## TOWN OF SILT
### PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION AGENDA
TUESDAY, April 4, 2023 6:30 P.M.
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
HYBRID MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED TIME</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>PUBLIC HEARING/ ACTION</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC LOCATION AND PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tab A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 5 min</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Williams</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 5 min</td>
<td>Public Comments - Each speaker will limit comments to no more than three (3) minutes, with a total time of 30 minutes allotted to public comments, pursuant to Section 2.28.020 of the Silt Municipal Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40 5 min</td>
<td>Consent agenda –</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Tab B Chair Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Minutes of the March 7, 2023 Planning &amp; Zoning Commission meeting</td>
<td></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 40 min</td>
<td>Silt Jumbo Storage – 510 W. Main St. Site Plan Review</td>
<td>Action Item Public Hearing</td>
<td>Tab C Planner Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 60 min</td>
<td>Rislende Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>Action Item Public Hearing</td>
<td>Tab D Planner Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25 5 min</td>
<td>Planners Report</td>
<td>Verbal Update</td>
<td>Planner Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 5 min</td>
<td>Commissioner Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</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, May 2nd 2023, 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, March 1, 2023. Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

Roll call

Chair Lindsey Williams
Vice-Chair Joelle Dorsey, arrived virtually after roll call at 6:35 PM
Commissioner Eddie Aragon
Commissioner Robert Doty
Commissioner Michael Bertaux
Commissioner Charlienna Chancey
Commissioner Jennifer Stepisnik, arrived after roll call at 6:55pm

Also present were Planner Mark Chain, Community Development Manager Nicole Centeno.

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Comments –

Angelo ll Centofante of 1819 Fawn Court asked to speak. He told the commission that he received a public hearing notice regarding a fence to be located along Highway 6 and 24. He said he was wondering why he got a notice for this fence application and did he not get a notice for the construction of the building. He thought the building was out of scale and he had lived in the area for many years, and this is going to disturb his view. Planner Chain indicated that he understood the concerns and wanted to inform the speaker that the public hearing notice requirements had been changed. From now on, he stated a plan review application will be noticed to all property owners within 200 feet.

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of the February 7, 2023 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Dorsey made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 7 meeting with the correction of the date as necessary. Commissioner Bertaux seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously

Conflicts of Interest – There were no conflicts of interest.

Agenda Changes – There were no agenda changes.
Sign Exemption – Family Dollar

Community Development Manager Centeno introduce the project. Staff indicated that Dave Randolph and Scott Kipnis representing the applicant (United Sign Systems) were virtually present. She noted that the property address was 1007 Main Street and this has been changed from a county address because of its located session in the middle of Silt’s Downtown. She told the Commission that they looked at this before, with the previous sign exception. Just like their first application, United Signs is proposing dual branded signage on the east end of the building for Family Dollar/Dollar Tree. She indicated that staff had no problems with the application, that the size of the signage was comparable to the other stores in that vicinity. She also indicated that the signs will be turned off 30 minutes after the store closes. She went through other items in the application and recommended approval with the conditions listed. The applicant asked if there were any questions related to the application.

Planning Chair Williams indicated that the sign appeared bigger than she was aware of from the previous exemption. She was a bit concerned as the signs faced residential properties and that it was a “big push”. Commissioner Doty noted that the signage in the front of the building was okay and perhaps this was easy to remedy. Perhaps it could be bought down a little in height and he said that the illumination did not appear to be too much. He thought was adequate for what it is.

Commissioner Bertaux said perhaps this signage should be made the same size as the previous signage on the other side of the building. Dave said that they could do this. Scott asked to address the Commission. He said that because the amount of space available and given the size of the building, that this was a reasonable sign proposal. Commissioner Aragon says that he had no comments regarding the size, but he did have a concern on the illumination. Chair Williams noted that the proportions could be modified slightly and that would make it a better proposal. There was some discussion on the dimensions of the sign etc. Dave thought that perhaps it was best to split the difference. After further calculations, Dave said the signs on the front and back were the exact same size, however, on the front, they are stacked and on the back they are not.

