

**ROUTT COUNTY JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS AGENDA**

**August 4, 2022
6:00 PM**

This hearing is available in person and through Zoom. You may access the hearing by joining our [Zoom Link](#).

Live audio is available by calling (669) 900-6833.

Meeting ID: 880 7418 8565

Password: 12345

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. (Comments regarding items on the agenda will be taken during that agenda item.)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes From July 7, 2022

Documents:

[070722-pc-corrected.pdf](#)

4. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

A. Consideration Of Public Comment And Discussion On The Draft Master Plan

[Link to Draft of Master Plan](#)

Documents:

[2022.07.28_Memo_Draft Master Plan Comments - kw.pdf](#)

5. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Administrator's Report may include the reading of future Planning Commission agendas and recent Board of County Commissioner decisions.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Agenda packets can be accessed at www.co.routt.co.us/AgendaCenter.

All programs, services and activities of Routt County are operated in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. If you need a special accommodation as a result of a disability, please call the Commissioners' Office at (970) 879-0108 to assure that we can meet your needs. Please notify us of your request as soon as possible prior to the scheduled event. Routt County uses the Relay Colorado service. Dial 711 or TDD (970) 870-5444.

ROUTT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

July 7, 2022

The regular meeting of the Routt County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Chairman Steve Warnke and Commissioners Brian Kelly, Bill Norris, Paul Weese, Ren Martyn, Andrew Benjamin, and Linda Miller. Commissioners Greg Jaeger and Jim DeFrancia were absent. Planning Director Kristy Winser and staff planners Alan Goldich and Michael Fitz also attended. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

MINUTES - June 2, 2022

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the above cited minutes, as written. Commissioner Martyn seconded the motion. The motion carried 7 - 0, with the Chair voting yes.

ACTIVITY: PL20220026

PETITIONER: Rita Donham and James Burgess

PETITION: Conditional Use Permit for Bed & Breakfast

LOCATION: 27875 US Highway 40; located approximately 1.2 miles west of Steamboat Springs on the south side of US 40, across from the Sleeping Giant School

Mr. James Burgess reviewed the petition. He explained that he and his wife are no longer full-time residents but would like to operate the proposed B&B when they are here. If something unexpected prevents them from being on site when guests are expected, their son, who lives in town, will stay on-site and serve as host. Mr. Burgess said that all bookings would be made in advance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Miller, Mr. Burgess stated that the new garage, which also contains a pottery studio, was incorrectly labeled on the site plan.

Commissioner Norris asked about the equestrian facilities. Mr. Burgess said that they used to keep horses, but that the proposed B&B would not include any equestrian facilities for clients.

Commissioner Martyn noted that the narrative describes the home as having five bedrooms, but the Assessor's records list only three. Mr. Burgess stated that an addition that included two bedrooms was constructed a few years after they purchased the property. Mr. Fitz stated that an additional condition of approval (COA) has been drafted at the request of the Assessor's Office allowing an

inspection of the property to enable the Assessor's Records to be updated. Ms. Winsler clarified that a referral is generally sent to the Assessor's Office, but in this case they did request a COA.

Mr. Fitz reviewed the proposal and presented a site plan of the property. He noted that the operation would have an on-site manager and that no amenities beyond those expected in a single-family residence would be provided. Advance reservations would be required. Mr. Fitz reviewed the suggested COAs and read the additional COA suggested by the Assessor's Office. He said that CDOT has issued an access permit for the driveway off of US 40. He noted that while the B&B would be open year around, the applicants anticipate that they will only have guests for 30 - 60 days per year.

Commissioner Miller asked about the trash receptacles. Mr. Burgess described the chain link structure that houses the trash and stated that it has been proven to be bear-proof. Mr. Fitz confirmed that the trash shed meets the requirement.

Public Comment

Ms. Rita Donham, the applicant, stated that she and her husband had been working on this project for several years, but that it had been postponed due to COVID. She said that the septic system and leach field had been overhauled, along with other improvements to the property to accommodate the proposed use.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Warnke closed public comment.

MOTION

Commissioner Norris moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a Bed & Breakfast (item #PL20220026) with the finding of fact that the proposal, with the following conditions, meets the applicable guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan and is in compliance with Sections 4, 5, 6 and 8.13 of the Routt County Zoning Regulations.

This approval is subject to the following conditions

:

General Conditions:

1. The CUP is contingent upon compliance with the applicable provisions of the Routt County Zoning Regulations including but not limited to Sections 5, 6, and 8.13.
2. Any complaints or concerns that may arise from this operation may be cause for review of the CUP, at any time, and amendment or addition of conditions, or revocation of the permit if necessary.
3. In the event that Routt County commences an action to enforce or interpret this CUP, the substantially prevailing party shall be entitled to recover its costs in such action including, without limitation, attorney fees.

