<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED TIME</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC LOCATION AND PRESENTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tab A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice-Chair Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roll Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pledge of Allegiance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:35</td>
<td>Public Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Each speaker will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limit comments to no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more than three (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minutes, with a total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time of 30 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allotted to public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments, pursuant to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 2.28.020 of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Silt Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>Consent agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1. Minutes of the</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Tab B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 19, 2022 Planning &amp; Zoning Commission meeting</td>
<td>Vice-Chair Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agenda Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45</td>
<td>Vote in new Chair</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Vice-Chair Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:55</td>
<td>Lot 94 Silt Trade</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Tab C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Center – Site Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planner Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Lot 94 Silt Trade</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Tab D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Center – Special Use</td>
<td>Recommendation to</td>
<td>Planner Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permit for Residential</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unit in Trade Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25</td>
<td>Modular Home on 5th &amp;</td>
<td>Discussion Item</td>
<td>Tab E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Ballard – Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planner Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>Risiende - PUD Zoning</td>
<td>Public Hearing and</td>
<td>Tab F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>and Subdivision Sketch</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Planner Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>Planners Report</td>
<td>Info Item</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Commissioner Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Silt Planning & Zoning Commission is tentatively set for Tuesday, June 7, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. Items on the agenda are approximate and intended as a guide for the Planning and Zoning Commission. “Estimated Time” is subject to change, as is the order of the agenda. For deadlines and information required to schedule an item on the agenda, please contact the Town of Silt at 876-2353. Please be aware that this agenda is given to the public and to the Commission in electronic form. If you require a hard-copy, please request one before or after the scheduled meeting. Normal Town copying charges may apply. Thank you.
The Silt Planning and Zoning Commission held their regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, April 19, 2022. Chair Classen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Roll call

Present: Chair Chris Classen, Vice-Chair Lindsey Williams, Commissioner Eddie Aragon, Commissioner Robert Doty, Commissioner Kim Leitzinger, Commissioner Joelle Dorsey.

Also present were Town Administrator Jeff Layman, Planner Mark Chain, Community Development Manager Nicole Centeno, and Community Development Administrative Assistant Dusti Tornes.

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Comments – There were no public comments.

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of the April 4, 2022 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Dorsey made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented. Vice-Chair Williams seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Conflicts of Interest – There were no conflicts of interest.

Agenda Changes – There were no agenda changes.

Rislende – PUD Zoning and Subdivision Sketch Plan

Planner Chain gave an overview on the 51-acre project, but stated that they will be back in front of the Commissioners on May 3rd. Rislende representatives that attended the meeting were August Group LLC DBA Rislende, which was represented by Mitchell Weimer, as well as Carlie; property owner Dennis Carruth, Land Planner Doug Pratte; High County Engineering Project Engineer Roger Neal; and Attorney Chad Lee with Balcomb & Green is the Attorney.

Planner Chain explained that this project will be going through the entire process for a Major Subdivision, and it will have its zoning through the Planned Unit Development Process (PUD).
What is being presented tonight is the sketch plan. As the project progresses, each tract will be presented in detail for a Site Plan Review to the Planning Commission. With utilities being accessible along the frontage road, the proposed project is looking to build two tracts within the next year or so. There are a total of 160 residential units that are proposed to go in. Planner Chain then asked Doug Pratte to speak and give a quick overview presentation on the project as a whole.

After the presentation, Chair Classen asked what the difference between active and passive parkland entailed. Doug Pratte explained that it is in our code and that they can’t build a permanent structure on the island. Michell Weimer said that space would be for activities such as throwing a frisbee and passive uses such as sitting under a tree. It won’t be a sports fields, but rather more like lawn space.

Commissioner Doty asked if they had the occupancy load and the size of the Event Center. Michell Weimer estimates that it will be somewhere in the amount of 250 to 300 people. They haven’t designed it yet, so they don’t know the exact size. Commissioner Doty then inquired about the Beacon. Mitchell explained that it will be as much indoor as it is outdoor restaurant. The brick-and-mortar walls will be smaller than what you will expect, but it will have a large patio and back yard area as well. He stated that the design the buildings are in the progress. Commissioner Doty wanted to clarify that all of the buildings would be presented to the Commissioners individually. Michell explained that there would be a few different meetings to look at all the details, that go into each building. Today is just an intro, we will be in front of you in two weeks to go over in more details the project.

Chair Classen asked if the bike path could be along the river. Michell explained that they don’t want it going in front of the Event Center. People who have events there won’t want people on their bikes who are proceeding through the property to go right through the event. There is a possibility for bike paths on the island in the future. Chair Classen said that there is a path over by the Holiday Inn, that dead ends by the over pass of 311 road. Mitchell said that there will be discussions on this matter, as once there is something to connect to, they will connect. It will take work from the engineers to get that accomplished.

Commissioner Doty thanked them for the presentation and looks forward to the project. There is not anything like this in our valley, he stated. Commissioner Doty also asked about what their thoughts are on the water recreations activities. Doug Pratte said that when you are on the water, you can raft, then the shore line activities are fishing, and walking trails along the river. The path to get to the island is accessible to everyone, so they can access the amenities that will be offered there.

Commissioner Doty then inquired about the access points. Michell explained that they are still working on this. Dennis Carruth stated that they had 5 access points granted CDOT in the previous development plan for the Divide Creek Center, but they are projected to have a new one soon. Commissioner Dorsey had concerns about the I-70 over pass, and the poor condition it is in. She also asked about the winter months. Mitchell wants to offer propane smokeless fire pits, overhead heaters, blanket rentals, and provide whatever is needed to keep the guests comfortable.

Commissioner Litzinger wants to know about connecting to the sidewalk by Holiday Inn, and if there was a way to not cross the access road twice to be able to stay on a sidewalk. She also inquired about pet areas, so people with pets could bring them to the island. Mitchell likes the idea of trying to connect to the Dog Park across the river. He is also going to further discuss not having to cross the road twice for the sidewalk.
Commissioner Aragon thought it was a great presentation, and is excited for the community to see what is coming.

Vice-Chair Williams wondered how they came up with the idea for their plan, and which one came first. Mitchell said that they had been driving by this property for a long time, when it went up for sale, the idea came to them about the same time.

Vice-Chair Williams also asked about the river activities that they did not want there. Mitchell explained that they don't want canoes or boats coming down the river in front of the Event Center, and disturbing an event that is taking place or impeding on the privacy of the residential places either. Mitchell believes that it would be appropriate for people to load/unload boats on the island, then walk over to enjoy the amenities. Vice-Chair Williams also asked if there had been any conversations about the potential impact to the Colorado River. She stated that she likes to look at the Bald Eagles in the trees, as well as other birds on the Island. Mitchell said that they will get the ecology study next week, and then they will better understand how to work around the wildlife.

River Run Single Family Cottage

Planner Chain introduced River Run representatives, Ray Neilson and Mark Steiver; then gave a quick recap on the project. The homeowners purchase the house, but lease the property on which they reside. The units were originally proposed to be 399 square feet, but are now being built at 650 square feet. Planner Chain then went on to explain that Unit 18 is two feet wider than all the other units. Ray Neilson has approved to enclose both porches and build an additional porch on unit 18. It was not permitted to be different, and the Town was under the assumption that it was the same as the previous 17 units. Ray provided the Town with no written documentation indicating any of the changes. It was discussed that the contractor made the Building Inspector aware of the changes, however, the permit remained issued without knowledge of changes. Planner Chain concluded that it is a logical place to have a larger unit, as a natural transition is taking place at the location, directly adjacent to the proposed self-storage units. Unit 5 has also submitted a permit application to enclose their porches, to match Unit 18. Ray Neilson has not given his final approval on this request. Ray stated that the homes are not designed to enclose both porches, but rather to serve the purpose of an open porch.

Planner Chain suggested that unit 18 be allowed, since it has been constructed, but for further consideration to be taken for unit 5. Planner Chain stated that the Town will need to work with Ray to develop clear guidelines for the River Run project. Planner Chain then asked Ray Neilson, as the land owner, to speak further on the topic of enclosed porches. Ray indicated that the contractor was given a lot space to build on, in exchange for keeping the cost lower during the building process. When Ray was approached about increasing the square footage of unit 18, he directed the contractor to get approval by the Town. He was under the impression that since the unit was getting inspected, everything had been cleared with the Town. It was decided that it was in a location that could accommodate a 14-foot wide unit. The other lots don't have that capability due to location and size. Ray did not follow up with the Town to verify that the changes had been approved and apologized for his lack of doing so. Ray did not want to go on record stating his opinion on enclosing the porches, but stated that he thought the Town was going to permit the River Run homes as any other Single-Family Dwellings in Town. In the River Run rules and regulations, the houses can’t expand the building envelopes by building up or out. The one place that Ray remained neutral was on the porches. River Run guidelines didn’t give design guidelines for porch alterations. Ray did have a number of people inquire about enclosing porches, he advised them against doing this, as the foundation and
units were not set up to accommodate this expansion. Ray stated his goal is to offer affordable housing, which requires that all of the house are the same. Ray thought that if there was someone who presented a good plan for enclosing their porch, that he would evaluate, approve then send them to the Building Department for a permit. Ray then states that he would like to go off the record and say that he would be fine with the Town not approving additional units to enclose porches. Community Development Manager Centeno requested that the pictures be projected, so the Commissioners could see the difference between the covered versus uncovered porches.

Chair Classen doesn’t remember any approved car ports coming in front of the commission either. Commissioner Dorsey agreed that she doesn’t remember having a conversation about car ports. Commissioner Doty asked what the contractual arrangement was between both parties, and who was going to live in Unit 18. Mark Steiver explained that the owner of High Country Builders is planning on living in that unit when it’s complete. Commissioner Doty also asked about the regulations to modify the house in any way. Ray explained that the homes cannot go bigger on the building envelopes but they have nothing in their regulations on not enclosing the porches. Commissioner Dorsey asked if all along their plan was to enclose both porches, with the structural ability to support the additional construction. Ray said that Unit 5 is already built without the structural ability to just enclose the porches, which could increase the living space. Ray agreed that they are wanting to enclose and add square feet to both their bedroom and their living room. It would be awkward to make them into a bedroom, but not impossible. With unit 18 that was always the plan, the foundation was made to accommodate those changes from the beginning.

Chair Classen wanted to know if what they were looking at, on the pictures, was going to face the road. Ray answered that yes, those pictures were showing the road facing side. He also stated that there would be a little roof on that side to break up the elevation.

Chris Classen also asked about sheds for the units. Ray said that they are just prefab sheds that you can get from Costco, measuring 5 foot by 6 foot. They need them for their garbage bins. Chair Classen likes the open porches in this quaint neighborhood. He went on to say that when Ray came in front of the commission to begin with, the units looked like a mobile home park. After changes and discussions, the units now have some dimension to them, and they look more like a home rather than a trailer. He doesn’t want to see the porches enclosed. Commissioner Doty agreed with Chair Classen on enclosing the porches. Ray Neilson does not have a problem with them just saying no enclosed porches. Chair Classen said that 18 was built with the foundation and as much as he doesn’t want to see it, it is too late to do anything about it now, but doesn’t want to see porches on any additional units. Commissioner Dorsey agrees with Chair Classen on what was originally discussed for the project. It was only approved for certain infrastructure impacts. If we allow one to enclose the porches, then we potentially are going to have a population density beyond what the impact studies initially indicated. She is not happy with the enclosure of unit 18, but agrees that it’s too late.

Ray wanted to know, if as a body, they could clarify the porches being covered as not being approved in writing. Planner Chain explained that they could not at this meeting, as there is a process involved to do so. Planner Chain wants written regulations that clearly state what the expectations are for this development.

Commissioner Doty did a walk through on the houses; he liked the houses and was under the impression that all 70 units would be the same. Vice-Chair Williams agrees with everyone and that she was not a fan of unit 18, and was getting the impression that things are not buttoned up and we need to go back to get everything cleaned up on this project.
Chair Classen asked about the header board on the side of the house (Unit 18) and what it was for. Mark Steiver explained that it is for a car port if they decide to add one in the future. Commissioner Leitzinger agrees with the comments that have been made already and she also agrees with Vice-Chair Williams to make sure that everything is documented properly from this point forward. She also wanted to know if enclosing meant putting up a temporary fence material on the porch to keep pets in. Ray Neilson said that they would have to get approval from him. Planner Chain stated that they can’t hang anything from the roof. That would be enclosing the porch. Commissioner Leitzinger agrees with the comments if that is what enclosure means. Commissioner Aragon is not a fan of enclosing the porches. He agreed with the other Commissioners comments about the enclosed porches. Commissioner Aragon thinks that they have opened a huge can of worms and doesn’t want to be a part of that.

**Self-Storage at River Run**

Planner Chain gave a quick recap on the project, as it still has to go through a site plan review. The Town Code states that you can’t have 60 feet or more of uninterrupted roof lengths. The roof line and length of building is 225 feet on building A. The proposed project talks about using various options to help, such as landscaping. Planner Chain feels like they need to add some more landscaping to the project to buffer between the building and the homes. On the original site plan there was a landscape buffer between the storage and the homes. Planner Chain said that he gave Larry and Yvonne, the architects, corrections that needed to be changed. He worked with Larry on ways to change the look of the roofline, as well as realigning where the doors would be staggered on the front of the building. Planner Chain still feels that there needs to be landscaping done by a professional. Planner Chain would like to require an agreed upon landscaping buffer from the property line for Building A, with minimum dimensions as shown on the updated plan. He would also like to see changes in elevation by varying parapet height as shown on updated concept plans, as well as a significant landscape buffer on the south edge of the Self-Storage area around and over to the property line located to the west of Building D (Tire Tech).

The Town is requiring the continuation of the path’s extension along the northern property boundary when adjacent to the Frontage Road right-of-way. Planner Chain turned the conversation over to Larry Rogers, who gave a quick overview on the storage units, and gave examples of what he and his partner have designed in the past.

Larry stated the buffers were unnecessary, as they do have some exposure to I-70 at the office and Building A, however, he feels that the storage is less impactful. Being lower and set back it lowers the impact but we still want to be sensitive to what we are trying to accomplish. Building B and C are behind Tire Tech, with a mostly solid wood fence. That is in turn buffering us to the roads. Building A and the Office are the only buildings that we are putting up that need any sort of buffering. Building G is climate controlled, and the back side, in which more planting could take place.

The next topic was fencing and how it’s crucial for security. Larry stated that the gates would grant easy access to the storage facility for nearby home owners.

Larry then explained that to address the roof pitch was being addressed by the parapets and staggering of the doors to give it a different feel. This will enable more of a residential feel. Typical storage buildings are beige and gray, but Yvonne stated that they are choosing a more premium color choice and they don’t have the look of a long industrial feel. Larry gave more in depth details on the office operations as well. There will be a 24-7 person there to help with
security, and any needs that might arise. Commissioner Doty wants to know what colors are being used in the parapets. Larry said Rustic Red is the siding and the gray for the roof, but those colors will alternate on each building (a color palette was presented). Vice-Chair Williams asked why they took away the landscaping by the fence, that was on the initial proposal. Planner Chain explained that the drawing was not to scale, but it had a landscape buffer in it. Larry stated that typical buffers are used between two owners, but this is not it is one owner. He doesn’t understand why we need to buffer if it is one land owner. Planner Chain explained that there is not one owner, there are 70 the home owners, as this affects not only the one land owner, but the 70 home owners as well.