Commissioner Bertaux made a motion to approve the dual branding sign with the conditions listed but with adding a condition # 7 which would state: “the sign exception is approved but will be the same size and height and width as previously approved on the front (west) side of the building. Second by Commissioner Dorsey.

Chair Williams said she needed to open the public hearing before moving forward.

The public hearing was opened at 6:56 PM. There was no comment. The public hearing was closed at 6:57.

Commissioner Bertaux made the identical motion. Second by Commissioner Dorsey: the motion passed by a vote of 4 to 1. Voting “no” was Commissioner Doty.

Conditions below for the record

1. That the illuminated signs are automatically turned off at store closing each night, in order to best accommodate the surrounding residential properties.

2. If there is an increase in the illumination or change to the current proposal, the applicant
will be required to apply for a new sign exception.

3. All representations of the applicant made in writing, application materials and verbally at the Planning Commission meetings or that are reflected in the meeting minutes are considered to be part of the application and are binding on the applicant.

4. Applicant will provide any additional requested documents and pay any remaining fees, prior to installation and recordation of the sign exception.

5. Community Development will need to issue a permit before installation of signs can occur. The Town will also need to inspect the signs, prior to the permit being approved to close out.

6. Any additional signs will require a permit and sign exception, if necessary.

7. That the dual branding signs on the east side of the building will be the same size and height as those approved on the front, AKA the west side, of the building.

______________

Bunchman Fence Variance

Commissioner Centeno introduced the project. She indicated that the owner, C T Western, received the site plan approval for a building in the Silt Trade center at 1828 Silver Spur in order to construct residential units on the second level. She indicated that the owner suggested it would be good to have privacy. She said the applicant, Mark Bunchman (Present virtually) indicated he wanted a higher fence due to the visibility of the project related to the lower grade adjacent to Highway 6 and 24. Manager Centeno said that there is not good guidance for this matter in the PUD and the height of the fence is not mentioned, outside of screening storage. She indicated that she thought the 6-foot fence, as requested, should be acceptable. She had noticed that across the street there were 6-foot-high fences along Highway 6 and 24 as well as along other nearby streets.

Staff recommended approval and noted that the application met the criteria in section 15.06 of the Silt Municipal Code. Centeno also went over her other conditions of approval including the fact that no construction should be placed within the easement, unless determined by staff that it's appropriate, based on utility placement. She read the conditions for the record.

Commissioner Bertaux noted that there was a bus stop nearby. He noted that there may be families renting there and he would like some separation from the street. Commissioner Aragon asked how far away the fence would be from the road. Mr. Bunchman then stated that it was about 10 feet off of the right-of-way. Chair Lindsay open the public hearing at 7:07 PM. There were no requests to speak. The public hearing was closed at 7:08 PM.

There were some comments on the motion. Commissioner Doty had some questions on the commercial zoning and whether this is employee housing. There were some discussions on parking, setbacks etc.

Commissioner Aragon made a motion to approve Bunchman Fence Variance requests with staff recommendations. Second by Commissioner Mike; The motion passed by a vote of 4 to 1. Voting No was Commissioner Doty.
**Conditions noted below for the record**

1. That the proposed fence meets all applicable criteria in the Silt Municipal Code Chapter 15.06.

2. That the proposed fence be located entirely on the applicant’s property; but not installed in designated/recorded easements, unless approved by staff.

3. That the fence exception is limited to the exact request as depicted in the applicant’s submitted photograph/site plan.

4. That all representations of the applicant made in writing, application materials and verbally at the Planning Commission meeting or that are reflected in the meeting minutes are considered to be part of the application and are binding on the applicant.

5. That applicant will provide any additional requested documents and pay any remaining fees, prior to installation and inspection of the approved fence.

6. That this approval is not for construction, but rather the exception of the height and location. Community Development will need to issue a permit before the installation of fence can occur.

7. That all future fencing proposals will require a permit and fence exception, if required.

____________________________

**Request to continue public hearing for Site Plan Review for Silt Jumbo Storage.**

Planner Chain said that this was an agenda item originally placed on this agenda for a review of a project at 510 W. Main St. He told the commission that there was a glitch in sending out the notices because of schedule related to President's Day. He asked the Commission to continue the Public Hearing until the April 4 Planning Commission meeting. Motion by Commissioner Dorsey to continue the public hearing and discussion to April 4. Second by Commissioner Aragon; the motion passed unanimously.