4. Permits will be assessed an Annual Fee in accordance with the Fee Schedule in Appendix B of the Routt County Zoning Regulations.
5. No junk, trash, or inoperative vehicles shall be stored on the property.
6. This permit is contingent upon the acquisition of and compliance with any required federal, state and local permits. The operation shall comply with all federal, state and local laws. Copies of permits or letters of approval shall be submitted to the Routt County Planning Department prior to commencement of operations.
7. Fuel, flammable materials, or hazardous materials shall be kept in a safe area and shall be stored in accordance with state and local environmental requirements.
8. All exterior lighting shall be downcast and opaquely shielded.
9. All trash shall be stored to prevent wildlife intrusion and it is recommended either inside a garage or inside Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) certified receptacles
10. Prior to the issuance of the permit, the permittee shall provide evidence of liability insurance in compliance with the County's **Insurance and Surety Requirements policy then in effect**. The certificate of insurance shall include all permit numbers associated with the activity **and Routt County shall be named as an additional insured**. Permittee shall notify the Routt County Planning Department of any claims made against the policy.
11. Accessory structures/uses associated with this permit may be administratively approved by the Planning Director, without notice.
12. Transfer of this CUP may occur only after a statement has been filed with the Planning Director by the transferee guaranteeing that they will comply with the terms and conditions of the permit. If transferee is not the landowner of the permitted area, transferee shall submit written consent for the transfer by the landowner. Failure to receive approval for the transfer shall constitute sufficient cause for revocation of the permit if the subject property is transferred. Bonds, insurance certificates or other security required in the permit shall also be filed with the Planning Director by the transferee to assure the work will be completed as specified. Any proposal to change the terms and conditions of a permit shall require a new permit.
13. The Permittee shall prevent the spread of weeds to surrounding lands and comply with the most current version of the Colorado Noxious Weed Act and Routt County regulations for noxious weeds.

Specific Conditions:

- 14. The CUP is limited to uses and facilities presented in the approved project plan. Any additional uses or facilities must be applied for in a new or amended application.
- 15. The CUP is valid for the life of the use provided it is acted upon within one year of approval. The CUP shall be deemed to have automatically lapsed if the uses permitted herein are discontinued for a period of one (1) year.
- 16. Prior to operation, permittee shall submit to Routt County proof of a Sales Tax Account /License.
- 17. Any required permits from the Routt County Road and Bridge Department or Building Department shall be obtained and any inspections completed before operations commence.
- 18. The operations are year around, 7 days per week, eight guest capacity.
- 19. Section 8.13 Standards for Bed and Breakfasts shall be complied with. The owners' son may act as on-site manager during the event that the owners cannot be present to accept guests.
- 20. The Assessor shall be permitted to inspect the property prior to the commencement of operations to update the property inventory.

Commissioner Kelly seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7 - 0, with the Chair voting yes.

ACTIVITY: PL20220029, PL20220027, and PL20220042

PETITIONER: Southshore Plow Service LLC d/b/a Snow Country Nursery; and Back Atcha, LLC

**PETITION: 1) Final Planned Unit Development
2) Lot Line Adjustment
3) Floodplain Development Permit**

LOCATION: 35975 US Highway 40; located immediately south of the city limits of Steamboat Springs and behind the Steamboat Christian Center

Mr. Walter Magill of Four Points Surveying and Engineering, representing the petitioner, reviewed the site plan and described the proposal to reconfigure the lots and define the uses for the PUD parcel. He indicated the access road and the bridge across the Yampa River that provides access to the western most portion of the parcel. Mr. Magill noted that Snow Country Nursery has been operating on the site since at least 2011 and that the proprietor of Snow Country, Mr. Mitch Clark, purchased both parcels in 2020. Mr. Magill reviewed that in 1995 the zoning of the northern parcel was changed from Agriculture/Forestry (A/F) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), but no Final PUD plan describing the allowed uses was ever recorded, so there are no uses allowed on the property. Snow Country currently operates a nursery business on the southern parcel under an existing Administrative Permit. Mr. Magill indicated the proposed reconfiguration

of the lots that would preserve the acreage of the parcels but divide the total property along a common property line running north/south. The western parcel would retain the A/F zoning, which would allow for the potential construction of a residence, and the eastern parcel would retain the PUD, with defined uses to be reviewed and approved through the Final PUD Plan. Mr. Magill also presented the FEMA floodplain maps and indicated the areas of the parcel within the floodplain. Mr. Magill reviewed the proposed uses and structures for the PUD and noted that the existing A-frame would be relocated. He stated that initial approval had been received from Mt. Werner Water and Sanitation District (Mt. Werner) to provide out of district sanitary sewer service to the property. The existing A-frame, which is currently served by a mound-design septic system, would be connected to the central sewer line and the existing septic system would be removed. Mr. Magill stated that because no agreement had been reached with the Steamboat Christian Center regarding the construction of a permanent restroom, employees of Snow Country would continue to use portable toilets.

Mr. Magill presented the proposed plan and indicated three proposed easements to be publicly dedicated. The 50 ft. easements are located on the western property line of the A/F parcel and on the north and east property lines of the PUD parcel. Mr. Magill stated that the City is requesting an easement through the middle of the PUD parcel to accommodate the extension of the Core Trail, which currently ends at the northern border of the property. He stated that the applicant is opposed to this easement, and is instead offering the easements along the property borders, which would allow the Core Trail to follow Dougherty Rd. to the east and then travel south along US 40, or travel west along the property line, cross the river and travel south on the west side of the river. The trail could then proceed to Legacy Ranch across City owned property. He clarified that if the latter alignment were chosen, a new bridge to accommodate the trail would need to be constructed by the City. Mr. Magill presented photos of the land on the west side of the river and noted that the balloon launch use would be discontinued if a residence is constructed there. He also noted that a utility easement would be required for any development on the west side of the river.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the three elements of the petition, described the parcel and proposed reconfiguration. He indicated on a site plan the adjacent properties and noted that this parcel and all of those adjacent to it are within the watershed protection zone. He indicated the location of the two Mt. Werner parcels, both of which contain infiltration galleries for the City's drinking water supply. He reviewed the history of the subject parcel and some of the many uses that have occurred there. He stated that Mr. Clark purchased the property in 2020 and that the County had received a complaint last summer that the Snow Country operation had expanded beyond the borders of the northern (currently A/F zoned) parcel. The County issued a notice of violation, and since then staff has been working with the landowner to bring the property into conformance. Mr. Goldich reviewed the proposed uses, structures, and their locations to be listed on the Final PUD Plan. He added that the Floodplain Development Permit is needed for the storage of trees and materials in the floodplain.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the comments submitted by referral agencies, as follows:

- Mt. Werner said that an initial approval had been granted for out of district service for sanitary sewer service. The City will need to issue the final approval for the sewer service. Conditions of approval (COAs) regarding of water quality mitigation activities, the removal the septic system, and the Watershed Protection Permit are included in the suggested COAs.
- The City of Steamboat Springs requested an easement along the river, through the eastern parcel (to become the PUD) to accommodate the extension of the Core Trail. The City also commented on the need for the Watershed Protection Permit.
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) requested bear-proof trash receptacles, wildlife friendly fencing and the opportunity to participate in planning for the Core Trail extension using a holistic approach that would consider the entire trail alignment at once.

Mr. Goldich offered that the Core Trail easement was likely to be the most difficult issue to resolve, as there are many variables involved. He stated that the goal of the City is to extend the Core Trail all the way to the Legacy Ranch, located at the intersection of Hwy 131 and US 40. He noted that the extension of the Core Trail was identified in the Master Plan update public outreach as very important. The City's preferred alignment is along the east bank of the river, which is the alignment identified in a variety of planning documents. This alignment would be safely away from traffic and would avoid the need to construct two river crossings. Mr. Goldich reviewed the easements along the property lines proposed by the applicant. He noted that placing the Core Trail next to US 40 would be less safe than along the river, and added that the sidewalks on the Christian Center property were not built to the Core Trail standards. He stated that the last existing portion of the Core Trail crosses Mt. Werner property at the shared property line with the PUD parcel. Mt. Werner does not, however, want the Core Trail to cross their 17-acre parcel that borders Mr. Clark's property on the south. Mr. Goldich added that CPW would like there to be a holistic approach to planning the trail alignment, rather than piecing it together one easement at a time. Calling attention to proposed COA #9, Mr. Goldich said that the City is willing to consider some constraints on the easement being requested. He stated that it is up to Planning Commission and the Board to decide if it will require the City's requested easement, and if so, if some or all of these constraints are appropriate. He stated that if the easement is required, a separate easement document would be drafted and recorded, and referenced on the Final Plat and Final PUD Plan.

Chairman Warnke asked if the petitioner would retain use of the 20-ft. easement along the river up to the time that the trail were built. Mr. Goldich stated that he would. He also clarified that the easement would be entirely within the required 50-ft. waterbody setback from the river. He confirmed, however, that although nothing can be built within the 50-ft. setback, the storage of trees in the setback would be allowed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Martyn, Mr. Goldich reviewed the previous proposal for a mini-storage facility on the property. He reviewed the PUD process and explained that the PUD parcel cannot be re-zoned to A/F because it does not meet the minimum lot size for the A/F zone district. He confirmed that a residence or any other use by right allowed in the A/F zone district would be allowed on the reconfigured A/F lot. He stated that the existing nursey business operates under an Administrative Permit for that use.

Chairman Warnke asked about access to the parcel. Mr. Goldich said that an access permit is in place for Dougherty Rd., but not for the nursery business. An access permit from CDOT for the nursery is required in the suggested COAs.

Public Comment

Mr. Craig Robinson, Parks, Open Space and Trails manager for the City of Steamboat Springs, stated that the easement being requested along the east side of the Yampa River corresponds to the preferred Core Trail alignment as it has been identified on a variety of planning documents going back 20+ years. He added that the extension of the Core Trail both to the west to Steamboat II and to the south to Legacy Ranch was identified through the recent Master Planning process as being very important to the community, and is part of the a proposed regional Yampa River Trail. He said that the City has taken a very opportunistic approach to acquiring easements for the Core Trail, and acknowledged that the process takes time. Regarding the suggested COAs pertaining to the requested easement, Mr. Robinson said that although the City has not heretofore purchased or condemned land for the trail, it would consider purchasing the proposed easement. He offered, however, that the timeframe of 15 years included in COA # 9.f might not be realistic, and suggested that it may be in conflict with the purchase of the easement. Mr. Robinson said that the City has worked with CPW on plans for the Core Trail and has discussed different alignments. In response to a question from Chairman Warnke, Mr. Robinson said that he could not speak to the City's willingness to purchase the easement, and said that more information may be needed prior to the Board hearing. He said that the City has constructed fencing for other sections of the trail and is prepared for the cost of constructing the trail. He discussed previous proposed alignments and stated that the preferred alignment currently being proposed by the City eliminates the need for two river crossings, which would significantly reduce the cost of constructing the trail. Commissioner Martyn noted that the City owns a large property to the west and asked what the City's long-term plans are for it. Mr. Robinson said that the plan is to conserve the land and install an additional infiltration gallery.

Mr. Ed MacArthur, the former owner of the 17-acre parcel owned by Mt. Werner to the south of the subject property and the owner of the next property to the south of that, stated that he fully supports the applicant's proposal. He described his past negotiations with the City that resulted in an agreement for a trail alignment that would cross the river twice and then follow the railroad alignment across his land. He said that the City never acted on this agreement and that he

has since made different plans for his property and no longer wants the trail to cross the western portion of his land. He said that he would agree to an easement along the front of the property (along US 40). Mr. MacArthur stated that if the easement crosses Mr. Clark's property along the east side of the river, it will dead end there, because neither he nor Mt. Werner are willing to grant the connecting easements. He described the problems associated with dead-end trails. He offered that other alignments are available that would allow for the extension of the Core Trail to the Legacy Ranch, but that the alignment along the river was not going to happen. He indicated alternative alignments for the trail on an aerial map.