Vice-Chair Williams asked Ray Neilson what his thoughts were on the matter. His plan is to completely screen the view of the houses from the outside people. Vice-Chair Williams asked about the walking path. Planner Chain explained that the path goes in front of the Holiday Inn to Golden Gate, and will need to go as far as their property line. He also inquired about the path by the river, and when that was going to be installed.

Vice-Chair Williams is trying to figure out what needs to happen to move forward with the plans. Planner Chain, Larry and Yvonne agree on most of the proposal, however, there are still a few changes needed. Commissioner Doty stated that he would not buy a home there if there was not adequate buffering between the storage units and the houses. Chair Classen thanked them for their presentation and looks forward to the next time they are in front of the commission.

**Planning Update**

Planner Chain stated that the Town recently received the Camario application. This will be the restatement of the previous plat, with some changes. The new owner will need to finish up engineering on the park and other items. Site Plan of Lot 1 at River Trace has been submitted. Rislende will have the public hearing on May 3rd. Brew zone has not come in yet they haven’t come to an agreement on purchasing or leasing a new property. He would also like to have another meeting on May 17th.

**Commissioner Comments**

Chair Classen asked about the Easter Egg Hunt. Community Development Manager Centeno, stated that it went well and served between 500-550 citizens. There were over 10,000 Easter Eggs stuffed, with the help of volunteers. The event concluded with a face painter and pictures with the Easter Bunny.

**Adjournment**

Vice-Chair Williams made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Dorsey seconded the motion, and adjourned the meeting 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Approved by the Planning Commission

____________________________ ____________________________

Dusti Tornes Lindsey Williams
Community Development Vice-Chair
Administrative Assistant
Meeting Date: 5/03/2022

Project: Lot 94 Silt Trade Center
Site Plan Review

Applicant: Jaeger Land, LLC

Owner: Jaeger Land, LLC

Current Zoning: PUD (Comm/Ind)

Proposed Zoning: Same

Present Land Use: Vacant

Proposed Land Use: Shop with Apartment

Attachments: Land Use Application
Revised PUD Regs (Ord 19-2008)

Background

The Silt Trade Center in the Lyon Subdivision indicates was annexed in the early 1990s. The original the original PUD regulations were recorded in 1994 and there have been 2 updates since that time. The most recent update is Ordinance # 19- Series of 2008. Therefore, I am reviewing the proposed development and site plan related to the standards in that Ordinance. A copy of that ordinance is attached after the staff report.

The 2008 update changed the designation in some of the lots from B-2 (semi-industrial) to an underlying B-1 which is more commercial/retail/business oriented. These lots also require a higher standard of finish – a bit more buffed out than a typical Commercial/Industrial area. The zone change also allowed a number of lots to have 2 dwelling units in each structure. Other lots are allowed to have a residential unit but one must go through the Special Use Permit Process. Lot 94 is noted as a B-2 lot. It allows a
more shopworn industrial type of appearance. It is not a lot noted with allowed residential units as a use by right.

**Note:** There are essentially 2 applications here. The site plan review for the Commercial and a Special Use Permit for the Residential. It is virtually the same information for both. I have combined the land use application submittal into one document in order to be efficient. But it is best to review each one separately. The Planning Commission reviews and approves or denies Site Plan review applications. A Special Use Permit is reviewed by the planning commission with the recommendation to the Board. The Board is the final approval body. We will start with the Commercial site plan review.

I. **Description of Request**

Jaeger Land proposes to build a vacant lot in the Silt Trade Center. The proposal is to install a metal building approximately 1500 ft.² in size. There would be a lean-to storage area attached to the east side of the structure. On the north side there would be an access to a second-story 2-bedroom apartment approximately 625 ft.² in size. Building height is approximately 23 feet to midspan.

II. **Applicable Municipal Code Sections.**

**17.42.050.** Permitted uses requiring a site plan review. All new construction for commercial and multifamily residential (3 or more units) permitted uses as described in this code require a site plan review.

**17.42.055** Application process.

In addition to submitting all application materials, a site plan review application is referred to the Planning Commission. The commission shall review application for code compliance at a regularly scheduled meeting and shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the application. They can also continue the public hearing to a date certain. If the planning commission approves such application with conditions, applicant may either submit a revised site plan with a building permit application or can appeal conditions to the Board of Trustees at a regularly scheduled meeting. *(Note: if the commission denies the application, applicant may appeal such decision to the board).*

**Ordinance No. 19 - Series of 2008.**

As noted previously, This is the Second Amendment to the Silt Trade Center PUD regulations. In general, the site plan review and the standards in the PUD document are really for the purpose that all the general zoning and site planning standards are being held in compliance. And perhaps most important that the buildings look appropriate for their specific location. This lot lies on the southmost road in the Trade Center and it is directly east of the carwash. This is the first lot with B-2 development standards

Please note that Chapter 17.42 (Design review criteria for commercial and multifamily structures) has extensive sections and criteria. Most of these do not apply in this
particular case as the area is fairly developed, there are existing roads properly graded, etc.

III. Review Comments

Setbacks:
Front: 20 feet
Side 0 feet (minimum space between buildings is 10 feet)
rear yards: 50 foot setback reserved as Utility/drainage easement (towards railroad)

Comment: Project complies.

Easements:
comment: Compliant. No structures proposed in easements.

Site plan Generally:
Comment: I initially had a number of questions and have resolved most of them with the project architect. Many issues revolved around parking layout, access surface etc. many of these questions have been answered and/or updated. These changes are noted on what is now the site plan of the application. Mr. Jeager owns a nearby laundry and the proposal is to have storage for his business as necessary. I also analyzed the site plan for eventually use by another renter or owner as time moves forward.

Off street parking:

Comment: The PUD defaults to the Town zoning code. Right now, there are 5 parking spaces at 90° to the access. Three for shop users and to for residential (if approved).

Building height:
standard is 35 feet.
Comment: Building complies.

Adjacent Use: as one can see look at the site plan, there is gravel on the western boundary and it appears that some usage or driving from the adjacent carwash spills over onto this property.
Comment: Owner has agreed to reclaim that gravel area adjacent to carwash and used by neighboring business. An option would be to present the town with a shared use agreement.

Construction Materials
Exterior metal sheeting is allowed and proposed with this B-2 use and lot. My main concern was a galvanized metal building that would be “shiny”. Discussed item with project architect. While this is a “basic building” as I would call it, it has some type of polymer finished so she should fit into the neighborhood.
Comment: proposed color is a Koko brown on the roof and trim, with “light stone” being selected for the siding. This appears to be workable for the type of use. Color palette is attached.
Landscaping.
This item was discussed with project architect. Initial landscaping proposal was minimal. After reviewing the PUD guidelines, notes are included on the site plan which requires a project to conform with the PUD’s landscaping requirements. These are not usually required until submittal of the building permit application.

**Comment:** applicant has agreed to landscape as per requirement. These are noted below:

- Landscape requirements, per ordinance 19-08 include:
- A minimum of 10% of the lot shall be landscaped
- 6’-0” buffer inside property line to edge of road
- Rock cover may be used in the landscape area, and shall have a 5 mil minimum weed barrier
- Within landscape buffer zone proved trees, 1 ½” diameter min. at 20 feet on center
- A minimum of four (4) trees and eight (8) one gallon shrubs shall be provided
- All landscaping shall be healthy and well kept
- Landscaping shall be irrigated

Screening/storage.

**Comment:** Please note that this is building has a proposed “lean to” storage area on the east. However, it will be open to the view from both North and South and also partially on the east side. As with all storage in Silt Trade Center this needs to be adequately screened by a fence that meets criteria in this area. Section O.2 of the PUD regulations state that outside storage needs to be well maintained with a 6-foot-high minimum chain-link fence with green mesh screening or as otherwise approved by the Town of Silt. This should be a condition of approval.

IV. **Staff Findings and Conclusions**

Staff finds the following:
1. PUD zoning and general site design standards are met.
2. Project complies with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. The elevations, building building and site layout and are acceptable. Applicant and design team have updated and commented on plan so that staff concerns have been mitigated.
4. Town Zoning standards are generally and adequately met.

V. **Planner Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the site plan for Lot 94 of the Silt Trade center with the following conditions:
1. all representations of the applicant made in writing, application materials and verbally at the Planning Commission or Trustee meetings or that are reflected in the meeting minutes are considered part of the application and are binding on the applicant.

2. That the updated site plan meets town access, hard surface materials (asphalt) and parking requirements are met.

3. That the color scheme as proposed for Koko Brown and Light Stone as included on the color palette are acceptable.

4. That a suitable shared use agreement with the occupant to the west be obtained or that that part of the site be reclaimed.

5. That the landscaping requirements be met at the time of building permit submission and meet the following requirements of the PUD:
   - Landscape requirements, per ordinance 19-08 include:
     - A minimum of 10% of the lot shall be landscaped
     - 6’-0” buffer inside property line to edge of road
     - Rock cover may be used in the landscape area, and shall have a 5 mil minimum weed barrier
     - Within landscape buffer zone proved trees, 1 ½” diameter min. at 20 feet on center
     - A minimum of four (4) trees and eight (8) one gallon shrubs shall be provided
     - All landscaping shall be healthy and well kept
     - Landscaping shall be irrigated

6. that the open areas in the lean-to storage structure or any outside storage be screened as necessary according to section O.2 of the PUD regulations. Specifically, that outside storage needs to be well maintained with a 6-foot-high minimum chain-link fence with green mesh screening or as otherwise approved by the Town of Silt.

VI. Recommended Motion:

**Motion to approve** the Site Plan for Lot 94 with the staff recommended conditions above. (Any modifications or additional conditions made by the Planning Commission should be added to this motion).
TOWN OF SILT
ORDINANCE NO. 19
SERIES OF 2008

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND RESTATE THE LYON SUBDIVISION PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES (HEREINAFTER “PUD GUIDELINES”), ALSO KNOWN AS THE SILT TRADE CENTER, IN ORDER TO BETTER CLARIFY ALL REVISIONS TO THE PUD GUIDELINES TO DATE, AND TO ALLOW FOR B-1 PUD LOTS 78A, 78B, 79, 125 THROUGH 128 INCLUSIVE, 130, 131, 141, 148, AND 152 THROUGH 158 INCLUSIVE, TO BECOME B-2 PUD IN USE, WHILE STILL REQUIRING THE B-1 PUD ARCHITECTURAL, SITE PLANNING AND LANDSCAPING CRITERIA FOR THESE MENTIONED LOTS.

WHEREAS, the Local Government Land Use Control Enabling Act of 1974, §§29-20-101, et seq., C.R.S.; Article 23 of Title 31, C.R.S.; and other applicable laws grant broad authority to the Town of Silt, Colorado ("Town") to plan for and regulate the development and use of land on the basis of the impact thereof on the community and surrounding areas; and

WHEREAS, on or about May 1, 2008, Kelly and Michael Lyon Family LLC (hereinafter "Applicant") submitted a rezoning application to the Town of Silt (hereinafter "Town") requesting that certain lots within the Lyon Planned Unit Development (otherwise known as the Silt Trade Center) and specifically known as B-1 PUD Lots 78A, 78B, 79, 125 through 128 inclusive, 130, 131, 141, 148 and 152 through 158 inclusive (hereinafter "Subject Lots") revert to B-2 PUD lots in use, while still maintaining the B-1 PUD architectural, site planning and landscaping features; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant received support for this application from the owners of 61 of the 82 lots within the Silt Trade Center, as evidenced in the Applicant's submittal; and

WHEREAS, this ordinance amends and replaces only the “Commercial Business Park” guidelines as stated on Sheet 1B of the Lyon Subdivision Planned Unit Development Final Subdivision Plat, and does not affect the residential portion of the planned unit development; and

WHEREAS, on or about July 1, 2008, the Planning & Zoning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) considered the application and recommended to the Board of Trustees (hereinafter “Board”) approval of the rezoning request and PUD amendment within conditions as noted in this ordinance; and

WHEREAS, on or about July 28, 2008, the Board considered the rezoning and PUD amendment application at a duly noticed public hearing, pursuant to the Silt Municipal Code (“Code”) and pertinent Colorado Revised Statutes; and
WHEREAS, on or about August 11, 2008, the Board determined that the proposed rezoning for the Subject Lots is consistent and in conformity with the existing pattern of zoning within the Silt Trade Center and within the Town, with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, as amended, and that the proposed amendment and restatement of the PUD Guidelines will clarify for the Town, the Applicant and the property owners within the Silt Trade Center the uses and restrictions, and convey to the Town, the Applicant and the property owners within the Silt Trade Center the uses and restrictions of the PUD Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Board is granted broad authority by State Statutes and its home rule charter in order to provide for the health, safety and welfare of its citizens; and

WHEREAS, Section 16.12.580 of the Silt Municipal Code (hereinafter “Code”) requires that the Board adopt an ordinance setting forth said Board’s findings of fact and conclusions prior to approval of the subject rezoning and PUD amendment application.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TOWN OF SILT, COLORADO, THAT:

Section 1

The PUD Guidelines (“Guidelines”)

The Guidelines shall be amended and restated as follows:

The following designated lots are within the Silt Trade Center PUD, subject to these conditions: Lot 78A, 78B, 79 through 158;

The following designated lots are B-1 PUD lots: Lot 129, Lots 132 through 140, inclusive;

The following designated lots are B-2 PUD lots with B-1 PUD architectural, site planning and landscaping criteria, as prescribed by this ordinance: Lots 78A, 78B, 79, 125 through 128, inclusive, 130, 131, 141, 148, 152 through 158 inclusive;

A. Permitted Uses: To provide alternative development standards that will encourage a variety of development including the following and other similar uses as permitted by the Town of Silt:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-1 PUD Uses</th>
<th>B-2 PUD Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Convenience Store with or without drive-through</td>
<td>1) Self-Storage Unit(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Day Care Center</td>
<td>2) Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Bank with or without drive-through</td>
<td>3) Service Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Laundromat</td>
<td>4) Auto Repair Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Office Building</td>
<td>5) Construction Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Retail Business with or without drive-through</td>
<td>6) Light Manufacturing Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Restaurant with or without drive-through</td>
<td>7) Wholesale Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Food Store with or without drive-through</td>
<td>8) Lumber Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Church</td>
<td>9) Cabinet Shop with or without manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Library</td>
<td>10) Car Wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Retail Gas Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Hotel/Motel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Professional Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Movie Theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Bowling Alley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: B-1 PUD uses can be placed upon any lot within the Silt Trade Center.

As to Lots 78A, 78B, 79, 125 through 128, inclusive, 130, 131, 141, 148, 152 through 158 inclusive, the following uses are specifically excluded: there shall be no Retail Gas Stations, Self-Storage Units, Car Wash, or Auto Repair Shops.