____________________________

**Planners Report**

Planner Chain provided this input. He wanted to tell the commission that the Preliminary Subdivision Plat for the Rislende project had been submitted and it would be reviewed at the April 4 meeting. He also reiterated the Silt Jumbo storage project would also be on that agenda for review.

Manager Centeno noted that some code items would be coming forward in the near future; the first batch would be to update Title 15 – regarding building code. Centeno also noted that the joint session between the Board and Commission is scheduled for March 27. Finally, Chain mentioned that at that meeting the commission also may see a potential development plan outlined for an introductory review by the Board for the 15 acres next to the Holiday Inn. He said that this was a mixed-use project was some residential by the river.
Commissioner Comment

Commissioner Jody had a few comments to make about the fence variance previously discussed.

There was a question about the name of the upcoming storage project – what is the “Jumbo” term and what exactly does it mean. Chain said that’s what the applicant is calling it. He noted that the square footage for the project was somewhere in the mid 60,000 ft.²’s.

Commissioner Dorsey had some questions on the status of the storage at River Run. Manager Centeno noted that it was getting ready for issuance of building permit. She also said that there was a question and that it may be phased approval because the office and residential unit were undergoing some design changes.

Chair Williams said that the February 27 work session, where there is an extended discussion on the Water Treatment Plant was very interesting and she suggested commissioners watch that session if it was available online.

Adjournment

Commissioner Bertaux made a motion to adjourn. Second by Doty; meeting adjourned at 7:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Approved by the Planning Commission

Mark Chain  
Planner  

Lindsey Williams  
Chair
**Town of Silt Planning Commission Meeting**  
April 4, 2023  6:30 PM  
**Silt Jumbo Storage – Site Plan Review**  
Planners report  

3/29/2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Silt Jumbo Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Owner</td>
<td>510 W. Main Storage LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>852 Handy Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbondale, CO 81623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>970.355.4080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Representative/Land Planner</td>
<td>None Designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Crystal River Civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1101 Village Road, Unit UL-3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbondale, CO 81623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>970.510.5312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Attorney</td>
<td>None Designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>Pinon Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>700 Redstone Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbondale, CO 81623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Engineer</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>510 West Main St, Silt, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>B-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North &amp; West – Unincorporated Garfield County,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South – B-3 (north of Main St.) East – Residential PUD and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>11 self storage buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 65,00 SF +/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Parcel Subject to application</td>
<td>7.22 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Vacant – formerly rented to Landscape Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Service and Commercial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel &amp; Reception Numbers</td>
<td>2179-091-00-036 and 2179-091-00-035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Lots A &amp; B- Amended Plat of Parcel No.1 of the Terrel Annexation No.1 - according to the plat recorded as Reception # 462364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Description of Request

Applicant is proposing to build a Self Storage Facility at the east end of town. Proposal is for 11 storage buildings and slightly over 60,000 ft.² of self storage. The subject property to be developed is tucked back and behind a property which has existing self-storage. The applicant shares an access right now with another property and this access will be upgraded with an asphalt driveway. The circulation around the proposed development is to have concrete driving in circulation area. The property is to have remote key access so there will be no office facility on site. The storage units will be one story in height. The tallest building will be approximately 18 feet in height. Elevations from Pella Building Systems Inc. is included in attachment E of the application.

II. Recent Project History

The property was annexed in either 1992 or 1994. I believe it came into town when the Terrel Subdivision was originally planned (to the east of the subject site) and annexed. This property may have been the original ranch house for this property when it was in agricultural use.

There has been no recent land-use entitlement since the mid-1990s. I am only aware that the property was recently used by a landscape contractor for that business use as well as some related storage for the contracting business.

III. Silt Comprehensive Plan

The property is designated as Service and Commercial Support according to the Comprehensive Plan. It would appear that the proposed development complies with the Comprehensive Plan.

Please note that Self Storage is an allowed use in the B – 3 Zone District. However, the property is subject to Site Plan Review.