Mr. Frank Alfone, General Manager of Mt. Werner Water and Sanitation District since 2015, stated his support for Mr. Clark's proposal. He said that the removal of the existing septic system and leach field was very important as it would eliminate the possibility of it contaminating the City's water supply. He noted that the infiltration gallery along the Yampa would be the only source of the City's drinking water if there were a failure at Fish Creek Reservoir. Mr. Alfone stated that Mr. Clark and Mr. MacArthur were both excellent neighbors, and thanked Mr. Clark for his help and cooperation with the most recent infiltration gallery installation. Mr. Alfone described the process through which out of district sanitary sewer service can be provided. He explained that a resolution from the Mt. Werner Board of Directors would be approved, followed by the execution of an out of service agreement, and then both of these would have to be approved by City Council. Mr. Alfone stated that although Mt. Werner collects waste, it is the City that treats it and any expansion of the collection system must be approved by City Council.

Mr. Alfone indicated on an aerial map the location of the Mt. Werner properties on either side of the subject parcel, the location of the existing Core Trail and the location of the new infiltration gallery, which is 800 ft. long and 25 - 35 ft. deep within the groundwater alluvium of the Yampa River. He noted the problems that had occurred on northern Mt. Werner property as a result of the trail dead end and subsequent residential development nearby. He stated that Mt. Werner is unwilling to grant an easement for the extension of the trail across the southern property, and cited concerns with trespass, vandalism, contamination and potential loss of continuity of service. Mr. Alfone acknowledged that these decisions, including the language and conditions included in the resolution approving out of district service, would be made by the Mt. Werner District's Board, and that he would take all information back to the Board.

Mr. Chris Wilson, a resident of Steamboat Springs, stated that for many years in his capacity as Trails Coordinator and Parks and Recreation Director for the City of Steamboat Springs he worked on all the plans cited by Mr. Robinson that identify the future alignment of the Core Trail. He stated his support for staff's recommendation to require an easement along the east side of the river. He reviewed the history of the development of the existing Core Trail and provided examples of some landowners who had at first opposed providing an easement

for the trail and then later changed their minds. He offered that it would be short-sighted to not require the easement because Mt. Werner has said that it will not at this time grant a connecting easement. He acknowledged that the process of acquiring easements all the way to Legacy Ranch will take an indeterminate amount of time and cautioned against conditioning this easement on the completion of that process within a certain number of years. Mr. Wilson stated that the applicant would have full use of the easement in the interim and that it was important to look at the long term. Mr. Wilson reviewed the process through which the City negotiated the easement and constructed the trail and fencing across Mt. Werner's northern parcel and said that Mt. Werner has always been a supporter of the Core Trail. He urged Planning Commission to require an easement that follows the City's preferred alignment. In response to a question from Chairman Warnke, Mr. Wilson recommended that no timeframe be specified.

Chairman Warnke asked if a PUD could be amended by a future landowner. Mr. Goldich said that the owner could apply for amendments at any time. He also acknowledged that the suggested 15-year trigger listed in COA #9.f was essentially arbitrary. He said that Planning Commission could change that number or not include a time trigger at all. He added that any of the proposed triggers could be removed or modified.

Commissioner Martyn asked if the City had proposed an easement across the 17-acre southern parcel when Mt. Werner went through the permitting process for the infiltration gallery. Mr. Alfone said that it did not.

Mr. Cedar Beauregard, a resident of Steamboat Springs, offered that if the City did not build a dead-end trail, there would be no Core Trail. He stated that he supports the proposal, but that he would like there to be many easement options to allow the trail to follow whatever alignment becomes possible in the future.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Warnke closed public comment.

Commissioner Benjamin stated his support for the petition. He said he was having a hard time understanding why the City prefers a Core Trail alignment that crosses multiple private properties rather than one that provides access to the public land to the west. He stated his preference for a trail alignment that would provide greater opportunities for recreation and fewer conflicts.

Commissioner Miller asked what would become of an easement purchased by the City if the City were to decide to locate the trail across its property to the west because it could not extend the trail through the Mt. Werner parcel to the south.

In response to a question from Commissioner Weese, Mr. Goldich said that the easement proposed by staff was requested by the City through the referral process. He said that the County generally supports the requests made by referral agencies, adding that the extension of the Core Trail was identified by the

community as a high priority. Commissioner Weese asked why the City could not negotiate an easement with the landowner independently of this process. Ms. Winser stated that the trails easement being proposed by the applicant is part of the 25% open space requirement. She added that the tree storage areas are also proposed by the applicant to meet the open space requirement. She indicated those areas on a site plan. Trees are only stored on the property for a portion on the year. Ms. Winser said that it would be up to Planning Commission and the Board to determine if the tree storage areas should be considered open space.

Commissioner Kelly suggested that the easement should be dedicated or not, but that there should not be a time requirement associated with it. If the City purchases the easement then it should be in perpetuity. Commissioner Kelly offered that this would provide certainty for both the City and the landowner.