B. Minimum lot area: 7,000 square feet;

C. Minimum lot frontage to a public and allowable access: 30 feet;

D. Minimum lot depth: 80 feet (Does not apply to Lots 78A, 78B, 155, 156, 157 and 158);

E. Minimum lot width: 50 feet (Does not apply to Lots 78A or 78B);

F. Maximum building height; primary structure: No building may be taller to the ridge than 35 feet above the original ground elevation or 100 year flood plain, whichever is greater. Lots within 100 year floodplain are designated on recorded plat. Construction in 100 year floodplain shall meet the current adopted building code, as adopted by Town of Silt. It is each individual lot owner’s responsibility to determine the requirements of the Town of Silt.

G. Minimum setbacks:
1. **Front and street side yards:** 20 feet from all street rights-of-way or private access easements, except buildings on lots adjacent to State Highway 6 may be ten (10) feet from the State Highway 6 right-of-way.

2. **Side and rear yards:** Buildings may be built to lot lines on one side if the adjoining building is 10 feet or more from the adjoining lot line or if the adjoining lot is vacant. No two buildings shall be within ten feet of each other. If more than one lot is owned by the same party, it shall be considered as one lot for setback purposes. Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR): No building shall be constructed nearer than 30 feet from the right-of-way of the UPRR.

**H. Utility and drainage easements:** There are to be reserved easements encumbering each lot herein for the purpose of construction and maintenance of utility and drainage facilities as follows:

1. There shall be a ten (10) foot wide utility and drainage easement along all street rights-of-way, including State Highway 6;

2. There shall be a five (5) foot wide utility easement along the south (rear) lot lines of Lots 125-130 and a five (5) foot utility easement along the west lot line of Lot 130;

3. There shall be a ten (10) foot wide utility and drainage easement along the west boundaries of Lots 124 and 135 and a ten (10) foot wide utility and drainage easement along the east boundary of Lot 97;

4. There shall be a ten (10) foot wide utility easement along the west boundary of Lot 87, for a distance of 128.73 feet, more or less;

5. There shall be a thirty (30) foot wide utility and drainage easement from the edge of the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way, to all those lots adjacent to and north of the Union Pacific Railroad; and

6. Other easements as shown on the Final Plat dated

**I. Off-street parking:**

1. All off-street parking lots shall be paved and the minimum requirements of the Town of Silt as to the number of spaces required shall be met.

2. All parking in the Silt Trade Center shall be designed to accommodate entrance and exiting from the lot in a forward motion of the vehicle, unless an alternative site plan is approved by the Town. See Section I.4 for Silver Spur requirements below.
3. Two driveways will be allowed per common ownership, but additional driveways may be allowed by the Town upon request by lot owner.

4. All parking areas in the front yard setback shall be separated from the right-of-way with a landscaped area which shall be a minimum width of 10 feet in the B-1 PUD areas and 6 feet in the B-2 areas, measured perpendicular to the right-of-way. Area of the right-of-way between the pavement and property line is to be landscaped. All front yards in the B-1 PUD and B-2 PUD, exclusive of parking and driveways, shall be landscaped. Lots upon Silver Spur may have parking areas within the twenty (20) foot wide setback area so long as the 10% lot landscaping is maintained on these lots. Vehicles may exit from these lots by backing onto Silver Spur.

5. Rock cover may be used in the landscaped area. Any rock cover area shall have as a minimum a weed barrier being five (5) mils or greater in thickness. Landscape plans shall be submitted to the Town along with building permit applications;

J. Construction materials.

1. All structures shall be constructed of new materials and shall be of brick, brick veneer, stone, manufactured stone, lumber, stucco, decorative concrete block, cedar siding or metal sheeting.

2. Exterior metal sheeting siding is not allowed within B-1 PUD District. Metal sheeting on roofs is allowed but no galvanized roofing material is allowed. All exposed metal sheeting is to be painted in earth tone colors only.

3. Unfinished and/or non-painted cinderblock or cement shall not be used for exposed walls.

4. All construction shall be in conformance with the latest adopted building Code as adopted by the Town of Silt.

5. All construction on lots 78A, 78B, 79, 125 through 128, inclusive, 130, 131, 141, 148, and 152 through 158 inclusive shall be built to the following standards.

   a. Building materials and design shall be selected by the applicant in order to achieve and maintain high architectural standards and to avoid boxy or monotonous industrial appearances. The following techniques will help achieve this effect:
1. Adding thoughtful architectural design elements into each building that may include:
   a. Varying and intersecting the rooflines;
   b. Adding dormers, porches, cantilevers, covered walkways, etc.;
   c. Adding architectural detailing to trim work, lighting, windows, doors, soffit and fascia;

2. Using a variety of complementary quality building materials and techniques to add interest and artistic appeal to the building that may include, but shall not be limited to: stucco, wood, brick, stone, untreated metal, architectural block and/or architectural concrete.

b. The building design shall contribute to the character of the zone district and to the community by the thoughtful use of materials, sizing, elements, features, color ranges, and of activity areas specific to the site, proposed uses and surrounding land uses.

c. Facade treatment shall be implemented in order for each building to be architecturally interesting. In order to avoid the effect of a single, long, or massive wall, the following additional standards shall apply:

1. Building bays wider than sixty feet shall be visually established by architectural features that can include but not be limited to: columns, ribs or pilasters.
2. No building wall that faces a street or connecting walkway shall have a blank, uninterrupted length of more than sixty feet without containing at least two of the following: change in plane, change in texture or masonry pattern, windows, trellis with vines, or an equivalent element that subdivides the wall.
3. All sides of the building shall include materials and design characteristics consistent with those on the front. Use of inferior or substandard quality materials for side or rear facades shall be prohibited. The sides and backs of buildings shall be as visually attractive as the front through the design of rooflines, architectural detailing, and landscaping features.

4. Base treatments shall be one of the following:
   a. Integrally textured materials such as stone or other masonry;
   b. Variously textured material combinations such as stone/wood, stone/stucco, wood/stucco, brick/wood or any such combination;
   c. Integrally colored and patterned materials such as
smooth rock, granite or tiles;

d. Variously colored and patterned materials such as mullions, panels or planters; and
e. Design patterns such as ledges, sills, headers, parapets or other wall variations.

5. Treatments on or near the top of the building must be recognizable from any street, parking lot or open space and consist of one of the following: cornice treatments, other than just colored "stripes" or "bands", with integrally textured materials such as stone or other masonry, or differently colored materials; sloping roof with overhangs and brackets; or stepped parapets.

6. Exterior building materials shall be high-quality material including, but not limited to: brick, sandstone or other native stone, wood siding, stucco or tinted/textured concrete masonry units.

K. Housing:

1. No structure of a temporary or permanent character, mobile home, trailer, basement, tent, shack, garage, barn or any other outbuildings of any description shall be used on any lot as a residence unless compliant with this section;

2. Lots 78A, 78B, 79, 125 through 128 inclusive, 130, 131, 141, 148, 152 through 158 inclusive may have up to two housing units per lot when proposed as an accessory use to the main commercial use, without the need of a special use permit for a maximum of 36 units. All other lots may have two housing units per lot, with a special use permit. All housing units shall be subject to a parkland dedication in-lieu fee of $868.84 per unit at building permit. Such fee will escalate 6% annually as set forth in the Silt Municipal Code.

3. A housing unit is defined as having at least one bathroom, one kitchen and one or more bedrooms. This section does not apply to hotels and/or motels, which are permitted uses in both B-1 PUD and B-2 PUD districts. Parking space requirements are defined by the Silt Municipal Code as adopted at the time of site plan review.

L. Commercial sign code: All signs shall conform to Chapter 17.60 of the Silt Municipal Code, unless approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission through the sign exception process.

M. Animals:

1. No animals, livestock or poultry of any kind shall be raised, bred or kept on any lot for any purpose, except dogs and cats per Chapter 6.04 of
the code and small caged (or aquarium) animals normally kept as household pets.

2. No animal may run at large.

3. The number of dogs and/or cats per housing unit shall be per Chapter 6.04 of the Silt Municipal Code.

N. **Solid Fuel Burning Systems and Oil Burning Systems:** No solid fuel burning systems or oil burning systems are to be permitted within the Silt Trade Center PUD.

O. **No unsightliness:** No unsightliness shall be permitted. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing:

1. Lots in the B-1 PUD District shall be allowed outside storage with a solid fence six (6) feet high with the same materials as the siding on the building on the B-1 PUD lot, so long as the outside storage is located behind the building or on the side the building and is not highly visible from State Highway 6.

2. Excluding those lots that are to be rezoned by this ordinance from B-1 PUD to B-2 PUD, all other B-2 PUD lots with outside storage must have a neat and well maintained 6 foot high minimum chain link screened fence with green mesh screening or as approved by the Town of Silt.

3. All broken windows must be replaced immediately.

4. No lot shall be used as a dumping ground for garbage or refuse. Dumpsters must be enclosed on three sides. Dumpsters cannot be located in front yard or side yard adjoining a street.

5. All lot owners shall maintain whatever landscaping installed, even if the building is vacated.

6. All landscaping shall be kept in a healthy and well-kept condition. Landscaping is a requirement of this ordinance and shall meet the minimum standards at all times after initial installation. Landscaping shall be checked for compliance prior to issuance of any permit including but not limited to new sign permits or business permits. It shall be the responsibility of the owner of the lot to assure compliance.

P. **No nuisances including annoying lights, sounds or colors.** All activities, lights, sounds and colors shall be in conformance with Chapter 17.49 of the Silt Municipal Code. No persistent noise in excess of fifty decibels dB
shall be detectable beyond the property line before 7:00 AM or after 10:00 PM.

Q. Utility lines: All utilities, including but not limited to: gas lines, power lines, cable TV, and telephone shall be placed underground. Under-grounding should not be limited to individual service lines to the homes and businesses, but apply to all lines.

R. Access to State Highway 6: No lot shall have direct access to State Highway 6 or across the railroad right-of-way.

S. Landscaping requirements.

1. A minimum of 10 percent of each lot within the Silt Trade Center will be landscaped. Areas to be landscaped include front and street side yards;

2. Lots along the railroad right-of-way are required to plant a 1 ½” diameter or greater tree for visual screening every 20 feet on center within the landscape buffer zone. Trees shall not interfere with the drainage easement along the southern property boundary of Lots 86 through 97. A minimum of four 1 ½” diameter or greater trees and eight 1 gallon shrubs per lot will be planted;

3. Lots 78B, 79, 136, 152, 153 and 154, when developed will be required to landscape the 10 foot setback area from State Highway 6 with one 1 ½” diameter or greater tree for every 2,000 square feet of the setback zone area. The setback area will meet the requirements as outlined under Item “H” for front yards. Lots 78B, 79, 136, 152, 153 and 154 will provide two 1 ½” diameter or greater trees and two one gallon shrubs for landscaping for every 1,200 square feet of floor space developed.

4. Landscaping shall be assured by a deposit provided to the Town at the time of issuance of a building permit. Said deposit shall be $250.00 for all lots within the B-1 PUD and B-2 PUD Districts and released upon installation of landscaping which meets or exceeds minimum standards as stated in this ordinance.

5. All materials binding the trunk or root ball must be removed prior to planting. Any tree or shrub not surviving after one year from planting will be replaced at owner’s expense. All plantings must be made within one growing season.

6. Trees suggested for this development are:
a. Austree (willow);
b. Flowering crabapple;
c. Hybrid cottonless cottonwood;
d. Fruit trees;
e. Ponderosa pine;
f. Lombardy poplar;
g. Maple;

7. Trees not permitted in this development:
   a. Cottonwood (female);
   b. Elm;

T. Site plan requirements. Each lot proposed as a commercial unit shall submit to the Town of Silt a detailed site plan showing at a minimum the following:

1. Structure location on the lot and setbacks from property lines;

2. Designated parking areas;

3. A landscaping plan showing the areas designated for landscaping, exterior fencing showing type of construction and height;

4. If construction occurs during a time when planting of vegetation is not practical, then certain assurances ($250.00 deposit) to the Town of Silt will be made to guarantee that the proposed landscaping improvements will be made;

5. Compliance with height, construction material(s) and setback restrictions;

U. The water service to Lot 137 shall be limited to commercial uses not requiring a fire protection system or other potential uses that require larger than a ¼ - inch service line.

V. That all new or revised easements, in particular the Drainage and Utility Easement that was amended by Ordinance 26, 1998, be indicated on the new plat and a note preventing placement of materials that may impede proper storm water runoff.

Section 2

All ordinances heretofore passed and adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Town of Silt, Colorado are hereby repealed to the extent that said ordinances, or parts thereof, are in conflict therewith.
Section 3
If any section, subsection, clause, phrase or provision of this Ordinance, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall to any extent, be held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void or unconstitutional, the remaining sections, subsections, clauses, phrases and provisions of this Ordinance, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall remain in full force and shall in no way be affected, impaired or invalidated.

INTRODUCED, READ AND APPROVED ON FIRST READING, a public hearing, this 11th day of August 2008, at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building of the Town of Silt Colorado.

PASSED, APPROVED ON SECOND READING, ADOPTED AND ORDERED PUBLISHED following a continued public hearing this 25th day of August, 2008.

ATTEST: TOWN OF SILT

[Signature]

Town Clerk Sheila M. McIntyre

[Signature]

Mayor David C. Moore
General Notes:
The purpose of these drawings is to graphically depict the general nature of the work to be performed. The Contractor shall maintain accurate records of the work done and submit them to the Owner for use in结算.

All materials in the work shall be in accordance with all applicable codes, standards, and specifications. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly selected and of adequate quality.

The Contractor shall be responsible for the accurate placement of all work shown.

The Contractor shall ensure that all operations on the worksite to those areas previously agreed upon with the Owner.

All materials stored on site shall be properly protected and protected by construction test results or approved test results. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall observe all P&Z Board conditions and other materials shown.

The plans shall be maintained in a clean, orderly condition, free of dirt, debris, and other material that may interfere with any inspections or operations. All materials shall be kept clean and neat at all times.

The Contractor shall be responsible for the accurate placement of all work shown on the plans.

The Contractor shall be responsible for the accurate placement of all work shown on the plans.

All mechanical subcontractors shall be responsible for designing and installing code-compliant heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems. All electrical subcontractors shall be responsible for designing and installing code-compliant electrical systems.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for the accurate placement of all work shown on the plans.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.

The Contractor shall be responsible for all necessary blocking, backing, and framing to ensure proper fit and finish of all materials. The Contractor shall ensure that all materials are properly stacked and protected to prevent damage and deterioration. Failure to protect materials may be cause for rejection of work.
Land Use Application Form

Project Name:  **Jaeger Shop**

Project Description / Property Information:

Address:  **1909 Horseshoe Trail, Silt, CO 81652** Parcel ID Number:  **217911201098**

Legal Description:  *Lot 94; Lyon Subdivision PUD*

Access to Property:  **Horseshoe Trail**

Acreage or Square Footage:  **12,277 SF** Existing Land Use Designation:  **B-1 or B-2 PUD**

Proposed Land Use Designation:  **Service Business**

Existing Zoning:  **B-1 or B-2 PUD** Proposed Zoning:  **B-2 PUD**

Proposed Use / Intensity of Use:  **Service Business**

Submittal Requirements:

- Initially, a completed application with original signatures and four copies shall be submitted to the department for review. The application shall include four sets of 24” x 36” plans, plats and other appropriate drawings. Application must also be submitted in electronic format (MS Word).
- In addition to this application, all information on the supplemental checklist must be submitted.
- Incomplete applications will not be accepted and will delay processing.
- When the documents are deemed adequate, additional copies as required by the department shall be submitted ten (10) days before the public hearing.
- All documents submitted for public hearing shall be hole-punched, collated and paper-clipped (no staples). All plans, plats or drawings shall be folded to 8 1/2” x 11” and inserted into the collated application. Each individual application shall be banded together and ready for public distribution.