IV. Property

The property is located at the east end of Main Street on the north side. It helps form the west boundary of the Towns municipal city limits. Information on adjacent land uses are already provided. Please note that the eastern boundary borders a residential subdivision in the town as well as a town park.

The property shares access with the storage unit facility to the south. A traffic report has been provided.

The property is perched on a shelf higher than the elevation of Main Street. The property is bordered on the north and northwest by the Cactus Valley Ditch. As a matter fact, the property extends a little bit beyond the ditch at one point. Nothing is proposed near the ditch or this “island” at the present time.

Once on the developable portion of the property, it is generally flat. Flat areas vary from 2% to 10% slopes. The property falls away on the east side very steeply, with spot slope elevations approaching 50%. Outside of the slope issues along these boundary, the property slopes from northwest to southeast.
V. **Applicable Municipal Code Sections.**

The Site Plan Review process is outlined in Chapter 17.42 of the Silt Municipal Code. I am listing applicable code sections below. As you know, the Planning Commission is the decision-making body for the Site Plan Review process. Appeals of the Commission’s decision or individual conditions of approval go to the Board of Trustee’s.

The Commission is charged with approving the application as presented, approving with conditions, nine the application or continuing the hearing until a date certain. Assuming some type of approval, I will bring you a Resolution of Approval at the May meeting.

I met with the applicant and the project engineer in early November 2023. I was actually quite surprised that there was such a large parcel just off of Main Street with B-3 Zoning. The property is generally hidden from Main Street. In our pre-application meeting we went over a number of items and I directed the applicant to have a good engineering plan, make sure that they dealt with access and contacted CDOT related to whether a new Access permit was required. I instructed them to pay special attention to drainage and to make sure they had a professionally done landscape plan. I encouraged extensive buffering on the east side of the project. I did not direct that a landscape plan or buffering for the project should occur on the north, northwest or the west boundaries of the project. Technically, perhaps that should have been done. I do not expect these uses on the adjoining properties to change in the near future. If you feel differently about this, please asked that the landscaping and buffering plan B enhance the north, northwest and west property boundaries.

**Relevant Code Sections:**

17.42.060 - Uses requiring a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review in all commercial districts
17.42.100 Intent of Landscape Design Guidelines
17.42.120 Site Plan and Design Standards
17.42.130 Grading
17.42.140 Public Rights-of-way
17.42.150 Perimeter Landscaping
17.42.170 Landscaping Installation
17.42.190 Off – Street Parking Requirements

VI. **Review Agency Comments**

**Town Engineer** — The Town Engineer have provided comments and notes on many of the engineering sheets contained in the application. They have been provided directly to the project planner and project civil engineer. They mostly revolve around a number of technical details. I will summarize them in the following section of the report. The project engineer will have to update the engineering report to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney before moving on to building permit.
**Town Attorney** – No comments at this time.

**Public works** – No comments at this time.

**CDOT** - we have asked the applicant/applicants engineered to provide a copy of the Original Access Permit.

**Fire District** – The applicant has been working with the Fire District on site plan, access, and fire protection issues. I will be confirming prior to the public hearing that all his comments have been followed up upon and that he is satisfied with the present plan.

**VII. Site Plan Issues**

**Access**

**Planners comment:** Acceptable. Applicant should provide original CDOT Access Permit for letter from CDOT access coordinator to demonstrate project could move forward as proposed.

**Landscaping**

**Planners comment:** My initial review indicates that the landscaping plan is acceptable. I have a call into the project Landscape Architect but he is away on vacation and we will be having a telephone conference on Monday. It appears that the species are appropriate for the area but they do not all sync 1:1 with town prescribed street trees. Also, I have questions on the reblooming lilac shrubs which are being used to help screen the east side of the storage buildings. They may be acceptable but I need to investigate this a little further. My initial thought that perhaps a year-round Evergreen would be a better choice. I will report to you at the meeting on this item.