Commissioner Martyn expressed concern with the County's efforts to address the extension of the Core Trail through a single property. He said that the result would be only a minor extension of the trail with no certainty that it could be extended beyond that point. Commissioner Martyn said that he would support the applicant with the three easements proposed by the applicant with the conditions or triggers included in COA #9 applied to them. The onus would then be on the City to negotiate with the landowner and to pursue the options for extending the trail with the other relevant landowners.

In response to a question from staff, a large majority of Planning Commission determined that the tree storage areas should qualify as open space. Mr. Goldich noted that those areas are sufficiently large that the 25% open space requirement would be satisfied without any of the easements being included. Mr. Magill clarified that the easements along the perimeter proposed by the applicant would be publicly dedicated in any case, without compensation.

Commissioner Miller noted that, as written, suggested COA #9 does not refer specifically to the easement along the river.

Commissioner Kelly expressed concern with allowing the Core Trail to be built right up to the water infiltration gallery. He stated that while trails are important, water is more important.

When surveyed regarding their preferred location for the trails easement, Commissioners Benjamin, Kelly and Martyn stated that the easements along the perimeter as proposed by the applicant were preferable. Commissioner Miller suggested that the easement along the river should be required, either without any of the triggers listed under COA #9, or at least without the time limit (COA #9.f). Commissioner Norris supported the river easement without COA #9.F, but with all the other triggers. Commissioner Weese stated that he would support the river easement only if COA #9.f were included, but that he would support a timeframe of no more than 20 years. He stated that if COA #9.f were deleted, he would not support the river easement.

MOTION

Commissioner Miller moved to recommend approval of the Final PUD and Lot Line Adjustment (items PL20220029 and PL20220027) with the following findings of fact:

1. The proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan and Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan and is in compliance with the applicable provisions of Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Routt County Zoning and Sections 2 and 3 of the Routt County Subdivision Regulations.
2. In review of the Final PUD and Zoning Amendment standards, it has been determined that the Zoning Amendment standards have been met.
3. The Final PUD is substantially similar to the use that has been approved through Planning permit PP2011-012.
4. The proposal is located within the Urban Growth Boundary.
5. The residences have received approval for sewer service from the Mt. Werner Water and Sanitation District.

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

Rezoning

1. The Zone Change Resolution shall be recorded concurrently with the Final PUD Plan and Final Plat if applicable.

Final PUD:

1. This approval shall become effective upon the recording of the Final PUD plan.
2. Prior to recordation, the applicant shall submit an electronic copy of the approved plat to the County Planning Department in a .DWG format or other format acceptable to the GIS Department.
3. Prior to operation, permittee shall submit to Routt County proof of a Sales Tax Account /License.
4. The Final PUD Plan shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Plat and Zone Change Resolution.
5. Prior to recording the Final PUD Plan, the permittee shall provide evidence of liability insurance in compliance with the County's Insurance and Surety Requirements policy then in effect. The certificate of insurance shall include all permit numbers associated with the activity and Routt County shall be named as an additional insured. Permittee shall notify the Routt County Planning Department of any claims made against the policy.
6. Prior to recording the Final PUD Plan, evidence of approval of Out of District sewer service by Steamboat Springs City Council and Mt. Werner Water and Sanitation District shall be submitted.

7. Prior to recording the Final PUD Plan, an issued Watershed Protection Permit from the City shall be submitted.
8. The abandonment of the septic system shall follow all procedures as outlines in Regulation 43 for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems.
9. A 20' trail easement along the eastern bank of the Yampa River dedicated to the public, and accepted by Routt County shall be shown on the plat and PUD. Routt County shall draft a document that is recorded concurrently with the Final PUD Plan that contains the following conditions:
 - a. The City shall purchase the easement from the landowner.
 - b. The City shall not act on the easement until all easements are in place to extend it to the City's Legacy Ranch.
 - c. The City shall not act on the easement until all funding is in place to construct it to Legacy Ranch.
 - d. The City shall construct the trail at its expense
 - e. The City shall construct fencing and/or other natural barriers to prevent trespass onto the subject property.
 - f. If not acted upon within 20 years, this easement shall be void.
10. Notes on the Final PUD Plan shall include:
 - a. This PUD allows for the operation of a landscape nursery, storage of items associated with a landscape nursery, and structures shown on this plan. Accessory structures/uses associated with this permit may be administratively approved by the Planning Director, without notice.
 - b. Any complaints or concerns which may arise from this operation may be cause for review of the Administrative Permit, at any time, and amendment or addition of conditions, or revocation of the permit if necessary.
 - c. No junk, trash, or inoperative vehicles shall be stored on the property.
 - d. All exterior lighting shall be downcast and opaquely shielded in accordance with Section 6.3 of the Routt County Zoning Regulations.
 - e. The permittee shall prevent the spread of weeds to surrounding lands, and comply with the most current version of the Colorado Noxious Weed Act and Routt County regulations for noxious weeds No chemical pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, or hazardous material shall be stored, used, or located on the site.
 - f. Vehicle and equipment maintenance including fueling and oil changes are to be conducted on an impermeable membrane with containment.
 - g. Stormwater from parking area, office area, or snow storage site to be directed to the east towards the US 40 ditch.
 - h. In case of spill or release of any hazardous materials, Snow Country will notify the Mount Werner Water District immediately.