**STAFF USE ONLY**

Pre-app conference:  (date)  Application received:  (date)

Application complete:  (date)  File Number:  

Fees:  Referrals Sent:  (date)

Deposits:  PZC approval:  (date)

Paid:  BOT approval:  (date)

RECEIVED APR 01, 2022
Town of Silt Community Development
231 N. 7th Street, Silt Colorado 81652; (970)876-2353 ext. 108

Land Use Application Form

- Amended Plat
- Boundary Adjustment
- Annexation
- Sketch Plan
- Final Plan
- Planned Unit Development
- Text Amendment
- Site Plan Review
- Easement Agreement
- Zoning or Rezoning
- Preliminary Plan
- Special Use Permit
- Zoning Variance

Project Name: **Jaeger Shop**

Project Description / Property Information:

Address: **1909 Horseshoe Trail, Silt, CO 81652**  Parcel ID Number: **217911201098**

Legal Description (attach additional sheets if necessary):

- Lot 94; Lyon Subdivision PUD

Access to Property: **Horseshoe Trail**

Acreage or Square Footage: **12,277 SF**  Existing Land Use Designation: **B-1 or B-2 PUD**

Proposed Land Use Designation: **Service Business**

Existing Zoning: **B-1 or B-2 PUD**  Proposed Zoning: **B-2 PUD**

Proposed Use / Intensity of Use: **Service Business**

Submittal Requirements:

- Initially, a completed application with original signatures and four copies shall be submitted to the department for review. The application shall include four sets of 24” x 36” plans, plats and other appropriate drawings.
- Application must also be submitted in electronic format (MS Word).
- In addition to this application, all information on the supplemental checklist must be submitted.
- Incomplete applications will not be accepted and will delay processing.
- When the documents are deemed adequate, additional copies as required by the department shall be submitted ten (10) days before the public hearing.
- All documents submitted for public hearing shall be hole-punched, collated and paper-clipped (no staples). All plans, plats or drawings shall be folded to 8 ½” x 11” and inserted into the collated application. Each individual application shall be banded together and ready for public distribution.

**STAFF USE ONLY**

Pre-app conference: ____________________ (date)
Application received: ____________________ (date)
Application complete: ____________________ (date)
File Number: ____________________
Fees: ____________________ (date)
Referrals Sent: ____________________ (date)
Deposits: ____________________
PZC approval: ____________________ (date)
Paid: ____________________ (date)
BOT approval: ____________________ (date)
Project Team Information (fill in all that apply) (add additional sheets of needed):

Property Owner(s): Name: Randy Jaeger Phone: 970-876-5020
Company: JAEGER LAND, LLC Fax: 
Address: PO BOX 985, Silt, CO 81652

Authorized Rep.: Name: Phone: 
Company: Fax: 
Address: 

Engineer/Designer: Name: Jeff Johnson Phone: 970-625-0580 
Company: Jeff Johnson Architectural, PC Fax: 
Address: 136 East Third Street, Rifle, CO 81650 

Billable Party: Owner X Representative Engineer 

The Billable Party, by signing below, hereby agrees to reimburse the Town the actual costs to the Town plus 15% administrative fees for all engineering, surveying and legal services rendered in connection with the review of the Application. The Billable Party shall also reimburse the Town for the cost of making any corrections or additions to the master copy of the official Town map and for any fees for recording any plats and accompanying documents with the County Clerk and Recorder of Garfield County. The Billable Party agrees that interest shall be imposed at a rate of 1.5% per month on all balances not paid within thirty (30) days of the date of the statement. In addition to any and all remedies available to the Town and in the event the Town is forced to pursue collection of any amounts due and unpaid, the Town shall be entitled to collect attorney’s fees and costs incurred in said collection efforts in addition to the amount due and unpaid.

Randy Jaeger §
Name (printed) 

PO BOX 985, Silt, CO 81652
Address 

970-876-5020 Phone
Fax 

Signature Randy Jaeger CO DL
Type of Identification 00-025-0521

Disclosure of Property Ownership

X If owner is an individual, indicate name exactly as it appears on the deed.

If owner is a corporation, partnership, limited partnership or other business entity, name principals on a separate page. Please include articles of organization, partnership agreement, etc., as applicable.

If owner is a land trust, name beneficiaries on a separate page.

If applicant is a lessee, indicate the owner(s) on a separate page.

If applicant is a contract purchaser, attach a copy of the contract and indicate the owner(s) on a separate page.

Please provide the name(s), mailing address(es), street address(es) and phone number(s) for all owners.
Property Owner Affidavit

I/We, JAEGER LAND, LLC, being first duly sworn, depose and state under penalties of perjury that I am (we are) the owner(s) of the property described herein and which is the subject of the application and proposed hearings; that all answers provided to the questions in this application, and all sketches, data and all other supplementary matter attached hereto and made part of this application are honest and true to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief. I (we) understand that this application must be complete and accurate prior to a hearing being scheduled. I (we) authorize Town staff to visit the site as necessary for proper review of this application.

(If there are special conditions such as guard dogs, locked gates, restricted hours, etc., please give the name and phone number of the person(s) who can provide access to the site)

Randy Jaeger
Name (printed)

PO BOX 985
Silt, CO 81652
Address

970-876-5020
Phone

Fax

Signature

SS.

Ramona Jaeger
Name (printed)

Address

Phone

Fax

Signature

Type of Identification

County of Basfield
State of Colorado

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 1st day of April, 2022.

By Tracy L. Barnar
(name printed)

Witness my hand and official seal.

Tracy L. Barnar
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 04/28/2023

TRACY L. BARNAR
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF COLORADO
NOTARY ID #190940-7109
My Commission Expires June 28, 2023
LAND USE APPLICATION FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>SMC Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>16.13.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation &amp; Development Agreement amendment</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>16.13.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Adjustment/Lot Line</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>16.04.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiumization</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Major Subdivision</td>
<td>16.05.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement Agreement and Amendments</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>2.44.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement and Amendments</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>2.44.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Subdivision-Sketch Plan</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>16.04.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Subdivision-Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>16.04.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Subdivision-Final Plan</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>16.04.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Exception</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Exception</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replat or Re-subdivision</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>16.04.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review- Commercial/Multi-Family</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>17.42.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Permit</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>17.78.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Subdivision-Sketch/Final</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>16.04.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Improvement Agreement Amendment</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>16.04.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation of Right of Way</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>2.44.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Variance</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>17.84.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning or Rezoning</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>16.12.410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Deposits must be included with application submittal. The deposit is used as security for department staff and consultant time to review the project application. Applicant shall also pay for fees and charges incurred by the town, such as legal fees, planning fees, engineering fees, and filing or recording fees, plus an administrative fee of 15% of the total consultant charges.

ATTACHMENTS/EXHIBITS MUST BE COMPLETE FOR SUBMITTAL.
Incomplete applications will not be reviewed until deemed complete.

Checklist below for Office use only.

1) A legal description of the property.
2) Evidence of legal ownership. May be a deed, title commitment, title insurance policy, or attorney's opinion of ownership.
3) Letter of consent. Required if the Applicant is not the property owner.
4) List of property owners within 200 feet. Call Garfield County Assessor's Office at 970/945-9134 for information.
5) Impact statement (description of how the proposed land use complies with the Town of Silt Municipal Code and Comprehensive Plan).
6) A copy of the completed application in electronic format (Microsoft Word).
7) A diskette, compatible with the Town of Silt GIS system, must be submitted before final recording of land use action. Mylars will not be signed prior to submittal of GIS disk. (For GIS information, call the Community Development Department, (970)876-2353.) Please do not print Final Plat Mylars until you receive approval by Town staff.
LAND USE ACTIVITY IMPACT STATEMENT

Name of Applicant: ___________ Randy Jaeger ___________________________ Date: __04-01-22________________

Location of Property: ___________ Jager Shop __________________________

Land Use Request: ___________ Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit __________________________

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Attach additional pages as needed.

1. Is your request compatible with the Silt Municipal Code?  Yes/No

2. Is your request compatible with the Silt Comprehensive Plan?  Yes/No

   If not, how is your request useful to the Town of Silt?

3. Explain how your request is compatible with the immediate area surrounding the site.

   Proposed structure complies with Silt Trade Center P.U.D.; it’s land use is allowed, and the property zoning allows proposed use

4. How is your request desirable for the Town of Silt?

   Applicant would like to provide a needed affordable housing option for someone living within the limits of the Town of Silt

5. Detail any real or possible environmental, town service, or other impacts your request may have.

   No apparent negative impact
6. Are there or have there ever been any landfills on any part of the property included in your request?  Yes [x]  No [ ]

7. Please mark all the concerns or impacts listed below which apply to your request and give a brief statement about how you have addressed them.

a. [ ] traffic
b. [ ] town services (water, sewer, etc.)
c. [ ] signage
d. [ ] open space
e. [ ] schools
f. [ ] emergency services (police, fire, medical)
g. [ ] other utilities (electrical, etc.)
h. [ ] other (pollution, etc.)

Please list any other items or information which you feel would be of help in assessing your application.
SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

Uses Requiring Site Plan Review.
All new construction for commercial and multi-family uses require a site plan review to determine conformance with the Silt Municipal Code (§ 127.42.050), including the following:

- New commercial construction (including additions to existing commercial buildings);
- Multi-family (three or more dwelling units within one building or on one lot);
- Uses that require a special use permit and site review are:
  - Transient merchants
  - Commercial or multifamily building with roof pitch not under 4:12; or
  - Commercial or multifamily building over 10,000 gross square feet.

Submittal Documents for a Commercial/Multi-Family Site Plan include the following:

- Land Use Application, Site Plan Application and applicable fee;
- Site Plan in a scale of 1/8" = 1' that addresses the following:
  - Zoning of subject parcel and that land immediately adjacent to subject parcel;
  - Maximum lot coverage not exceeding 80%;
  - Maximum building height not exceeding 27 feet;
  - Streets constructed in conformance with SMC Section 16.04.390;
  - Building setbacks in conformance with SMC Section 17.44.020;
  - Concrete sidewalks no less than six (6) feet wide in multi-family and ten (10) feet wide in commercial;
  - Public pathway (trail) plan;
  - Building materials and designed in order to achieve and maintain high architectural standards and avoid boxy or monotonous industrial appearance;
  - Façade treatment on all sides of the building;
  - Landscaping plan in conformance with SMC Sections 17.42.090 through 17.42.190;
  - Loading/Receiving areas in conformance with SMC Section 17.42.200;
  - Number and location of off-street parking spaces in conformance with SMC Sections 17.42.190 and Chapter 17.56;
  - Pedestrian crossings in conformance with SMC Section 17.42.210;
  - Screening of parking, truck loading and receiving areas, outdoor storage, refuse containers and mechanical equipment in conformance with SMC Section 17.42.220;
  - Potable water service main (or service line);
  - Sanitary sewer service main (or service line);
  - Drainage plan;
  - Erosion and sediment control plan;

17.42.055 Application process.

A. An applicant for commercial or multifamily site plan review shall provide such written information on the land use application form and on forms provided by the town, plus any other supplemental information needed to convey information to the commission, including the following:

1. A description of the proposed land use(s);

Applicant requests, in addition to a service business per Silt Trade Center Ordinance, allowing a single Employee housing unit on Lot 94

2. A statement of the planning objective(s);

Applicant would like to provide a needed affordable housing option for someone living within the limits of the Town of Silt

3. A description of adjoining land use(s) and zoning;

Adjoining Land uses are either undeveloped, or Silt Trade Center P.U.D B-2 Uses; such as Dusty Wagon Car Wash to the West and the Post office directly North

4. Existing zoning of the subject property;

Silt Trade Center P.U.D; B-1 and B-2 Uses

5. A statement regarding the proposal's conformance with the comprehensive plan and zoning; and

Proposed structure complies with Silt Trade Center P.U.D; it's land use is allowed, and the property zoning allows proposed use

6. A site plan map(s) depicting all proposed land use, including utilities, landscaping, structures, parking, and other development of any kind.

Refer to attached Site Plan

(Supp. No. 51, Rev.)
AGREEMENT FOR PAYMENT OF LAND USE APPLICATION FEES

1. Randy Jaeger

and I __________________________________________ AS AUTHORIZED APPLICANT,

if different from Owner, (Collectively “APPLICANT”), AGREE AS FOLLOWS with the
Town of Silt, Colorado (TOWN), in consideration of the TOWN’S acceptance of
APPLICANT’S application for the land use approval as further described below:

1. APPLICANT has submitted to the TOWN an application for approval of:

   Site Plan Review- Silt Trade Center PUD Lot 94

2. APPLICANT acknowledges and understands that the Board of Trustees has
   established a fee structure by resolution for Land Use Applications. This fee will include a non-
   refundable deposit which must be paid prior to the TOWN’S acceptance of any application for
   processing, and the provisions for billing the APPLICANT for any costs accrued above the non-
   refundable deposit amount. The Board of Trustee’s land use application fee schedule adopted by
   resolution and this agreement shall govern the payment of fees for processing applications.

3. The APPLICATION shall not be accepted for processing unless the property
   owner of record of the property included in the APPLICATION signs this AGREEMENT. In the
   case of multiple property owners, the Town Clerk shall have the discretion to determine which
   owner shall sign.

4. The APPLICANT shall be billed by the TOWN for all actual costs (including but
   not limited to staff time (based upon hourly rates paid to staff application
   reviewers), attorney’s fees, consultant’s fees, engineering fees, mailing, copying
   and publication and any other fees incurred by the TOWN), which the TOWN
   has accrued to date in processing the APPLICATION. The TOWN will bill the
   APPLICANT until all costs are paid.

5. The APPLICANT agrees to pay all such bills in full, and by whatever manner of
   payment is specified by the TOWN, by delivery made to the TOWN no later than
   one month after the billing date. The TOWN shall have the discretion to suspend
   processing of the APPLICATION if any payments under this agreement are not
   made on time. This suspension may involve the postponement of scheduled
   Planning and Zoning Commission or Board of Trustees hearing or meetings and
   the incurrence of additional costs such as for renotification or republication.
   Similarly, the TOWN shall have the discretion to terminate the processing of any
   APPLICATION for which any billed payment is more than three months
   overdue.
6. The person whom the APPLICANT designates to receive all billings for fees under this AGREEMENT is as follows (Include full name and mailing address):

Randy Jaeger
PO Box 995
Silt, CO 81652-0935

Any billing mailed to this person's address and not returned to the TOWN shall be deemed to have been received. The APPLICANT may change the billing address under this paragraph by providing written notification of such change to the TOWN.

