

TOWN OF SILT
REGULAR PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
July 5, 2023 – 6:30 P.M.
HYBRID MEETING

The Silt Planning and Zoning Commission held their regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, July 5, 2023. Vice- Chair Dorsey called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Roll call

Present

Chair Lindsey Williams
Vice-Chair Joelle Dorsey
Commissioner Robert Doty
Commissioner Michael Bertaux
Commissioner Jennifer Stepisnik

Absent

Commissioner Charlienna Chancey
Commissioner Eddie Aragon

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Comments – There were no public comments.

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of the June 6, 2023 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Doty made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented. Commissioner Stepisnik seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

Conflicts of Interest – There were no conflicts of interest.

Agenda Changes – There were no agenda changes.

Possible Consolidation of lots 157 and 158, Silt Trade Center - Advisement

Planner Chain introduced this item. He said that this was not a public hearing but that the Town had been approached regarding the consolidation of 2 lots in the Silt Trade Center. He noted that there were a few reasons why he brought this to the Commission looking for advisement and direction and not having a full public hearing (Site Plan Review) immediately. The most important reason was that he had needed to do extensive research on the number of rezoning applications that had occurred related to the Silt Trade Center in the past. Specifically, he was

wondering if there were concerns in the past about lot sizes, whether lot consolidation had been mentioned, whether there was concern related to massing, physical infrastructure and other such items.

Chain gave historical background on the Trade Center and noted that the PUD amendment in 2008 was the current PUD ordinance/regulations in effect. He had gone through the archives and upon reading, he learned that the 2008 approval had been the six request for PUD rezoning; and not all have been approved. He noted that the PUD amendment in 2008 accomplished the following:

- rezoned a number of lots from B-1 to an underlying B-2 designation (B-2 being a bit more industrial than the underlying- B-1).
- Clarified that for a certain part of the Trade Center that 2 residential units could be built on each lot for a total of 36 residential units in that area. After that, a special use permit was required for additional residential usage.
- The amendment tried to make clear what architectural building guidelines were the most up-to-date of what governed future development.
- Clarified that a Parkland dedication fee was required for all residential units at time of building permit

Related to the past staff reports, he noted that many of the issues discussed in the 2008 PUD rezoning were procedural. One significant issue was how many owners were petitioning for the rezoning (initially there were not the 67% required by the STC documents. He also indicated that there was some opposition to the rezoning from B-1 to B-2 from a couple of the lot owners within the Trade Center as well as from the residential area across Highway 6. There was also discussion about storage, screening, landscaping, noise standards and building materials. Finally, grading and drainage issues were also a subject of discussion. Chain also related that sizes of the lots were not discussed in the past staff reports.

Chain said that one of the concerns he had was that the conceptual consolidation application requested that even though two lots were combined into one that the owner would like to continue to have the original number of dwelling units – that would be 4 dwelling units - that would be allowed if there were two separate lots and preserve the right to 4 units even if consolidation did occur. Chain thought that perhaps this could lead to massing concerns. It definitely would result in a zoning conflict since action by the applicant would make the reconfigured lot nonconforming if 4 dwelling units were still allowed to be constructed.

Chain indicated that he did not want to go into too much detail on the specifics of the technical parts of the application as this matter may be coming forward at the very next Planning Commission Meeting.

Jeff Johnson introduced himself as the project architect. He said his client currently has a business in Summit County and they are getting a considerable Amount of work in the Roaring Fork and Colorado River Valleys. He wishes to build a building on the 2 combined lots which in its entirety would include an adjacent building, a total of 3 rentable commercial spaces and 4 two-bedroom apartments above. Jeff said he was aware of the architectural guidelines associated with the PUD and he did not want to design plain, boxlike buildings. He said that the owner had a primary goal of wanting to maximize the housing element. He noted the issues were: lot line dissolution; verify how many residential units could be built combining the lots; and there could be a hardship if the construction of residential units was perhaps reduced.

There was some more general discussion and Jeff noted to the Commission that he was hoping for some guidance on the issue. Commissioner Doty thanked the applicant for his work and said he wanted to make a few comments. He said that the PUD allows 2 residences per lot as a use by right. He thought if lots were combined and the intent was still to build four units that it may create a conflict with zoning. He said he was not trying to squelch development possibilities but wanted to make sure that the correct zoning mechanism was maintained.

Chair Williams noted there were two items here: housing affordability and commercial potential. She said she did like the commercial development here.

There was some more discussion. It was noted that there would be a site plan review for any commercial development in this area whether there was a consolidation of lots or not. The general thought was that the underlying zoning requirement of two residential per lot was appropriate. Mr. Johnson thanked the commission for their comments and said he would discuss next steps with the owner.

Planning Update

Planner Chain updated the Planning Commission on the following items:

Autumn Ridge. Some utilities on the existing property were being adjusted so that they did not go through developable portions of the property and would be allocated to appropriate easements. The driveway entry into Lot 2 had a CDOT Access permit and was in the process of being constructed.

Camario. All documents have been recorded and installation of infrastructure was beginning.

Annexation on Home Street. Planner Chain noted that there would be a small annexation on the west side of town along Home Avenue. The property had been used for miscellaneous construction storage in the past and city services were available.

Village at Painted Pastures. Chain noted that a development agreement for Lot 3 had been recorded and that there was a request to extend the site plan review approval for Lot 1.

River Run. It was also noted that there were some issues with the masonry wall height at the storage area for River Run. Staff did not know what direction the issue would be taking in the near future. Chain also told the commission that code enforcement was being included in the 2023 budget.

Commissioner Comment

Commissioner Doty said he thought that the lot consolidation issue was interesting. He also thought it was good to see that this is wanting the locate their shops and offices here.

Commissioner Stepisnik said housing is becoming an important issue for that area. She also thought Affordable Housing should be part of long-range discussions.

Manager Centeno noted that Trey Fonner, Public Works Director may be coming to the August Planning Commission meeting to discuss general projects in town, their status and to answer any questions that the Planning Commission may have.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:43 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by the Planning Commission

Mark Chain

Mark Chain
Planner

Lindsey K Williams

Lindsey Williams
Chair