- i. Trash collection facilities or dumpsters will be situated to prevent effluent contribution to surrounding soils.
- j. Use of IGBC certified bear-resistant canisters shall be used to reduce human-bear conflict.
- k. Any fencing installed on the property should be wildlife friendly to prevent entanglement and entrapment of wildlife. Recommendations can be found in CPW's Fencing with Wildlife in Mind publication.
- l. Prior to Planning signing off on any building permits for the residential structures, the City of Steamboat Springs and/or Mt. Werner Water and Sanitation District have signed off on the building permit.
- m. The lowest floor of all residential structure shall be elevated to 2' above the base flood elevation. Building plans indicating the finished floor elevation of such structures shall be submitted with the building permit. Elevation Certificates for the lowest floor of the structures must be submitted to the Floodplain Administrator at three different points during development. These are:
 - During building permit review and prior to signing off on the foundation only building permit, and
 - Once forms have been constructed and prior to signing off on the full building permit, and
 - Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (as built).
- n. The landowner shall be aware of river flows during the spring runoff season and shall remove items from the floodway if flows are expected at a volume that will overtop the riverbank.
- o. An access permit from CDOT for the main nursery access shall be obtained by April 1, 2023. An extension of up to one year for this requirement may be granted administratively without notice by the Planning Director.

Lot Line Adjustment:

1. The plat shall be finalized and recorded within one (1) year unless an extension is granted pursuant to Section 2.1.6, Routt County Subdivision Regulations. Extensions to up to one (1) year may be approved administratively.
2. The Final Plat shall be recorded concurrently with the final PUD Plan and Zone Change Resolution.
3. Prior to recordation, the applicant shall submit an electronic copy of the approved plat to the County Planning Department in a .DWG format or other format acceptable to the GIS Department.
4. All property taxes must be paid prior to the recording of the plat.

5. A 'no build' zone shall be indicated on the plat for Lot 2 to avoid construction of structures and septic fields within the special flood hazard area. The "no build" zones shall be approved by the Planning Director before the plat is recorded.
6. The notes on the plat shall include, but are not limited to the following:
 - a. Routt County is not responsible for maintaining or improving subdivision roads. The roads shown hereon have not been dedicated nor accepted by the County.
 - b. The suitability of these lots for an individual septic disposal system and the availability of permits for individual septic disposal systems have not been established. The issuance of permits for individual septic disposal systems shall be a condition of obtaining a building permit for these lots.
 - c. Existing and new accesses shall meet access standards set forth by the Routt County Road and Bridge Department and Fire Prevention Services.
 - d. The availability of water and permits for wells on the lots or parcels hereon shown has not been established.
 - e. Revegetation of disturbed areas shall occur within one growing season with a seed mix that avoids the use of aggressive grasses. See the Colorado State University Extension Office for appropriate grass mixes.
 - f. Routt County (County) and the Steamboat Springs Area Fire Protection District (District) shall be held harmless from any injury, damage, or claim that may be made against the County or the District by reason of the County's or the District's failure to provide ambulance, fire, rescue or police protection to the property described on this plat, provided that the failure to provide such services is due to inaccessibility of the property by reason of internal roads being impassable. This conditions shall not relieve the County or the District of their responsibility to make a bona fide effort to provide emergency services should the need arise.
 - g. Address signage in conformance with Routt County Road Addressing, Naming, and Signing Policy shall be located at the entrance to the driveway.
 - h. A current soils test showing that the soil is of a sufficient stable nature to support development will be required before obtaining a building permit.
 - i. Prior to Planning signing off on a building permit for development on Lot 2, a development permit from the Army Corps of Engineers shall be submitted, if required.

Commissioner Weese seconded the motion,

The motion carried 4 - 3, with the Chair voting yes.

Commissioners Benjamin, Kelly and Martyn voted in dissent.

MOTION

Commissioner Kelly moved to recommend approval of the Floodplain Development Permit (item PL20220042) with the finding of fact that the proposal with the following conditions is in compliance with the applicable provisions of Sections 5.13 of the Routt County Zoning Regulations.

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

Floodplain Development

1. This Permit is contingent upon compliance with the applicable provisions of the Routt County Zoning Regulations including but not limited to Section 5.13.
2. This Permit is limited to uses and facilities presented in the project plan approved through this permit and through PL20220029. Any additional structures or grading must be applied for in a new or amended application.
3. In the event that Routt County commences an action to enforce or interpret this Permit, the substantially prevailing party shall be entitled to recover its costs in such action including, without limitation, attorney fees.
4. This approval is contingent upon any required federal, state and local permits being obtained and complied with; the operation shall comply with all federal, state and local laws.
5. Revegetation of disturbed areas shall occur within one growing season following completion of the project, with a seed mix which avoids the use of aggressive grasses. See the Colorado State University Extension Office for appropriate grass seed mixes.
6. The lowest floor of all residential structure shall be elevated to 2' above the base flood elevation. Building plans indicating the finished floor elevation of such structures shall be submitted with the building permit. Elevation Certificates for the lowest floor of the structures must be submitted to the Floodplain Administrator at three different points during development. These are:
 - a. During building permit review and prior to signing off on the foundation only building permit, and
 - b. Once forms have been constructed and prior to signing off on the full building permit, and
 - c. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (as built).
7. The landowner shall be aware of river flows during the spring runoff season and shall remove items from the floodway if flows are expected at a volume that will overtop the riverbank.

Commissioner Norris seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7 - 0, with the Chair voting yes.

ADMINISTRATOR 'S REPORT

Ms. Winser announced that Chris Brookshire had retired after a 42-year career with Routt County. She said that the positions of Planner II and Planner Tech are open and being advertised.

Ms. Winser stated that the draft Master Plan update would be released for public comment beginning on Tuesday, July 12th. A joint meeting of Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners and public hearing for comment on the draft Plan will be held on August 4th. The Master Plan will be the only agenda item for that meeting. The adoption hearing by Planning Commission is scheduled for August 18th, with the Board ratification hearing on August 30th.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the upcoming agendas.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.