7. In the event of nonpayment of fees, the TOWN shall have the right to file a fee collection action against any or all of the persons signing this AGREEMENT as APPLICANT. Any resulting judgment for fees may be enforced in any legal manner whatsoever and may be filed as a judgment lien against the real property which is the subject of the APPLICATION, as well as against any real property owned in whole or in part by judgment debtor hereunder.

8. Any agreement by the TOWN to forego any of the judicial or administrative remedies available to them under this AGREEMENT in response to the late payment or nonpayment of fees, shall not in any way constitute a waiver by the TOWN of any rights to collect fees or appropriately process the APPLICATION as provided herein.

9. This AGREEMENT shall be construed and enforced in accordance with the ordinances and laws of the TOWN and the State of Colorado.

APPLICANT
(Property owner to sign per paragraph 3, above)

By: Randy Jaeger
Date: ______________________

TOWN OF SILT

By: ______________________ Date: ______________________

Mayor

Attest:

By: ______________________ Date: ______________________
Garfield County, CO

Summary
Account  R350916
Parcel  217911201098
Property  1909 HORSESHOE TRL, SILT, CO  81652
Address
Legal  Section: 11 Township: 6 Range: 92 Subdivision: LYON SUB PUD Lot: 94 (12286 SF)
Acres  0
Land SqFt  12,286
Tax Area  35
Mill Levy  83.6550
Subdivision  LYON SUB PUD

View Map

Owner
JAEGER LAND LLC
PO BOX 985
SILT CO 81652

Land
Unit Type  VACANT COM LOTS -0200 (VACANT LAND)
Square Feet  12,286

Actual Values
Assessed Year  2021  2020
Land Actual  $7,453,000.00  $8,944,000.00
Improvement Actual  $0.00  $0.00
Total Actual  $7,453,000.00  $8,944,000.00

Assessed Values
Assessed Year  2021  2020
Land Assessed  $21,610.00  $29,940.00
Improvement Assessed  $0.00  $0.00
Total Assessed  $21,610.00  $29,940.00

Tax History
Tax Year  2021  2020  2019  2018  2017
Taxes Billed  $1,807.80  $1,993.64  $1,897.84  $2,392.12  $2,082.16

Click here to view the tax information for this parcel on the Garfield County Treasurer's website.

Transfers
Sale Date  Deed Type  Reception Number  Book - Page  Sale Price
8/1/2021  CORRECTION WARRANTY DEED  961718
8/1/2021  WARRANTY DEED  961,286  $120,000
8/1/2021  STATEMENT OF AUTHORITY  961205
8/9/2021  EASEMENT  961207
1/18/1999  QUIT CLAIM DEED  432375  1120-642  $0
12/8/1954  Plat  471909
12/5/1954  WARRANTY DEED  471810  0924-0705  $0
8/22/1954  ORDINANCE  471907  0924-0960  $0
11/11/1993  ORDINANCE  457919  0888-0362  $0
9/28/1993  WARRANTY DEED  450010  0876-0921  $0
5/29/1964  DEED  225617  0358-0370  $0
8/16/1927  WARRANTY DEED  190319  0192-0051  $0

Property Related Public Documents
Click here to view Property Related Public Document

No data available for the following modules: Buildings, Photos, Sketches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASALT TRADE ASSOCIATES, LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 710</td>
<td>BASALT CO 81621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIGHT DAYS A WEEK, LLC</td>
<td>235 COUNTY ROAD 236</td>
<td>SILT CO 81652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAEGER LAND, LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 985</td>
<td>SILT CO 81652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;J PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 246</td>
<td>SILT CO 81652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT MINI STORAGE LLC</td>
<td>400 WEST CODY LANE</td>
<td>BASALT CO 81621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNNY MOUNTAINS LLC</td>
<td>1809 MEDICINE BOW COURT</td>
<td>SILT CO 81652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN POSTAL REALTY HOLDINGS I</td>
<td>75 COLUMBIA AVENUE</td>
<td>CEDARHURST NY 11516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

There are a number of residential units that are allowed essentially as a use by right in the Silt Trade Center. Specifically, by the adoption of ordinance #19-2008 there were 18 lots identified as being able to accommodate two residential units/lot with a maximum unit load of up to 36 units with that PUD update. This lot, Lot 94 is not one of them. The PUD regulations go on to say that other lots can apply to have a residential unit via approval of a Special Use Permit.

As you have just reviewed a Site Plan Review for the main use of this lot, a shop proposed by Jaeger Land, I will keep this staff report relatively brief. Please see the land use application for all the details of this dwelling unit.

I. Description of Request
Jaeger Land proposes to build a 625 square-foot two bedroom, one bath apartment in a second-story space in a proposed shop/industrial building on a vacant lot in the Silt Trade Center. The primary intent of the application/site plan review is to install a metal building approximately 1500 ft.² in size. There would be a lean-to storage area attached to the east side of the structure. On the north side there would be an access to a second-story 2-bedroom apartment approximately 625 ft.² in size. Building height is approximately 23 feet to midspan.

II. **Applicable Municipal Code Sections.**

Special Use Permits are reviewed via Chapter 17.78 of the Silt Municipal Code. Special Uses are reviewed by the Planning Commission who makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The board is the final decision-making body.

17.78.030 - Review criteria.

Criteria for review of special use applications are:

A. Compliance of the application with this code;
B. Compatibility of the proposal with the character of the surrounding area;
C. Desirability and need for the proposed use;
D. Encouragement of the most appropriate use of land throughout the town;
E. Potential for adverse environmental influences that might result from the proposed use;
F. Compatibility of the proposed use with the comprehensive plan; and
G. Adequate provision for ingress and egress of vehicular and other traffic; parking, servicing and loading/unloading; refuse and service areas; utilities; screening and buffering; signage; yards and open space; and any other items determined necessary or appropriate by the board.

III. **Review Comments**

A. Compliance of the application with this code;

*Comment: Generally complies with code. Access and parking spaces are provided.*

B. Compatibility of the proposal with the character of the surrounding area;

*Comment: There are other second-story residential units in this general area. The residential Land use would fit into this neighborhood.*

C. Desirability and need for the proposed use;

*Comment: Accessory residential units in mixed-use and commercial/industrial areas can be desirable and can fit into the surrounding neighborhood. In this particular case, there are similar uses. The good thing about these residential uses in such area is that*
usually the commercial/industrial/retail use amortizes the cost of construction and the residential can be an asset to all involved.

D. Encouragement of the most appropriate use of land throughout the town;

Comment: Residential accessory uses are desirable at this time in the Colorado River Valley. The need ebbs and flows over time but in the long run this is very desirable use for the community.

E. Potential for adverse environmental influences that might result from the proposed use;

Comment: Staff proceeds very little adverse environmental effects from this land use. Please note that there is a 2-hour occupancy separation from a construction standpoint between the commercial/shop uses and the residential occupancy.

F. Compatibility of the proposed use with the comprehensive plan; and

Comment: This this use would be found to be compatible with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan.

G. Adequate provision for ingress and egress of vehicular and other traffic; parking, servicing and loading/unloading; refuse and service areas; utilities; screening and buffering; signage; yards and open space; and any other items determined necessary or appropriate by the board.

Comment: access is adequate, parking provided etc. The town’s Multifamily Building Specifications (17.42.085) really apply to larger residential development and try to make sure that the developer is maintaining acceptable architectural standards that avoid boxy or monotonous appearances, there are varying and/or intersecting rooflines etc. No standards not really apply to a single unit in such a situation.

One thing I always like to look at is whether there is some type of small, private open space or some other area that a resident can call their own, feel comfortable and feel like they have a nice place to reside. Adequate storage is always a good amenity to have. I have worked with communities on the public and private sector sides who have both storage standards for multifamily housing (e.g. 1 ft.³ of storage for every 3 SF of gross floor area – everyone has equipment, tools and recreational items in Western Colorado). Another thing I think is very useful in such situations is a small, private open space area. This could be an outdoor deck, patio or some other area where they may take refuge – be able to have a quiet meal outside or have a barbecue etc. It does not appear that there is any such standard that I found in the Municipal Code and I definitely do not see such space in this application.

I would encourage provision of some small, private open space area – perhaps on the south side of the building or the balcony. I have seen standards for ground floor units having 60 ft.² of such space or 5% of an upper-level unit.
IV. Staff Findings and Conclusions

Staff finds the following:
1. a residential unit can be compatible in this area.
2. It would comply with the Towns Comprehensive plan.
3. Would not have any negative impacts in the area and would actually be of a positive benefit for all.

V. Planner Recommendation:

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Special Use Permit Lot 94 of the Silt Trade center with the following conditions:
1. all representations of the applicant made in writing, application materials and verbally at the Planning Commission or Trustee meetings or that are reflected in the meeting minutes are considered part of the application and are binding on the applicant.
2. Request some kind of small, private open space area or other amenity for the benefit of the residential users of the property.

VI. Recommended Motion:

Motion to approve the Special Use Permit for an accessory residential use for Lot 94 with the staff recommended conditions above. (Any modifications or additional conditions made by the Planning Commission should be added to this motion).
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Town of Silt Planning Commission

FROM: Mark Chain, Planner

DATE: 4/27/22

RE: Modular Housing, town standards & 5th & Ballard

Background

Jim Bennett, a retired veteran, has lived at 519 Ballard for a number of years. The structure on site is a trailer either built or placed there in 1971. It has a bad roof and it is constantly leaking. The home is not really tied down - I believe it is set on blocks and there is a shed out back set on railroad ties. The present structure is a approximately 12’ x 72’ and that includes an older addition.

This structure is at the end of its useful life and actually should have been replaced or retired number of years ago. But there is a problem with replacing the home. Some issues are financial but others are regulatory.

The property is zoned R-2, General Residential District which is common in the older part of town.

Issues

1. **Financial.** Jim is on a fixed income and that isn’t the Town’s or anybody else’s problem. However, he has found some manufactured home options that may be affordable to him. One is placing an 880 ft.² modular on a foundation that has two bedrooms and one bath. He is looking at this in another option and I have scanned one of these and have included it in the packet.

2. **Regulatory.** There are number of town code sections which prevent Jim from placing a modular on this and many other sites in the Old Town Area even if cost is no object. Some of these are as follows:

General zoning.
1. **Modulars/manufactured homes in general.** The town generally does not allow manufactured homes or modulars as a use by right. And this is even if they meet all current building code requirements as well as being placed on a foundation. You apply to build a duplex manufactured home in certain zone districts but one needs a special use permit for this. And the town schedule of uses for all zone districts discourages manufactured homes or modulars. Specifically, here is the statement in the Town Zoning code in the list of permitted uses:

   “Single-family dwelling units, but excluding manufactured homes, mobile homes, modulars and factory built homes”. Essentially, single-family dwelling units are allowed but it excludes manufactured homes/factory built/modulars in all residential zone districts”.

I was a bit surprised at this as many communities allow manufactured homes that are on a foundation and meet all building code requirements. I believe discouraging manufactured homes in this case is a carryover from previous times when many people wanted to discourage mobile homes or modulars. But, there are many older mobile homes and modulars in the old town site and it is hard to upgrade these. While modular homes have not become as prevalent as I had presumed they would become, they still have a place in helping people upgrade their living situation.

2. **Dwelling unit size.** The Town’s minimum unit size in its main residential districts is as follows:

   - R-1: 1200 ft.²
   - R-2: 1000 ft.²
   - R-3: 860 ft.²

When I read the standards they look as if they apply to all residential units. I think requiring the above minimum sizes for single-family detached homes we are encouraging more costly options. Smaller houses have their place in the world and of course not for all individuals or families. But when the minimum standard dwelling single-family district is 1,000 SF for more when for a single or elderly person a smaller would do; why require more square footage and more cost??

3. **Parking guidelines.** For some of the smaller and older lots in town these can be a bit of a hindrance also. Town standards generally ask for two offstreet parking spaces on concrete any space being 9’ x 19’. This is probably all well and good for newer subdivisions and people expected. But I don’t know if this is appropriate for the older parts of town.

4. **Town exterior elevation criteria.** Section 17.43.030 of the Municipal Code has extensive exterior elevation and architectural standards. Once again, I believe these can be good for the newer subdivisions in town. But I don’t
know if they are appropriate for the older parts of town or for when someone wants to replace her model a home. For example, one code section – 17.43.030 J requires the width of a home at the front building line to be at least two thirds the depth of the home. This can be difficult to reach on some of the town’s older and narrower lots.

**Planner Comments**

I do not mean to belittle the town code or try to make a special arrangement for any particular person. I just think that some of the town standards in this case can get in the way of people trying to upgrade things. I also want to point out that it is good to have some architectural and site planning standards but maybe this is for newer developments and for areas with larger lots. It may not be long in some or all of the older downtown area.

In this particular case, you have a gentleman who wants to remain in the area and not move away and have to live with his son but this is a problem and it may be happening to other people also. I think we want to be able to encourage smaller units especially if they meet all building code and health standards. And I understand the concern about is the propensity for having a long 3:12 roof pitch. Maybe there is a way to have certain standards or embellishments for some of these smaller, manufactured home situations if you wish to go in that direction.

Another thought, if you do decide to move forward and look at liberalizing town code in certain areas you may not want to offer similar relief for mobile home parks/modular home parks these are different animal maybe they should be treated differently.

**Some discussion points** (and we can also continue this at another time)

- Would it be good to allow smaller units (think those new cottages at River run)?
- Are manufactured homes/modular units that meet standard building code criteria considered a problem in the Town? I believe they have their place.
- Are you aware of any other town standards that discourage replacement of older residential units?
- Would you like staff to look at other regulatory obstacles to replacing certain residential units or upgrading living situations?
*SHOWN WITH OPTIONAL SINGLE SLOPE ROOF, INTERIOR VAULTED CEILING AND TRANSOMS

casi-ta /ˈkeɪsətə/ noun
[especially in the US West] a small house or other building

The Casitas Series
Single Section Modular Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SqFt</th>
<th>Bedrooms/Baths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sierra</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1 Bed / 1 Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arroyo</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>2 Bed / 1 Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canyon</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>2 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sonora</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>2 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mesa</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>2 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Built to BellaVista Series Standards
*IRC Modular Construction
*3/12 Gable Roof Pitch Standard

BONNAVILLA®
A DIVISION OF CHIEF INDUSTRIES, INC.

www.bonnavilla.com
Summary

Account  R350194
Parcel    217903319010
Property  519 BALLARD AVE, SILT, CO 81652
Address   
Legal     Section: 3 Township: 6 Range: 92 Subdivision: BALLARD ADD Block: 3 Lot: 16 THRU Lot: 20 ONLY THE W 65'
Description  
Acres     0
Land SqFt  8,125
Tax Area  35
Mill Levy  83.6550
Subdivision BALLARD ADD

Owner

BENNETT JAMES E
PO BOX 871
GLEWWOOD SPRINGS CO 81602

Land

Unit Type  MANUFCTD HOUSING-LAND - 1135 (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)
Square Feet 8,125

Actual Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Actual</td>
<td>$62,000.00</td>
<td>$42,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Actual</td>
<td>$2,050.00</td>
<td>$2,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual</td>
<td>$64,050.00</td>
<td>$44,260.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Assessed</td>
<td>$4,430.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Assessed</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessed</td>
<td>$4,580.00</td>
<td>$3,160.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tax History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes Billed</td>
<td>$303.12</td>
<td>$242.88</td>
<td>$230.48</td>
<td>$195.24</td>
<td>$177.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click here to view the tax information for this parcel on the Garfield County Treasurer's website.

Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale Date</th>
<th>Deed Type</th>
<th>Reception Number</th>
<th>Book - Page</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2007</td>
<td>DEATH CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>724259</td>
<td>1930-721</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2007</td>
<td>PERSONAL REP DEED</td>
<td>724256</td>
<td>1930-723</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2006</td>
<td>LETTERS</td>
<td>724245</td>
<td>1930-722</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2001</td>
<td>WARRANTY DEED</td>
<td>591928</td>
<td>1302-987</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/2001</td>
<td>WARRANTY DEED</td>
<td>585829</td>
<td>1275-616</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/2000</td>
<td>DEATH CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>562114</td>
<td>1182-470</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/1983</td>
<td>Deeds</td>
<td>0634-0542</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/1900</td>
<td>Deeds</td>
<td>0522-0232</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property Related Public Documents

Click here to view Property Related Public Documents.

Photos

No data available for the following modules: Buildings, Sketches.
Chapter 17.43 ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE PLANNING STANDARDS

Sections:

17.43.010 Purposes.

The town shall evaluate the design and location of structures and other development features within residential zone districts according to the provisions of this chapter, in order to create neighborhoods that are well-planned and add to the overall appearance and functionality of the town. Unless otherwise specified in this chapter, all applications for new single-family structures and new duplex residential units shall comply with this chapter, as well as all applicable building codes and zoning codes as adopted by the town.

(Ord. 14-07 (part))

17.43.020 Site planning.

A. Applicant shall submit a grading plan that is based on slope geometry, and complies with the following:

1. Cuts, fills, grading, excavation, vegetation removal and building construction shall be confined to designated building envelopes (on submitted and approved site plans), except under either of the following circumstances:
   a. Disturbance is directly related to building access, utility installation, roadways, trails, irrigation facilities, fences, trees and similar vegetative material and/or storm water drainage as determined by the town administrator or his designee; and, if in the town administrator’s opinion absolutely necessary in order to site unit; and
   b. Disturbance is approved by the town’s engineer following a review of the applicant’s soils report that indicates the exact amount of cut and/or fill proposed (such report shall be prepared by a licensed geotechnical engineer for the project).

2. No placement of any structure upon a thirty percent or steeper grade, natural or man-made, unless a slope stability analysis is performed by a licensed geotechnical engineer and the town approves such work as necessary to the overall functionality of the home;

3. No excavation prior to utility company notification and subsequent locating of utilities, and issuance of building permit; it is the property owner’s responsibility to call for locates at least three business days prior to excavation; and

4. Within one growing season of completion of unit, lot owner shall restore disturbed areas with vegetation or other substance such as wood and/or stone to minimize erosion; in no event during or after construction event shall the property owner allow the infestation of weeds upon the property.

B. Driveways. Applicant shall submit a driveway plan that indicates a maximum eight percent grade, unless the town administrator or his designee determines that such a grade would present a practical hardship to the applicant. Such plan shall further indicate the following applicable standards:

1. Adequately sized culverts where driveways and walks cross ditches and drainage trenches; the size, placement and cover of such culverts as recommended by a soils engineer and/or a Colorado licensed and registered engineer specializing in storm water drainage;
2. Any required or necessary culvert(s) with flare ends and grates or bar racks on each end to keep animals and debris from entering the culverts;

3. Driveways shall be installed perpendicular to the street, unless the size and/or shape of the lot warrant another driveway design, as reviewed and approved by the town administrator or his designee;

4. Driveways shall be flared at the point where it meets the street in order to allow for appropriate entrance to and exit from parking spaces;

5. Driveways that have a length in excess of seventy-five feet shall be designed with a minimum width of twelve feet and shall also be designed to afford all reasonably-sized vehicles to enter and exit the driveway in a forward-facing direction, by means of a hammerhead, T-turnaround or circular driveway; and

6. Driveways shall be maintained for structural integrity during the life of the structure. Cracking, settling and lifting that is determined to be a problem to the structural integrity of the driveway shall be remedied within thirty days notice by the town.

C. Ridgeline Protection. Applicant shall submit a building plan that indicates that ridgeline protection (as defined by this code) shall occur, complete with a site specific geotechnical study.

D. Utility Meters. Applicant shall submit a site plan that clearly indicates the location of all utility meters to each proposed unit, and further shall comply with the following:

1. Applicant shall purchase (from the town) and install at his expense a water meter for each unit to be placed in a location approved by the town within the front yard utility easement adjacent to the right-of-way, or another location as determined by the town;

2. Each duplex unit shall have its own utility meters installed on its own real property, assuming that the unit will be subdivided at a later date, without the need for easements across another unit's property for maintenance and/or replacement;

3. Exposed plumbing and piping shall be painted to match exterior colors of the primary structure prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

E. Storm Drainage. Applicant shall submit a storm drainage plan showing compliance with the following criteria:

1. Finished floor elevation certified by a Colorado registered professional engineer or licensed surveyor shall be shown for those properties located within the floodplain;

2. Storm water is routed away from the structure in a location approved by the town and away from adjoining properties; and

3. Institution of the following techniques to divert storm water to the appropriate locations, including, but not limited to, the following:
   a. French drain;
   b. Re-grading of lot;
   c. Berm(s);
   d. Swale.

4. In no case shall a homeowner grade his lot such that the subdivision's drainage plan is altered.

(Ord. 14-07 (part))
17.43.030 Exterior elevations.

The town’s intent in requiring covered front porches and/or a decoratively railed entryway off the front entrance to a home is to minimize the impact of protruding and front loading garages that could be up to twenty-four (24) feet in front of the home. The town recommends that garages be side-loading or built with access of alleys, if possible.

A. Garage compatibility

1. Any proposed detached garages shall be compatible in architecture, materials and color with the main residential structure.

B. Main Entrance Door. Applicant shall submit a site plan that indicates the following provisions:

1. The main entrance door, including porch and/or covered entryway, shall be a primary decorative feature to the home and shall face at least one street or alternately, the face of the door when closed shall not exceed a forty-five degree angle with the street, when the plane of the closed door is extended to the street.

2. Width of the stairway shall equal the height of the stairway up to six feet, unless a landing is provided midway between finished grade and the elevation of the entrance (i.e. a stairway with the highest tread and/or landing of six feet shall be no less than six feet in width.) If a landing is provided midway between the finished grade and the elevation of the main entrance, then the width of the stairway shall be no less than four feet wide.

3. For corner lots, the main entrance of the home shall be no less than twenty feet from the front lot line.

C. Windows and Doors. Applicant shall submit a window and door schedule that clearly indicates compliance with the following criteria:

1. No door or window may have bare aluminum on any portion; and

2. Windows and doors comply with Chapter 15.24 (energy efficiency standards) of this code.

D. Roofs. Applicant shall submit roof plans that indicate the following criteria:

1. Roof material is shingled (asphalt or wood shake), tile or treated metal roofs (copper or roofs that are shiny must be treated immediately in order to minimize glare);

2. Roof material does not include galvanized corrugated metal or asphalt rolled exterior roofing materials, but may include metal purposely designed to rust;

3. Roof pitch shall in no case be less than four vertical inches for each twelve horizontal inches (4:12), unless the structure is designed to have a flat roof (such as a southwestern style roof), as determined by the town administrator or his designee; and

4. No fewer than three roof features, upper level accents or architectural features shall be added to the front and/or side of the structure and clearly visible from the street, as determined by the town administrator or his designee. A schedule is provided in this section to lend assistance in calculating the points for these types of roof features or upper level accents. Each home must have twenty-five points in order for the community development department to authorize issuance of a building permit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cupola</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormer(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry fireplace chimney</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Feature</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper level deck(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladian window(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriel window(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear-story or mezzanine window(s) (2nd level)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay window(s) on the front of the home, which extend from the plane of the home more than twelve inches</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip roof</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansard roof</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gable roof with pitch greater than 6:12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper accent(s) (pre-finished patina)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated rusting metal roof accent(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilaster(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanlight window(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutter(s) on second floor windows</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick quoin(s) at corner of building</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainscoting for at least 1/3 of the building height</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainscoting to eave line as an accent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flared eave</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round turret</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersecting ridgelines (3 or more)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic accents on front of home</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other architectural accent proposed shall be reviewed according to the preceding list of points, and the closest points shall be awarded for like features, in the town administrator’s sole discretion.

E. Exterior Finishes. Applicant shall submit a building plan that indicates the exterior material proposed for the unit that complies with one of the following, or a combination of the following:

1. Wood or a wood product treated to resist weathering and decay;
2. Brick;
3. Stucco;
4. Cultured stone;
5. Stone;
6. Vinyl siding no less than .042 inches thick;
7. Painted fiber cement;
8. Faux brick product (polyurethane); and

F. Eave Overhangs. Applicant shall submit elevational plans showing eave overhangs that include the following criteria:
1. Eave overhangs shall be a minimum depth of twelve inches, as measured from the edge of the eave to the sidewall structure, exclusive of gutters;

2. All eave overhangs shall include some type of soffit structure or be finished in a manner that is architecturally pleasing (i.e. no exposed wiring).

G. Sheds and Outbuildings. Applicant shall submit a site plan for any shed or outbuilding (where allowed by zoning) that clearly indicates the following:

1. Any proposed detached building shall be generally compatible in architectural materials and color with the main residential structure; and

2. Sheds or outbuildings measuring one hundred and twenty square feet or less shall have a sidewall height equal to or less than eight feet.

H. Landscaping.

1. Disturbed portions of any lot, following excavation or site preparation, shall require re-vegetation, with the exception for garden and/or landscape preparation;

2. Lots shall be landscaped within six months of issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the primary residential structure;

3. All plants over thirty inches shall be planted outside of the sight visibility triangle for a corner lot, as determined by this code;

4. Native species not considered noxious weeds in this code are encouraged, as well as "xeric" landscaping (xeriscaping), to reduce water consumption;

5. Those trees as described in Chapter 12.16 (desirable trees) are encouraged;

6. All plants shall be kept living and healthy. All landscaping replacements shall be made within one season of plant mortality; and

7. All residential lot owners are responsible for landscaping or maintaining the right of way between their property line and the street, to include weed management. Since public safety is a must, all trees must be trimmed to avoid sidewalk encroachment by branches.

I. Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk. Applicant shall submit a site plan indicating curb, gutter, sidewalk, and a drainage swale on all those properties devoid of such items within the town’s right-of-way that conform to the following criteria, unless modified further in this section:

1. Sidewalks shall be a minimum of four (4) inches of concrete and four (4) feet in width, over a suitable material as described in the town’s public works manual, or as approved by the town administrator or his designee;

2. Sidewalks shall be installed in a location and at an appropriate elevation as approved by the town administrator or his designee; and

3. Square or rollover curbs shall be installed adjacent to the street per the town’s public works manual; and

4. For those residential lots located between 1st Street and 16th Street, and between Main Street and Linda Avenue together with Sheryl and Kim Avenues, that have not historically had curb, gutter and sidewalk, applicant shall submit a site plan in conformance to the following:
   a. Street side swales, also known as barrow ditches, shall have no steeper slope than three (3) feet (vertical) to one (1) foot (horizontal) and be constructed within the town right-of-way;
b. Sixty (60) foot rights-of-way shall be designed for two (2) ten-foot driving lanes, a seven (7) foot wide parking lane on each side of the street, and a drainage swale on each side of the street, as depicted in the town’s public works manual, or such street profile as determined by the town administrator or his designee;

c. Fifty (50) foot rights-of-way shall be designed for two (2) ten-foot driving lanes, a seven (7) foot wide parking lane on the south and east sides of the street, and a drainage swale on each side of the street, as depicted in the town’s public works manual, or such street profile as determined by the town administrator or his designee;

d. Forty (40) foot rights-of-way shall be designed for two (2) ten-foot driving lanes and a drainage swale on each side of the street, as depicted in the town’s public works manual, or such street profile as determined by the town administrator or his designee.

J. Width and Depth of Home on Lot. Applicant shall submit building plans indicating that the width of a home at the front building line shall be at least two-thirds (⅔) the depth of the home, as measured from the front building line to the rear lot line, as determined by the town administrator or his designee.

K. Roof Projections and Appurtenances. Applicant shall submit "elevational" drawings that indicate that evaporative coolers (swamp coolers) are located on the non-street side of the structure, so as to not be completely visible from the street. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the town administrator or his designee may grant special consideration to an applicant requesting a structure on a corner lot, whereby placement of an evaporative cooler may be problematic.

L. Request for Board of Adjustment Review. Upon written application on a form provided by the town, applicant may request a deviation(s) from the preceding architectural guidelines. The board of adjustment shall consider the application in a regularly scheduled meeting no less than thirty days following receipt by the town of a complete application. At a minimum, the applicant shall provide additional drawings, submittal items and any additional materials that support the applicant’s request for deviation(s) from code, including but not limited to the following:

1. A scaled site plan indicating all property boundaries, all setbacks to structure, easements of record, utility locations and existing conditions (including topography) that may be a reason for the request:

2. A scaled elevational drawing indicating the following:
   a. Each side of the building from a directional perspective (north, south, east, and west);
   b. Roof pitch of all roof sections, including any appurtenances, if applicable; and
   c. Architectural features on each side of the building, including all exterior materials and dimensions of all features proposed.

3. A detailed letter requesting the exact deviations(s) from this section, including reasons for the deviations and impact(s) the deviation may have on adjoining properties.

4. A fee of two hundred and fifty dollars, plus any engineering, planning, administrative, copying, printing or other costs incurred by the town for review of the application.

(Ord. 14-07 (part))

(Ord. No. 3-2011, § 1, 6-13-2011; Ord. No. 5-2011, § 1, 7-11-2011)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Rislende – PUD Zoning and Subdivision Sketch Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>August Group LLC, DBA Rislende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell Weimer, Cole Buerger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121 Polo Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenwood Springs, CO 81601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202.215.1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Silt 70 LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10106 W San Juna Way, Ste 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Littleton, CO 80127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Representative/ Land Planner</td>
<td>The Land Studio, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug &amp; Julie Pratte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>365 River Bend Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenwood Springs, CO 81601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>970.927.3690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>High Country Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1517 Lake Avenue, Suite 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbondale, CO 81623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>970.945.8676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Attorney</td>
<td>Balcomb and Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad Lee, Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>818 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenwood Springs, CO 81601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>970.945.6546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Architect</td>
<td>Red House Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Barth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Engineer</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>West of BLM regional office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South of I 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East of County Road 311 (Divide Creek Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>PUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Land Uses</td>
<td>West – commercial (Holiday Inn)— Light Industrial, North – I-70, South – River and agate/rural uses, East – Government Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Zoning</td>
<td>North – RZ, East – Unincorporated Garfield County, South – Unincorporated Garfield County, West – Commercial PUD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Public hearing – PUD Zoning  
Review of Major Subdivision Sketch Plan

Tonight’s meeting will have two main elements. One will be a public hearing on the PUD zoning for Rislende. There is a public hearing in front of the Commission on the zoning and you will make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. You can make a recommendation or choose to continue the public hearing.