**Drainage Plan**

**Planners comment:** there were number of minor modifications that the town engineer is requiring. Some of the items are:

- roof drains presently go outside of the drainage basin. Add roof gutters/downspouts that discharge into basin and get taken to the detention pond.
- Update drainage plan so that if there is overtopping of the storage pond in an extreme event, there will be no overtopping onto Highway or backflow into drainage pond.
- Check culvert under Highway 6 and make sure it daylights to the other side.
- Of concern regarding trend settlement. Applicant should avoid use of screened rock and that all pipes in Class 6 base course.
- Install manhole cleanouts wherever there is a major bend and storm sewer

**Other technical items**

- provide bollards at corner of buildings to prevent damages structures.
- There are some long hose runs to certain areas from the propose hydrant locations. Make sure is acceptable to Grand River Fire.
**Miscellaneous Site plan Review Comments:** the architecture and building height seems to be appropriate for the location. The drainage from the site seems to be isolated from either the Cactus Valley ditch or drainage that occurs along the west side of the adjacent subdivision. I would not think this commercial/light industrial use would appear to adversely affect the Terrel subdivision residential uses (see photos with landscape plan)’s.

**VIII. Planner Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the silt Jumbo Storage Project with the following conditions.

1. All representations of the applicant made in writing, application materials and verbally at the Planning Commission meeting or that are reflected in the meeting minutes are considered part of the application and are binding on the applicant.
2. The applicant shall work in good faith with the town engineer to resolve issues identified in the review redlines to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer and Staff prior to submittal of a building permit and the construction of any site improvements on the property.
3. All exterior lighting in the project shall conform to the Town of Silt lighting standards.
4. That the applicant provide either a copy of the original Access Permit or a letter from CDOT access coordinator showing that access is acceptable.
5. That the landscaping plan be acceptable to the Town Planner. (Note: If there are any other related issues that come up in the discussion with the landscape architect they will be bought to the Planning Commission at the meeting on April 4).
6. That sample lease documents be shown to the town the confirm that no outside storage will occur or that hazard ways than the two reels will not be stored within the rented units.
7. That all land-use related fees and other items with Town Consultants be paid prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
8. That planning Staff bring a Resolution of Approval to the May Planning Commission meeting for review and execution.

**IX. Recommended Motion:**

Motion to approve the Silt Jumbo Storage Site Plan Review with the staff recommended conditions. (Any modifications or additional conditions made by the Planning Commission should be added to this motion).
510 W Main Street (Lots A And B)
Silt, Colorado 81652

**Graph Notes:**
- The design is based on the best available information. This includes but is not limited to site conditions, features, structures, and topographical information. Crystal River Civil is assuming no responsibility for the accuracy of site information.
- If any discrepancies or inaccurate information is found within Crystal River Civil's drawings, the affected work should be temporarily put on hold. Contact CRY to verify a situation and hold all work until the necessary alterations have been made.
- All work must be completed in accordance with the approved documents, site information, and specifications. Use of materials that are not CDOT and/or ASTM Standards must be approved by Crystal River Civil, the landscape architect, the owner, and any stakeholders.

**Construction Notes:**
- It is the responsibility of the contractor to notify the utility providers of any changes made to the site. If changes are not approved and approved, Crystal River Civil must verify the alterations prior to receiving approval of completion.
- The contractor is responsible for the accuracy of site information and shall be held accountable for any discrepancies.
- All materials requiring compaction must meet CDOT and/or ASTM Standards.

**Utilities:**
- All materials must comply with both local and state regulations.
- Stormwater Management:
  - All materials must comply with local stormwater management requirements.
  - All materials must comply with local stormwater management requirements.
  - All materials must comply with local stormwater management requirements.

**General Notes:**
- All work must be completed in a manner that ensures the safety of the public and the contractor.
- All work must be completed in a manner that ensures the safety of the public and the contractor.
- All work must be completed in a manner that ensures the safety of the public and the contractor.