MEMORANDUM

Date: July 28, 2022
To: Routt County Board of County Commission and Planning Commission
From: County Planning Staff and Cushing Terrell
RE: Comments on the Draft Master Plan

County Planning staff collected comments on the Draft Master Plan from the Board of County Commissioners at a joint work session on June 23, 2022 and via email. The public comment period for the Draft was July 12 - July 22, 2022. The public emailed their comments to County planning staff.

Staff/consultant responses are in [blue](#).

BCC/PC COMMENTS:

Overall/Introduction :

- When discussing the “term” of the plan, rather than a comprehensive update, the plan should be revisited and amended as necessary every 5 years.
 - [Language was added on page 16 to review the Plan every 5 years](#)
- In the previous Master Plan, there was a chapter with acronyms and definitions. Was this considered?
 - [Added Appendix 5.3 Definitions on page 125 that includes acronyms.](#)
- Pg 19 reads “Four open houses” then in listing them only 3 are listed with Steamboat omitted
 - [Page 21 - Steamboat was added](#)
- Page 11: Include average annual wage in addition to median household income - while the AMI is quite high, average annual wage is only about \$40,000 a year. Income inequality is a major driver of issues facing Routt County.
 - [Average Annual Wage was added to page 13](#)
- P. 16: is it accurate that all municipal plans are adopted/ratified by the County?
 - [Updated the language on page 18](#)
- P. 18: I don't think we had “over 922” responses. I think we had either over 900 or exactly 922.
 - [Updated the language on page 20](#)
- Page 12 “Housing Prices” - this section does not seem to fit the rest of the content in this section. It makes sense later and works there but it seems forced here.
 - [Removed this subsection as it is addressed in Background on page 35](#)
- I would like to see more section numbers throughout the document. With updates to the plan page numbers may change and people may reference or look for something from a wrong page number
-

Growth, Land Use & Infrastructure:

- The last paragraph on page 26 describes ridgeline matters; on page 27 the existing skyline map, but nothing ties the comments to the map.
 - [Page 29 - added language to tie the information to the map.](#)
- Page 30, Future Growth Areas map:
 - Does Clark qualify as Tier 3?
 - [Yes, as indicated by the pink circle.](#)
 - Is Glen Eden actually considered a “community”?
 - [No - the label was left over from a previous version and has been removed \(page 28\)](#)
 - Considering SLWSD services and a considerable number of lots in Steamboat Lake Subdivision, wouldn't it be considered Tier 3?
 - [Yes - it was added to the map \(page 28\)](#)
- P. 25: does it make sense to use the word “shall” when talking about municipalities? Our MP can't really dictate what they do.
 - [Removed “shall” on page 27](#)
- P. 28: are the barriers to learning also barriers to economic growth? Should you also use the phrase “equitable access” or similar?
 - [Updated the language on page 31](#)
- Page 66 (referencing Dark Skies policy): This is the first and only mention that I see of this in the plan. I would like to see it in a policy or somewhere else as well.

Housing & Economy:

- Regarding the discussion on the economy, smaller school districts are very dependent on income from coal extraction and will need new sources of funding in the transition away from coal
 - [Discussion of the school districts' funding was added on page 39, and Action 8.25.A on page 98: Partner with organizations looking to replace coal extraction with businesses that contribute to the economy and local tax base](#)
- Page 38 - Policy 13 - do the words “unless a permit is obtained” imply that a permit process is in place?
 - [This language was removed to avoid confusion \(page 40\). There is no permitting process in place.](#)
- P. 38 seems to indicate that we are prioritizing the protection of natural resources only for economic reasons
 - [This was taken out of subsequent drafts.](#)
- Page 36: Also the amount of land getting subdivided making ranch operations harder to find the proper amount of land to work on. And not getting checker boarded. May be a good area to talk about supportive uses needed for many of these ranches to subsist. Talking about how many ranches need to find alternate incomes to be able to make it.
- Page 37: The policies don't talk much about uses in the county and only talks about housing needs when the chapter talks about the character of the agriculture being needed to be thought of and important
- Page 38: The last section of this area I would think would be where we would mention as policy the need to keep the character of agriculture relevant which was stated previously in the chapter
-

Historic & Cultural Resources:

cushingterrell.com

- Pg 32 Policy #4 instead of “that attract visitors” use language that includes everyone
 - [This language was updated in subsequent drafts \(page 34\)](#)
- The Master Plan does not appear to address Cultural Resources (for example Historic Building Stocks) and in light of the currently changing environment the mark is missed about Routt County's Existing Infrastructure as a resource. How or the process of our existing building stock, roads, bridges, etc are maintained and upgraded should be addressed.