The property is also subject to a review of the Sketch Plan for a Major Subdivision. The Sketch Plan process is the first step in the review of a major subdivision. At this point in time the Commission has an opportunity to analyze the lot arrangement, whether there is legal access or not, adequate utilities for the proposed full-time and visiting population to the property. This review should also identify relationship to topography, flooding potential, wildlife, any natural hazards etc. At the sketch plan level there is not a hearing in front of the Commission. You look at the information and make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The Board does have a hearing at the sketch plan level.

There is a lot to bite off here. But please be aware that this is just the first step in a process assuming approval at this level. Next steps will be the detailed engineering in the preliminary and final plat applications related to a major subdivision. You will be evaluating and holding public hearings during the subdivision stage. In addition, each of these tracts/lots will be subject to a Site Plan Review. In many ways the Site Plan Review for each of these areas will be when the real heavy lifting is done. While technical items such as infrastructure are currently being analyzed, the rest of the project is still at a concept level stage. Below is an excerpt from the PUD Application which outlines the general timing and phasing of the project to show you this lengthy time frame. And often times, a large PUD takes longer to develop given ups and downs of the economy etc.

### PHASING/DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building / District Development</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Years 5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract 3 ‘The Beacon’ Gathering Spot</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 1 Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 6 ‘Rislende Place’ Events Center</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracts 2,3,4 Commercial/Residential Mixed-Use’</td>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracts 5,7 Single-Family Residential’</td>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have the complete application for the PUD and the subdivision sketch plan previously provided to you digitally. Please let me know if you would like a hard copy of any of these documents or specific portions of these documents. As part of this report I will have snippets of the PUD document and will also include what I consider the “meaty” sections of the Sketch Plan engineering documents. The majority of the sketch plan information is at the conclusion of this staff report.

**PUD REVIEW**

**Maximum Development Potential**

**Residential.** Section A.6 of the PUD introduction limits the number of residential to 160 for the project. This includes 72 at the northeast corner by BLM and approximately 16 single-family type units in the single-family residential zones in the heart of the project.

**Nonresidential.** Specific limits have not been proposed. However, I believe this is mostly taken care of by the constraints in maximum building size and maximum density allowed in the various districts. For example, maximum density in the Events Center District is 20,000 ft.² per acre or a 0.5 FAR. So, think on a 1 acre site a one-story building that takes up a little bit less than half of that area. Please be aware that the zoning guide suggests a maximum lot coverage of 70% in both Event Center and the Commercial/mixed-use districts - and these can be modified during Site Plan Review either up or down if the town thought there was either too much development or that the plan was so good that it could be increased. Please note that Lot Coverage by town documents is area occupied by the ground area of the buildings on the site – it does not include impervious lot coverage such as parking.

**Height.**

The allowed zoning Height varies throughout the project. The multifamily area (by BLM) does not have a prescribed height and that may be something you would want to add.

The height in the Lodging District is 25 feet and it has a lower maximum lot coverage and this is appropriate given location/proximity to the river. Please note that both the commercial/mixed-use and the Events Center District allow up to 40 feet in height. I have walked the site 2 different times and also spent some time looking at views both from the frontage road area as well as along the I 70 right-of-way. I believe concerns with height are mitigated in these districts by two factors:

- There is a maximum building size in each of the zone districts of 30,000 ft.². This does not allow a massive, long linear structure. Think of a 3 story downtown building in one of our local towns with 100 foot lot depth. This would be a building that takes up about one third of the assumed “main street frontage” over the length of a block which would also allow for parking and delivery access all off of a presumed alley. Such a building size is usually looked on favorably in downtown type areas.
- A 40-foot height limit also gives flexibility for three-story mixed-use structures. If one wants to have a very comfortable retail/public ceiling height on the ground floor, a 3rd story residential or loft unit gets pinched with a 35 foot height limit. That extra 3 to 5 feet allows a much more spacious feeling for three-story mixed-use buildings. I believe the 40 foot height is acceptable.
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Massing. I addressed this partially in the paragraphs above. I have talked to the project planner and he may want to provide some comments on massing from the developer’s perspective. We can discuss the massing and height limits in more detail at the meeting as I do want planning commission input on this item.

Landscaping.

In the PUD Zoning Guide landscaping is treated separately than open space/parkland. Section D.1 has a criterion that minimum landscape area as a percentage of total disturbed lot area shall be 18%, or as modified by site plan approval. This is an interesting concept and not often inserted into PUD development guides. Some would note that only 18% of a property may end up being “open”. However, the 18% requirement is for disturbed area and a lot; so if someone is only developing half of a lot the other half would not be disturbed and would remain in its present, open condition (the entire property is undeveloped right now). And once again, this can be modified in either direction during site plan approval.

Open space/parkland.

There are a number of items going on when discussing this topic. First, section C. Of the PUD Guide states that the open space and/or parkland will be provided at 25% – which meets the town standards. Second, there is a Parkland Dedication Proposal in the PUD documents which indicates that they are providing parkland via Town requirements contained in Section 16.04.530. Their proposal is to provide this parkland dedication as privately held which is allowed under certain procedures in the Subdivision Regulations for the town. Arrangements will have to be made so that the public has appropriate access to it. The benefit to the town would be that the owner/developer is responsible for maintenance. Finally, the river island and the river itself, which make up a majority of the property itself will remain open.

Land use proposed in individual zone districts. Most of the uses proposed are taken out of the town code. Yes, there are many, but especially in an area that proposed to be mixed-use this would appear to be acceptable.

PUD Approval Criteria

Approval Criteria are contained in section 16.12.030 of the SMC. I will address them quickly in a point-by-point fashion below:

A. Have an appropriate relationship to the surrounding area, with no adverse effects on the surrounding zone districts within the town, as determined by the board
   
   Comment. Complies.

B. Adequately address pedestrian and other non-motorized transportation.
   
   Comment. Complies.

C. Adequately address pedestrian and other non-motorized transportation
   
   Comment. Complies. There is a major pedestrian path through the project and there will be
some pedestrian access to areas along the river in certain locations. We should discuss sketch plan comments on the main pedestrian path as part of the Sketch Plan

D. Provide open space and/or parkland in an amount at least twenty-five percent of the total project acreage
   
   Comment. Complies.

E. Provide for a variety in housing types and densities, where the PUD proposes only residential development
   
   Comment. Complies.

F. Provide adequate off-street parking for all proposed uses
   
   Comment. Complies.

G. Cluster development, where possible
   
   Comment. Complies.

H. Propose density in conformance with the comprehensive plan
   
   Comment. Complies.

I. Be at least two acres in total area
   
   Comment. Complies.

J. Be comprised of only those land uses permitted by the PUD ordinance
   
   Comment. Complies.

K. Detail all those zoning regulations that may differ from standard districts
   
   Comment. Complies.

L. Include the provisions of C.R.S. §24-67-105(G)
   
   Comment. Complies.

Planning Recommendation

The PUD is well conceived, meets the town’s PUD Approval Criteria and appears to protect the Town as development would proceed. It also provides a new amenity to the area and can bring great benefit to the Town. I do not have specific conditions for you at this time as I still need to think through a few items in more detail. I also would like to hear your comments and ideas because sometimes the best comments come from sitting town boards and/or the public. I also still need to do a point-by-point analysis of the benefits that were proposed for this development in his previous incarnation versus the
present one. I can have these ready for you for adoption that the next meeting if you concur with my direction.

**SKETCH PLAN REVIEW**

This is probably the first Major Subdivision Sketch Plan that has been reviewed by the town in a number of years. Remember, we are looking at the big picture issues here – lotting arrangement, access, general infrastructure water/wastewater, identifying hazard areas and constraints etc. This property has been subject to development studies and review for over 20 years. There were detailed studies including floodplain analysis, access and traffic analysis/control plans details and water rights and so forth. Much of the still apply.

The charge of the Planning Mission is to look at the Sketch Plan from a big picture level and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees. This is not a public hearing.

**I. Applicable Municipal Code sections**

Pertinent sections for the Planning Commission Review are contained in sections 16.04.020 and 030 of the SMC. Review criteria are contained in 160.04.030 E (1-6). I am including the sections of the code as part of the staff report.

High Country Engineering is the project engineer and they have submitted a Major Subdivision Sketch Plan application which you previously received a link to for your records. I am also including relevant sections of the Sketch Plan/Engineering Study at the conclusion of this staff report.

**CODE EXCERPT BELOW**

16.04.030 Major subdivision sketch plan submittal—Completeness—Scheduling of planning commission meeting.

A. The applicant for major subdivision sketch plan, upon submittal of a complete application, shall schedule with the planning department a staff-applicant conference. At this conference, the applicant shall explain to staff the entire proposal, using all submittal documents;

B. Following the submittal of major subdivision sketch plan application and the staff-applicant conference, the planning department shall have fifteen days to check the application for completeness. This cursory review shall not be a review for strict conformance with the Code related to the type of proposed development, zoning compliance, comprehensive plan conformance, or conformance with the town's master plans. Town staff may notify the applicant that a longer period of time is needed to check for application completeness, and in such case, the planning department shall have an additional fifteen days to check the application for completeness;

C. If the application is incomplete, the planning department shall notify the applicant in writing within fifteen days, and the applicant shall have no more than thirty days to respond with additional submittal materials that make the application complete. The town may grant another thirty-day extension, upon good reason therefore. If the applicant is unable to complete the application within thirty days, or sixty days if continuance is requested and granted, the application is deemed abandoned, and the applicant shall submit a new application. In no case shall the applicant have more than two continuances granted;
D. If the application is complete, the planning department shall have no fewer than thirty days, but no more than forty-five days to review the major subdivision sketch plan application for Code compliance with this title and the provisions of this Code;

E. Within fifteen days following the planning department’s review of the application, the town shall schedule a public meeting before the commission to consider the application, using the following guidelines:

1. Conformance to the town’s comprehensive plan, as amended from time to time;
2. Relationship of development to topography, soils, drainage, flooding, potential natural hazard areas, and other physical characteristics;
3. Availability of domestic water means of wastewater collection and treatment, access, and other utilities and services;
4. Compatibility with the natural environment, wildlife, vegetation and unique natural features;
5. Public costs, inefficiencies and tax hardships; and
6. Conformance to the town’s zoning code, if land has been previously annexed and zoned within the town.

Referral Comments

Town Engineering comments initial comments.

- It’s important to note the presence of high groundwater. This will require additional measures during construction and material selections to ensure watertight pipelines for potable water and sanitary sewer.
- Since the property is along the river and offsite drainages run through it, it should be evaluated by an ecologist for the presence of any USACE jurisdictional wetlands.
- This property is along the Colorado River which is the only Town drinking water source. Therefore water quality is of utmost importance. All stormwater and snowmelt runoff must be run through BMPs that treat the water quality capture volume (WQCV). Detention is not critical, but the BMPs should also be included to screen floating debris up to the 100-year event.
- This property is contained within the regionally accepted LOVA Trails Master Plan document. There appears to be a narrow gravel path extending through most of the project, but the application documents don’t acknowledge LOVA Trails and it appears that the path may be too narrow. I don’t know the trail has to be hard surfaced at this time, but it should at least include the appropriate width (10-ft for hard surface and 1-ft shoulder on each side?), a structural aggregate platform that can support maintenance vehicles and a crusher fine surface.
- The trail is shown running along the river behind BLM. The river bank in that area has experienced significant erosion in the recent years. Bank armoring will be necessary if the trail is to be constructed along that section.
- **Pedestrian crossings must be provided at CR311 in the E/W direction and the N/S.** The crossing near the tunnel is ‘mid-block’ and in a high-speed area making it a hazard. It should be deleted.
- The Future Access centerline off CR#311 must align with the centerline of the Holiday Inn Access.
SKETCH PLAN DEVELOPMENT MAP
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• We should limit the number of vehicle and pedestrian conflict whenever possible. The project proposes 4 accesses off River Frontage Road in a section of road that has a posted speed of 45 mph from the east, but where I often observe vehicles travelling at 65-75 mph in both directions. The subdivision layout already includes utilities and easements running E/W through the center from CR#311 to the BLM through and a portion of subdivision road behind Tract 1. It seems logical to develop this property instead with a single roadway in this same utility corridor and eliminate three (3) accesses off the high speed Frontage Road. Doing so might also reduce project costs because CDOT highway improvements typically cost more than subdivision roads and the length of roads between Tracts 3/2 and 2/1 appear to match the distance behind Tract 2. See the image below.

These initial comments have been forwarded on to the applicant and they are analyzing them. I am not that familiar with the LOVA trail system or the possible limited area to the south and east of the BLM offices which may pose certain constraints. I will try to get up to speed on those details.

Water quality is critical to maintain because it is the primary and only source of domestic water for the town and we encountered considerable constraints due to the mud and debris slides which impacted Glenwood Canyon last year. Probably the chief concern of the applicant is the concept of utilizing a main access for the site through the middle the property as opposed to chiefly from the I 70 Frontage Rd. That noted access connection is extremely close to the river.

It is my understanding that sufficient water rights have already dedicated to the town or arrangements have been made. The developer will also be abandoning what is known as Silt Well No. 2 and drilling a new well for irrigation purposes.

There is a surface use agreement that is associated with the property and this needs to be abandoned which should be very feasible given the technology of horizontal drilling and use these days.
I also need to become more familiar with the existing Access Control Plan for the area. And arrangements for access permits were already obtained. They will have to be reactivated if they are to be used.

There’s been much study on the main water and wastewater transmission lines to the property which parallel the Frontage Road. This water transmission line and wastewater trunk line go out to Coal Ridge High school.

Extensive floodplain mapping and analysis has occurred over the past. It was my understanding that something needed to be recorded once development was to occur on the site and I will check town records to confirm.

Public Works Comments –

None at this time.

REVIEW CRITERIA

Below is a point-by-point comment on the review criteria contained in section 16.04.030 E.

1. Conformance to the town's comprehensive plan, as amended from time to time;
   
   **Comment:** The plan in general is in conformance with the town Comprehensive Plan.

2. Relationship of development to topography, soils, drainage, flooding, potential natural hazard areas, and other physical characteristics;
   
   **Comment:** these items have been studied in detail while past arrangements have been made for the development of the property. Certain elements may need to be updated as the plan moves forward into Preliminary and Final Plat

3. Availability of domestic water and means of wastewater collection and treatment, access, and other utilities and services;
   
   **Comment:** it is my understanding that water supply is adequate for the project, water rights have been dedicated and arrangements have been made for wastewater treatment collection.

4. Compatibility with the natural environment, wildlife, vegetation and unique natural features;
   
   **Comment:** compatibility with the natural environment should be able to be maintained. More detailed studies will be updated as necessary.