**Conclusion:**
- The contractor is responsible for the removal of all materials and fees from construction. Water materials must not exceed the requirements for permit by source handling in the project and must be approved by the owner.
- All materials reporting per contract must meet CDOT and/or ASTM Standards.
- If traffic issues are created for the project, it is the responsibility of the contractor to obtain and implement all proper traffic plans and procedures.
- If traffic issues are created for the project, it is the responsibility of the contractor to obtain and implement all proper traffic plans and procedures.
**Name of Project** | Rislende – PUD Zoning and Subdivision Sketch Plan  
---|---  
**Applicant** | August Group LLC, DBA Rislende  
Mitchell Weimer, Cole Buerger  
121 Polo Rd.  
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601  
202.215.1576  
**Owner** | Silt 70 LLC  
10106 W San Juna Way, Ste 205  
Littleton, CO 80127  
**Owner Representative/ Land Planner** | The Land Studio, Inc.  
Doug & Julie Pratte  
365 River Bend Way  
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601  
970.927.3690  
**Civil Engineer** | High Country Engineering  
1517 Lake Avenue, Suite 101  
Carbondale, CO 81623  
970.945.8676  
**Project Attorney** | Balcomb and Green  
Chad Lee, Esq.  
818 Colorado Avenue  
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601  
970.945.6546  
**Project Architect** | Red House Architecture  
Bruce Barth  
**Water Engineer** | NA  
**Property Location** | West of BLM regional office  
South of I 70  
East of County Road 311 (Divide Creek Road)  
**Existing Zoning** | PUD  
**Surrounding Land Uses** | **West** – commercial (Holiday Inn)– Light Industrial, **North** – I-70, **South** – River and agate/rural uses  
**East** – Government Offices  
**Surrounding Zoning** | **North** – RZ, **East** – Unincorporated Garfield County,  
**South** – Unincorporated Garfield County, **West** – Commercial PUD
I. Major Subdivision preliminary Plan/plat

Before you tonight is a public hearing for the Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan for the Rislende PUD. Relevant code sections are Sections 16.04.090 through 16.04.190 of the Silt Municipal Code. This is a subdivision action, and the great majority of relevant regulatory information is contained in Title 16 – subdivision regulations. The charge before the Planning Commission on Tuesday evening is to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. That recommendation can be for approval, approval with conditions, denial or to continue the public hearing to a date certain. The Board of Trustees is the final decision-making body for the Preliminary Plan/plat.

A layman’s explanation of the Preliminary plan/plat stage is to provide the necessary information to staff, the commission and the board that shows that all potential planning or engineering details are taken care of and that the property is suitable for final subdivision. Specifically, the purpose as outlined in Section 16.04.090 which is included below:

16.04.090 Major subdivision preliminary plan/plat—Purpose.

The purpose of the major subdivision preliminary plan and preliminary plat is to provide the necessary information to permit the town staff, the commission, the board and the public to properly review the proposal and to resolve potential planning or engineering details that may arise before the major subdivision final plan and final plat are prepared. The major subdivision preliminary plan and preliminary plat therefore require extensive information and engineering studies.

In the case of Rislende, the preliminary plan/plat is essentially an infrastructure exercise. The Town previously reviewed a lot of the technical, zoning and engineering related information as part of the approval of the PUD Zoning and the Subdivision Sketch Plan. In essence, the Town is now examining the main loop road that goes through the property as well as sizing of various utilities stub outs to the individual parcels with the exception of Parcel 4. Grading and drainage details as well as road sections etc. are also considered. The heavy lifting of a site-specific plan will actually be done when there is a Site Plan review for the individual parcels. As I understand it, assuming approval of the Preliminary plan/plat; the applicant will be coming to the Town for a Final Plat approval of the entire project plus a site plan review for Parcel 1 – the multifamily housing project which will be adjacent to the BLM headquarters.

II. The Property
The subject property is slightly more than 51 acres in size and is a remnants of the old Stillwater Project. The Town approved the PUD zoning of the property with the adoption of Ordinance 13 – series of 2022. The town also approved the Second Amended and Restated To annexation and Development Agreement by adoption of Ordinance 16 – series of 2022. Both of these documents have been recorded and they are included in the application packet as Exhibit D.

To refresh your memory, I am reinserting into the staff report the proposed development Schedule proposed by the applicant as well as a quick summary of some of the features of the PUD zoning.

**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>

**Quick Summary Bullet Point Information**

Below is a quick summary of some of the zoning and development details.

**Maximum Residential Development Potential.** This also appeared acceptable. The potential was:

- 160 total residential units
- 72 at northeast corner by BLM – 50 right now are proposed to be tax supported rental units
- 16 single-family units in central portion of the project.
- 72 residential units as part of mixed-use buildings along frontage Road.