Transportation & Mobility:

- Recommendation to add information about County roads
 - [Map was added on page 43, information was added on page 44](#)
- There is a need for passing lanes on US 40 and Hwy 131 - the County needs to do everything in its power to improve the road system. Constructing wider shoulders would improve County road safety.
 - [Action 4.14.B on page 84 of the Implementation Matrix: Advocate with CDOT and identify funding sources to widen shoulders on state and federal highways to improve safety](#)
- The Land Use Story Map should be mentioned as a resource for those wanting more in-depth information
 - [A link to the Story Map was added on page 44.](#)
- Pg 41 Map should include Oak Creek
 - [Map was updated \(page 46\)](#)
- Pg 42 Map would be more useful if communities were identified
 - [Map was updated \(page 47\)](#)
- P. 43: #2 what about ag operators?
 - [Added Action 6.1.C on page 88: Work with the agricultural community to better understand their use of County roads and how to reduce conflicts with other road users.](#)
- P. 43 #6 I'm not sure what this is referencing? Should we add a comment about minimizing conflict between user groups on roads?
 - [This is addressed in other action items under Transportation & Mobility](#)
- P. 47: consider addressing event permitting - especially city events that spill into the county
 - [Added Action 5.3.D \(page 86\): Evaluate the need for permitting for special events and consider off-site impacts.](#)
-

Recreation & Tourism:

- Pg 45 Background paragraph end with “County” instead of “Community”
 - [Language was updated \(page 50\)](#)

Open Space & Agriculture:

- Recommendation to cite Senate Bill 35 specifically when discussing 35-acre subdivisions
 - [Bill was cited specifically on page 53](#)
- More creative use of 35-acre parcels should be encouraged.
 - [Policy 6.1 on page 88: Support bona-fide and viable agricultural operations](#)
 - [Action 6.1.A: Revise Zoning and Subdivision Regulations to support agricultural operations.](#)
 - [Action 6.1.B: Encourage outreach programs for new residents to educate them regarding activities associated with ranching and their responsibilities to maintain rural lands.](#)

- Agricultural operators say that many large ranches are increasingly being used more as hobby ranches and less for agricultural production.
 - Added Policy 6.1 (page 88) and 6.2: Discourage development that changes the rural character or historic agricultural uses and/or practices. Action 6.2.A: Create a definition of agriculture that helps decision makers decide whether a true agricultural operation is the primary use of a property or not.
- Pg 51 Agricultural lands #9 after “irrigation ditches” add “and scattered developments”
 - Language was updated (page 55)
- Pg 51 Ag land #12 define domestic predators or give a couple examples
 - The way it is written is consistent with the language used in the County’s regulations that also has a definition that’s used by CPW.

Sustainability & Climate Action

- Pg 53 New technologies paragraph after “larger homes” add “and scattered developments”
 - Updated, page 58
- Page 42: This is a confusing map. What is the percentage in reference to?
 - Clarifying language was added to the map: The labeled %s represent the percentage (on average) of vehicles that are heavy truck traffic (semi trucks).

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- It seems that the continued rejection of commercial development in the County is missing
 - While the foundation of the plan has not changed, we have moved away from calling it “commercial.” Instead, we state throughout the plan and specifically under 1.4 Guiding Principles; to Direct Growth to municipalities and other targeted areas. One of the goals of the Master Plan update was to address issues that have often caused confusion for the public as well as for decision makers. One of those issues is what is considered “commercial.” There are supplementary uses that are allowed in the A/F zone district, if they meet certain standards, even though they have a commercial component. Examples of these uses are guest ranches and snow mobile tours. Rather than stating that the County rejects all commercial development in rural Routt County while simultaneously allowing certain commercial operations, it was decided that it would be more clear to rely on the Land Use Chart which lists individual uses, where they are allowed, and what type of permitting is required. Standards are then applied to the proposals for such uses to assist decision makers in determining if the uses are appropriate for the proposed location.
 - The next step in this process will be to update our regulations to implement the plan.
- We need to prioritize recreation/public spaces adjacent to Tier 1 and Tier 2 Future Growth Areas so that our residents will have areas to recreate and we can reduce some conflicts in the County
 - Added Action 5.10.B (page 87): Support the creation of public spaces for recreation adjacent to Future Growth Areas
- The PDR program and conservation easements are not mentioned. These easements cover a significant portion of land in Routt and the fact that they cannot be developed should be highlighted.
 - Language was added to page 53 and map Public & Conserved Lands on page 123
- Suggestion to reference the County’s historic diverse communities when explaining the Future Growth Areas
 - Language was added to page 18
- Define the boundaries of the Tier 3 Growth Areas

- Added Action 1.1.C (page 71): Develop standards for any future development in Tier 3 Small Established Communities. We are intentionally not creating boundaries for Tier 3 areas. In the Master Plan, we include criteria that define Tier 3, then the Action is to create standards in the Regulations to help evaluate land use applications in Tier 3 areas. All proposals for these areas will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking the community needs and benefits into account.
- Secondary dwelling units should not be used for short term rentals
 - Language was added to page 32
- Add an action to address the appropriateness of soil berms to protect the natural topography
 - Action 6.15.C (page 90) was added: Protect the natural topography and prevent the spread of noxious weeds by reviewing the appropriateness of allowing soil berms.
- Define criteria for short term rentals
 - Short Term Rentals are defined in the glossary and there is no need to establish criteria for them when they are not allowed in the unincorporated County.
- Add an action item around supporting RRCCR and their destination management efforts
 - Added Action 5.1.H (page 85): Support the efforts of community groups to manage the impacts of recreation.
- Infrastructure needed in both Tier 1 and Tier 2 must include services like adequate grocery stores, gas stations, parks, services businesses as well as open spaces to accommodate projected populations
 - The Future Growth Areas framework allows for uses of this type to be permitted through the land use development process.
- WATER - is critical to our existence and quality of life. This draft Master Plan is comprehensive with an extensive action list, but the issue of the reliability of long-term water supply is not addressed. The Plan mentions water conservation, but not supply.
 - Language was added on page 32
- Section 1.2 does not accurately reflect how white settlers actually obtained the land. A more truthful land acknowledgement of the indigenous people should be considered.
 - Language was added on page 11
-