5. Public costs, inefficiencies and tax hardships; and
   
   **Comment:** The developer will be paying to provide the infrastructure and it appears that all infrastructure as well as open space will be provided and/or maintained by the owner.

6. Conformance to the town's zoning code, if land has been previously annexed and zoned within the town.
   
   **Comment:** Conforms.
The intent of this application is to establish a ten-lot subdivision from what is currently referred to as Divide Creek Center – a 51-acre parcel south of the I-70 Frontage Road and east of CR 311. The items in this application address Silt’s requirements per section 16.04.010.B. for “Major Subdivision PUD Sketch Plan” applications.
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Parcel Overview and Planning Objectives

In 2007, the town of Silt approved the annexation of the subject parcel of land. Later that same year the Board approved a subdivision exemption for a BLM regional office along the property’s eastern edge. In 2013, the then-owner of the land submitted an Amended and Restated Annexation and Development Agreement (“ARADA”) as well as a Planned Unit Development (“PUD”) zoning plan. Both the ARADA and the PUD were approved by the Silt Board of Trustees in 2013.

The 2013 ARADA and PUD laid out a vision for a number of single- and multi-family residential units with designated open space along the river. The plan was never final platted and for the last eight years the parcel of land has sat undeveloped, providing for little more than agriculture and cattle grazing.

In early 2021, August Group LLC entered into contract to purchase approximately 48 acres of the land, leaving approximately 3.4 acres with the current owner, Silt 70 LLC. Together, the LLCs are writing a new ARADA and PUD to reflect an updated and dramatically different approach to developing the overall parcel. This Sketch Plan Application is included with our Major Subdivision PUD approval process, wherein we seek approvals of the new ARADA and PUD documents.

August Group LLC comprises Mitchell Weimer and Cole Buerger, both native Coloradans currently residing in Glenwood Springs, Colorado. Their vision for development and operations will happen under the banner brand of “Rislende”.

The overall parcel plan is as depicted on the attached site plan document. The 3.4± acres remaining under the current owner are located in the northeast corner of the parcel, abutting the I-70 frontage road to the north and the BLM parcel to the east. The 48± acres being sold to August Group LLC include the remaining acreage between County Road 311 (aka 16th Street, aka Divide Creek Road) and the BLM office, a small triangle of land to the east of the BLM office, a thin strip running along the southern edge of the BLM parcel, and the river island – with the parcel’s property line extending to the Colorado River’s midpoint.

Our planning objectives are to create a coordinated phased development comprising housing, commercial and office spaces, and upscale riverfront venues for leisure, events, and special attractions – with broad natural and manicured open spaces and parklands throughout the property. Further, the development is designed to complement the town of Silt and the region; provide needed and highly desirable goods and services, along with employment opportunities; respect and protect the natural beauty and importance of Colorado River riverfront; and provide both passive and active parkland activities for residents and visitors.
Land Uses and Zoning: Existing and Proposed

Existing: The subject parcel is currently zoned through an approved PUD from 2013. That document established two zones: commercial/mixed-use and open space. The zones were developed to support a housing development that did not come to fruition, and the parcel today sits unused except for some agriculture and cattle grazing.

Proposed: As depicted on the attached sketch plan document, our proposal establishes five zones across eight tracts: multi-family residential (1 tract, 3.4± ac), events (1 tract, 3.8± ac), lodging / single-family residential (2 tracts, 4.2± ac total), commercial/residential mixed-use (3 tracts, 10.6± ac total), a river island tract (7.4± ac), a river tract (20.1± ac), and access/utility ROW (1.8± ac)

Parkland Dedication: Per Silt Municipal Code 16.04.540, we are proposing a full and complete credit for private recreational facilities across the subdivision, in lieu of public dedication of parkland. Please find attached a “Rislende Parkland Dedication” document that outlines our position in detail. In that document, we calculate a parkland requirement of 2.91 acres. Our plan creates over 3.6 acres - 2.5 acres of active parkland and 1.2 acres of passive parkland.

Adjoining Land Uses and Zoning

To the north: I-70 and frontage road

To the east: BLM regional offices and Colorado River

To the south: Colorado River, Silt Municipal Park, and Garfield County unincorporated land owned by Frei Family Limited Partnership and used for gravel extraction

To the west: County Road 311, a 2.41 acre city-owned parcel at the corner of CR311 and River Frontage Road (currently vacant, zoned commercial), and a Holiday Inn Express & Suites on a 5.81 acre riverfront parcel.

Estimate of Proposed Residential Units

The multi-family residential zone provides a maximum density of 20 units per acre, or 72 units in total (approximately 180 residents).

The lodging / single-family residential zones provide a maximum density of 4 units per acre, or approximately 16 units in total (approximately 56 residents). The commercial/residential mixed use zone provides a maximum number of 72 units across the parcel (approximately 180 residents).
When fully developed, using these planning guidelines, Rislende would support a total of approximately 160 units and 416 residents (across multi- and single-family residences).

**Estimate of Population on Commercial Areas**

The commercial/residential mixed use zones prescribe a minimum lot size of 12,500 sf and a maximum building size of 30,000 sf. Detailed commercial design will be provided for approval during the site plan reviews for those zones as they are developed.

**Overview of Water and Sewer Plans**

*Domestic water* will be provided by the Town of Silt via a public water system. Connection to this system has been anticipated since 2007 when the original development was submitted and the BLM parcel was developed. The water and sewer main lines were installed along the I-70 Frontage Road in 2004-2005 as an extension to the Coal Ridge High School. Water will be connected into the frontage road 10” waterline and will have an internal 8” C900 waterline loop installed. This loop will go from the 10” main line along the Frontage Road into the property to provide services and fire hydrants and return to the main line. An additional connection may occur across CR311 to the west if an additional loop is required. It is expected that this development will have similar EQR usage as the 2013 proposal but is being evaluated to verify.

*Irrigation water:* A well currently exists on the property and is expected to be capped and abandoned. A new well will replace it and will function as the source of irrigation for the proposed development. The well to be constructed is included in Silt’s augmentation plan and is denoted as Silt Well No. 2. All lots will have irrigation line extensions and all landscaping will be irrigated via these lines. (Exception: Tract 1 proposes irrigation with municipal water.)

*Wastewater disposal:* The property currently has an existing sewer main located along the southern side of the I-70 Frontage Road. A 15” main and manholes approximately every 500’ run the east-west length of the property. The northeastern Tracts 1 and 2 will be able to gravity flow into this main with the addition of a service line to each property. Tracts 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 will be serviced from a line extension located adjacent to CR 311 at the access road to the Holiday Inn. This line has been sized to accommodate this development and a connection point has be provided near this access point. The line extension will require a deep cut or bore under the County Road. The line will then be extended into the development along an established utility corridor to serve Tracts 3-7.

*Other utilities:* In 2007 the parcel was split and the BLM building was built on a separate parcel. The BLM addition, along with the Coal Ridge High School, prepared the Frontage Road corridor along the property with all of the necessary access to utilities – including gas, electric, fiber optic, and cable.
Water Rights Dedication

The parcel’s water rights dedication, including the conveyance to the town of four shares of Grand River Ditch Company, was executed as part of the annexation development agreement in 2007.

Proposed municipal water usage: EQR calculations will be provided during site plan review(s) for specific projects as they are developed. Early estimates indicate that when fully developed, the parcel is unlikely to exceed the 213 EQR credits provided to the parcel as part of the annexation agreement.

Proposed non-potable water irrigation: Silt Well #2, on the property near the old homestead foundation and near where The Beacon is planned, shall be our legal and physical source of supply, as proposed by the Town of Silt (Case Number 07CW219), with a credit allowing 4.6 acres of irrigation annually.

Evidence of Legal Access

The parcel is adjacent to an I-70 frontage road, owned by CDOT, which provides legal access per the town’s standards.

Statement of Geologic Characteristics

Please find attached a Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Study and Geologic Site Assessment for the subject parcel, dated May 30, 2008 and prepared for Stillwater Commercial LLC.

Overview of Planned Development Phasing

As a guide, our current high-level plan† is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building / District Development</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Years 5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract 3 ‘The Beacon’ Gathering Spot</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 1 Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 6 ‘Rislende Place’ Events Center</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracts 2,3,4 Commercial/Residential Mixed-Use*</td>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracts 5,7 Single-Family Residential*</td>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Current plan, subject to change
*To be evaluated, planned, and built in phases
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I. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to address the roadway, waste water disposal, utilities, storm water drainage, public services for the proposed residential, commercial and recreational modifications of the 9 (nine) tracts for the property located at 54311 County Road, Silt, Colorado, 81652.

II. Location

The proposed Rislened PUD property is a 9-tract commercial development located in the Town of Silt, Garfield County, Colorado. The northern property boundary is adjacent to the I-70 Frontage Road and the Colorado River Valley BLM office. The western boundary is adjacent to County Road 311, and the southern and eastern boundary is bordered by the Colorado River. The Rislened PUD Commercial Property is approximately 51.2-acres and is located in Sections 10 and 11, Township 6 South, Range 92 West of the Sixth Principal Meridian. The Colorado River flows southwesterly adjacent to the property and around an island contained within the property boundary along the south side. Figure 1 shows the parcel in red with the surrounding property boundaries shown in lighter red. The plat of the parcel is filed at the Garfield County Clerk and Recorder’s Office, and shown in Figure 1. The Parcel number is 217911200007. See Figure 1 and Figure 2 for Vicinity Map and Survey of Parcel.

![Figure 1: Vicinity Map (Subject Parcel Shown in Red)](image-url)
III. Access

- Access to the parcel is provided via five (5) access entrances directly from County Road 311 and I-70 Frontage Road (aka River Frontage Road). Access 1 entrance is approximately 200-feet south from the intersection of County Road 311 and River Frontage Road. This drive would access Tract 4 from County Road 311. Access 2, also providing access to Tract 4, is located approximately 550-feet east, along Frontage Road from the intersection of County Road 311 and the Frontage Road. Access 3 entrance is approximately 1020 feet east along River Frontage Road from the intersection of County Road 311 and River Frontage Road and provides access to Tracts 2, 3, and 5. This location provides a primary access to the property and terminates in a cul-de-sac for turnaround access. The road will provide access to Tracts 2, 3, 5 and possibly 6 if joint access uses are developed on the tracts. The remaining two access points are located approximately 1,650’ and 2,240’ east of the County Road 311 and Frontage Road intersection. This access is proposed to be a loop access and will provide access for Tracts 1, 6 and 7 (see Figure 3 for locations). These access points are similar to the access points approved with the 2007 submittal. These locations will provide fire access and turnaround for all of the tracts, with the exception of Tract 4, which will have to provide adequate turnaround on site or connect the two access locations on that Tract. Tracts 8 and 9 are recreation Tracts and access will be from within other areas of the development.
IV. Water Supply

Water for domestic use, will be provided by the Town of Silt via a public water system. Connection to this system for this parcel has been anticipated since 2007, when the original development was submitted and the BLM parcel was the only lot developed. The water and sewer main lines were installed along the I-70 frontage road in 2004 - 2005 as an extension to the Coal Ridge High School. Water will be connected into the frontage road existing 10" waterline and have an internal 8" C900 waterline loop installed. This loop will go from the 10" mainline in the Frontage Road, into the property to provide services and fire hydrants, and back out to the mainline further down the road. An additional connection may also occur across County Road 311 to the west near the road to the Holiday Inn Suites. This loop will only occur if an additional loop is required beyond the frontage road. It is expected that this development will have similar "EQR"s (equivalent residential units) usage, but will be evaluated to verify that the development will be at or under the original EQRs that were previously evaluated in 2007. See Sketch Plan map for described layout.

A well currently exists on the property and is expected to be abandoned. A new well is planned to replace this well and will function as the source of irrigation for the proposed development. This well that is to be constructed, is included in a Town of Silt augmentation plan and is denoted as Silt Well No. 2. Details regarding the well and augmentation are included in the Appendix. All lots will have an irrigation line extended to each property line and all landscaping is proposed to be irrigated via the newly installed irrigation line. See Sketch Plan map for layout.

V. Wastewater Disposal

The property currently has existing sewer main infrastructure located on the northerly side of the property along the Highway 70 frontage road. A 15" main and manholes approximately every 500’ run the entire length of the property. The northeasterly properties Tracts 1 and 2 will be able to gravity flow into this main with the addition of a service line to each property. Tracts 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 will be serviced from a line extension located adjacent to County Road 311 at the access road into the Holiday
Inn Suites. This line has been sized to accommodate the development and a connection point has been provided near this access point. The line extension will require a deep cut or bore through the county road. This line will then be extended into the development along an established utility corridor to serve the previously identified tracts.

The lift station near the Holiday Inn Suites for that area and the proposed area will be evaluated for capacity and determination of any required modifications. HCE will work with the town engineer to determine sizing the amount of flow that can be handled before an upgrade to the lift station will be required. It is our understanding that this was anticipated in 2007 and an upgrade or new lift station was anticipated.

VI. Other Utilities

In 2007 the parcel was split and the BLM building was constructed on a separated eastern parcel. The BLM addition along with the construction of the Coal Ridge High School in 2005 prepared the frontage road corridor along this property with all of the necessary utilities to extend into this development. The corridor includes, gas, overhead electric, fiber optic telecommunications, and cable. Services include Xcel Energy for gas and electric service, CenturyLink for telephone and network, and Comcast for cable.

VII. Storm Water Drainage/Floodplain

The subject property is identified as being 51-acres in size according to county records and the exemption plat (Figure 3). HCE has previously prepared a CLOMR on the property through FEMA. The CLOMR was prepared to delineate the fill area of the property that was previously, and now currently proposed, to be modified to raise grade on the property above the current floodplain elevations. FEMA has indicated that since the floodplain mapping has not changed since the CLOMR application that the CLOMR is still active and can proceed to completion without submitting a new CLOMR application.

The proposed development is shown on FEMA’s FIRM map for the Town of Silt, Community Number 080205, Panel Number 1092C, and effective date of August 2, 2006. On the effective FIRM, the Colorado River was studied by detailed methods downstream of the County Road 311 crossing (Section G-#512.1). The proposed development is in Zone A and Zone X. Zone A is special flood hazard areas subject to inundation by the 1% annual chance flood with no base flood elevations determined (100-year storm event). Zone X is areas outside the special flood hazard areas. See Figure 4 – Existing FIRM Map.

The soil types, as designated by the Natural Resources Conservation Services are Kim loam, 3 to 6% slopes (#40), Potts loam, 6 to 12% slopes (#56), Torrifluvents, nearly level (#65) and Wann sandy loam, 1 to 3% slopes. The Hydrologic Soil Group for Kim loam, Potts loam, and Wann sandy loam are type 'B' – soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. The soils in the map unit Torrifluvents, which are located along the lower bench of the Colorado River, are classified as hydrologic group 'D' – soils having a very slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet.
The proposed Rislende PUD commercial development consists of overlot grading operations, installation of utilities, roads and drainage facilities. The building pad sites will be filled to elevate them above the proposed base flood elevation. The fill placed will need to be armored with riprap to protect the stream bank from erosion.

The majority of the site sheet flows from north to south towards the Colorado River. Two proposed onsite
Figure 7 – Proposed Floodplain Per CLOMR
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