**Maximum nonresidential potential**

- Events Center district - 20,000 ft.² per acre
- Maximum lot coverage at 70% in both Event Center and mixed-use districts (same as in town code – consists of land under building footprint, not total impervious surface which would include parking).
- Maximum building size and mixed-use district – 30,000 ft.².

**Building Height.**

- 25 feet in lodging district.
- Event’s center District commercial/residential mixed-use – 40 feet.
- 35 feet in multifamily residential district

**Landscaping.**
• 18%; minimum landscaped area as a percentage of total disturbed lot area.

Open space and Parkland

• 25% in open space and/or Parkland of total project acreage
• Parkland dedication according to proposing credit for private recreational facilities across the subdivision in lieu of public dedication. Allowed by Section 16.04.540 (specifcs will need to be worked out by agreement). 3.6 acres proposed – 2.5 of active/1.2 of passive Parkland.

III. Relevant Sections of Municipal Code

The subdivision process is contained in Title 16 – Subdivisions of the Silt Municipal Code. Relevant sections of the review for the elementary plan for major subdivisions are in section 16.04.100 through 16.04.180.

As you can see, there is a lot of information in the application packet and this is where the majority of the technical details reside. Some of this information was vetted previously with the previous Stillwater application – especially some of the floodplain, water rights and water supply issues. And the general concept of interior circulation and the network of perimeter paths was examined at the time of Sketch Plan and PUD zoning. You’ll see a number of studies provided including

• preliminary geotechnical Study and Geologic Site Assessment
• Noxious Weed Analysis
• Civil engineering report
• Grading and drainage report
• Traffic Impact study
• and historical water use affidavit
• Wetland Delineation report
• Landscape Plan
• Outline of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions

IV. Large Scale Development Concept

Nothing has really changed related to this review when compared to what was reviewed and approved as part of the Sketch Plan. Primary access comes from the Frontage Road. There will end up being 3 access points along the frontage Road. Two of these access points will include right-hand deceleration lanes. No traffic signals are required. Main water and wastewater mains are located in the frontage Road (and they actually extend out to the high school). The main interior Road is a loop road called Rislende Loop. This road extends from the frontage Road and heads south between Tracts 3 and tract 2. It provides access also to Tract 5 Tract 6 and tract 7. The loop includes a north-south connection also between Tract 1 and Tract 2. Tract 1 is the 3.7 acre project which will include Multifamily residential and be part of the initial development site.

V. Technical Issues
Grading and Drainage

- Some culverts may need to be added to provide more “freeboard” and prevent potential overtopping.
- There is a location or two where drainage flows may exceed capacity of single curb inlet.
- Approval condition needs to be added to require individuals storm water management and pollution treatment for each individual tract upon development/site plan review.
- Stormwater Velocity’s in some cases indicate that bank erosion could occur in a few places. Scour protection should be provided.
- Town Engineer requires additional analysis to be completed and provided with Final Plat.
- FEMA should be asked to review and approve the berm between detention pond and the river as a flood control dike.

Miscellaneous and utility details

- When development occurs, all mains should be surveyed and located at top of pipe for the as built’s.
- There should be 4 foot separation between parallel irrigation storm and sanitary lines.
- Tract 5 may require greater diameter water line for lodging facility.
- Insulate sewer service lines under culverts to prevent freezing.
- Taper of deceleration lane inclusive of taper may be a bit short and should be reviewed.

VI. Compliance with other relevant code sections

Section 17.42.070 F.1 - public sidewalks

**Planner Comment:** Public sidewalks are required to be 6 foot wide on residential properties and 10 foot wide for commercial uses unless the town determines another width is more desirable. Applicant is showing 6 foot in width on one side of the loop road elements. This should be discussed. 6 foot width is probably required in the multifamily area. It is hard to make a final judgment for required width in some of the more mixed-use and commercial areas. **We should discuss this with the applicant at the public hearing.**

VII. Landscape plan

The landscape Plan is focused on the frontage Road. That would seem appropriate as there is a separate site plan review for each of the tracks as they get developed. The landscape plan as shown indicates 52 deciduous trees being planted along the frontage Road. The trees indicated are noted as suggested trees for the Town or are a closely related subspecies. The official Street in shrub tree list for the town is taken from Resolution 16 – Series of 2019.

VIII. Other comments

- With the Final Plat and first Site Plan Review detail covenants will need to be reviewed.
• I have not had time to check your review the streetlight details and their specific locational on the frontage road. They will have to be checked for any potential conflicts.

IX. Staff Findings

The Preliminary Plan/Plat submittal is consistent with the sketch plan approvals that were obtained in the fall of 2022. Applicant has made a complete application and town staff and appropriate review agencies for this time have reviewed the submittal.

X. Staff recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Rislende the PUD Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan/Plat with the following conditions.

1. Any representations in writing or made at public hearings in front of the Planning Commission or the Board of Trustee’s are considered conditions of approval.
2. That the applicant update all information as directed by the Town Engineer, were in good faith with the town engineer to resolve these issues and have these updates prepared for the submittal of the Final Plat.
3. That no development will occur until there is an approved Site Plan Review for each individual tract.
4. That a plat note or other Approval condition be added to require individuals storm water management and pollution treatment for each individual tract upon development/site plan review.
5. That the applicant provide sidewalk with as indicated in the per town standard in section 17.42.080 F (1) unless modified during the review process (note: 6 foot wide on both sides of public streets residential areas and 10 foot wide and commercial/mixed-use areas). Staff is open to discussion of this item at public hearing

Recommended Motion:

“I move to recommend that the Board of Trustee’s approve the Rislende they Preliminary Plat/Plan as presented with the conditions noted in the staff report (modifier add conditions if changed during the discussion).
Exhibit M
Landscape Plan
Exhibit E
Major Subdivision Preliminary Plat and Civil Engineering Plans
OWNER:  
SILT 70, LLC  
10106 WEST SAN JUAN WAY,  
SUITE 210  
LITTLETON, COLORADO 80127  
(303)973-3344

ENGINEER:  
HIGH COUNTRY ENGINEERING, INC.  
1517 BLAKE AVENUE, SUITE 101  
GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLORADO 81601  
(970)940-8876
A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN E1/2 OF SECTION 10 AND THE W1/2 OF SECTION 11 TOWNSHIP 6 SOUTH, RANGE 92 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN COUNTY OF GARFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO.

COUNTY OF GARFIELD, STATE OF COLORADO

PRELIMINARY PLAT
RISELENDE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

RISLENDE LOOP 0001
0002 RISLENDE LOOP
0004 RIVER FRONTAGE ROAD
0002 RIVER FRONTAGE ROAD
0001 RIVER FRONTAGE ROAD

XCEL ENERGY

D = DRAINAGE EASEMENT
U = UTILITY EASEMENT
T = TRAIL ACCESS EASEMENT

This property is subject to reservations, restrictions and covenants of record or in place and exceptions to title shown in the title controversy statement.

This property is subject to the master declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions for RISLENDE PUD as a condition of approval of this plat by the board of trustees of the town of SILT, and to meet the requirements of the SILT municipal ordinance, and to embrace the intent and effect thereof.

A parcel of land situated in E1/2 of section 10 and the w1/2 of section 11, township 6 south, range 92 west, of the 6th principal meridian, county of garfield, state of colorado.

This property is subject to, without limitation, the master declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions for RISLENDE P.U.D. as a condition of approval of this plat by the board of trustees of the town of SILT, and to meet the requirements of the SILT municipal ordinance, and to embrace the intent and effect thereof.

This property is subject to reservations, restrictions and covenants of record or in place and exceptions to title shown in the title controversy statement.

I, ___________, do hereby certify that I am a registered land surveyor licensed under the laws of Colorado professional land surveyor #23875.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL OF THE TOWN OF SILT, COLORADO

ATTEST: ___________
OVERALL SITE MAP
Rislende Planned Unit Development
Situated in Section 10 and 11, Township 6 South,
Range 92 West, of the 6TH Principal Meridian
Town of Silt, County of Garfield, State of Colorado.