

**TOWN OF SILT
 PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION AGENDA
 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2021 6:30 P.M.
 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
 REMOTE MEETING**

ESTIMATED TIME	ELECTRONIC AGENDA ITEM	PUBLIC HEARING/ ACTION	ELECTRONIC LOCATION AND PRESENTOR
	Agenda		Tab A
6:30	Call to Order		Chair Classen
	Roll Call		
	Pledge of Allegiance		
6:35	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		
6:40	Consent agenda – 1. Minutes of the December 1, 2020 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting	Action Item	Tab B Chair Classen
	Conflicts of Interest		
	Agenda Changes		
6:45 20 min	Topics of discussion for upcoming work session between the Board of Trustees and Planning & Zoning Commission	Discussion Item	Tab C Planner Chain
7:05 10 min	Planners Report	Info Item	Tab D Planner Chain
7:15 10 min	Commissioner Comments		
7:25	Adjournment		

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Silt Planning & Zoning Commission is tentatively set for Tuesday, March 2, 2021, 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.

**TOWN OF SILT
REGULAR PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
DECEMBER 1, 2020 – 6:30 P.M.
REMOTE MEETING**

The Silt Planning and Zoning Commission held their regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, December 1, 2020. Chair Classen called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

Roll call	Present	Chair Chris Classen Vice-chair Lindsey Williams Commissioner Eddie Aragon Commissioner Joelle Dorsey Commissioner Marcia Eastlund Commissioner Kim Leitzinger
	Absent	Commissioner Brittany Cocina

Also present remotely were Town Administrator Jeff Layman, Town Clerk Sheila McIntyre, Town Attorney Michael Sawyer and Planner Mark Chain.

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Comments – There were no public comments.

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of the October 6, 2020 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting

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

Conflicts of Interest – There were no conflicts of interest.

Agenda Changes – There were no agenda changes.

Ordinance No. 17, Series 2020, AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF SILT, COLORADO, AMENDING SECTION 17.42.060 OF THE SILT MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

Attorney Sawyer explained that for many years the town has been involved with enhancing its streetscape, particularly along Main Street and that the town has received a large amount of money in grants over the years to help with the improvements in the downtown area as a part of the plan to help build and define the image of Silt. He continued by saying that it is important that the town has the control to ensure that landscaping that goes in is consistent with the towns long-term plans. In reviewing the code staff realized that there was a gap in the towns ability to

ensure that landscaping and public rights of way are consistent with the plans and the efforts that the town has undertaken. Mr. Sawyer stated that there is no current regulatory requirement that states that a landscape plan must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and that this ordinance would amend the code to require a special use permit and site plan review for landscaping that is greater than 150 square feet in a public right of way in commercial districts.

The public hearing was opened at 6:47 p.m. There were no public comments and the hearing closed at 6:47 p.m.

Commissioner Aragon made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of Trustees of Ordinance No. 17, Series 2020, AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF SILT, COLORADO, AMENDING SECTION 17.42.060 OF THE SILT MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS. Commissioner Dorsey seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Planners Report

Planner Chain went over the following items:

Report on County Action for Ruiz Minor Subdivision (by Silt River Preserve)

Planner Chain stated that he worked with both AVLT and Colorado Parks and Wildlife to provide a letter to the County addressing the concerns and objectives of the Planning Commission, most notably the proximity of the project to the eagles' nest. He stated that the County included the P&Z's recommendations in their final approval and that the construction restriction would be for the time period of December 1 to July 31 which would provide for flexibility if there are no fledglings in the nest or if they leave the nest early.

Garfield County Referral – Minor Subdivision for Ruiz Family on nearby property to the above parcel

Planner Chain stated that this parcel sits south of the above parcel so it is further away from the eagles' nest buffer and that he has no concerns with this development. There was a consensus to have Planner Chain send a letter to the County stating that the town has no comments on this subdivision. There was additional discussion regarding the impact that out of town residents have on the town's bulk water system and the fact that in town residents pay more for water than those who buy bulk water. Clerk McIntyre stated that the Board of Trustees would be approving the 2021 fee schedule at their next meeting should anyone want to attend.

Request for Short-term Rental AirBnB

Planner Chain stated that the town received an inquiry from someone who would like to set up their RV as an AirBnB. He went through what the code allows in terms of short-term rentals along with the pros and cons of allowing this type of use. He stated that he feels that this needs to be discussed in more depth and to include the Board of Trustees to see if a code change needs to be made to accommodate and regulate such requests. Administrator Layman stated that a joint meeting could be set up between the Commission and the Board, and asked that the Commission prepare an agenda of what they would like to discuss. It was recommended to plan for a 5:30 p.m. work session prior to a Board meeting in January or to schedule this out

over more than one meeting. It was stated that there may be some items that the Board might want to discuss with the Commission as well.

Access to area north of Stoney Ridge Phase 3

Planner Chain stated that the Town had been approached by Jerry Rusch who had requested that the town help provide him with access to his 7-acre parcel that is within the town limits off of Eagles Nest Drive. Mr. Chain stated that his research shows that no access from a town street was provided for this parcel. He asked if there was any more information that the Commission was aware of that would help him assist Mr. Rusch if possible. There was a consensus that the Commission would like more information and Planner Chain stated that he would contact Mr. Rusch.

Commissioner Comments

Chair Classen asked Administrator Layman for an update on the direction of the Community Development Department and he stated that the town plans are to stabilize the department where it is today and to make a decision down the road as to what the future plans are for the department adding that many communities utilize contract planners. Vice-chair Williams commended staff for the tree lighting ceremony and how nice it turned out. Chair Classen also welcomed Ms. Leitzinger and thanked her for her interest in serving on the Planning Commission.

Adjournment

Vice-chair Williams made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Aragon seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously. Chair Classen adjourned the meeting 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by the Planning Commission

Sheila M. McIntyre, CMC
Town Clerk

Chris Classen
Chair

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Town of Silt Planning and Zoning Commission

FROM: Mark Chain, Town Planner *MC*

DATE: 01/28/2021

RE: Topics for Discussion – Upcoming Work Session Town Board

The purpose of this agenda item is to prepare for the joint work session with the Board in March. I think it is great for the Board and the Planning Commission to meet one time a year in order to maintain a positive working relationship and review how planning, development, and enforcement issues are working or not working. It gives a chance for all parties, staff included, to step back for a minute without the crush of a required action item and reflect how things are working in the town and think strategically.

In tonight's discussion, anything can be on the table. Please take some time to think about the Zoning Code and the Comprehensive Plan. I've also talked to 1 or 2 staff members and have a couple of items below to put on your radar.

Sign Code.

Sign codes are 1 of those items that are always controversial. I've been involved with the total revamping of sign codes with some communities and once you start taking input on the sign code the comments are all over the place. People pushing for tighter control and others wanting bigger and brighter signs. The scope of your review can change quickly.

In my work with the Town, I have heard comments about the Golden Gate sign. I assume everybody has their take on it and you probably heard from many citizens also. Signs for commercial establishments abutting a state highway/interstate are a different animal from those in downtown and in residential neighborhoods. I have only dealt with signs in Silt towards the downtown and residential areas and those related to subdivision development. I don't have any overriding thoughts on these items at the minute but would like to hear your feedback. I could also do some quick research if you think it necessary after the February meeting to provide you more information.

Short term rentals

We talked about this item at a recent meeting. I think this is a good issue to discuss with the Board. As an FYI, that individual has not come through to make a formal request with the town. But I expect short-term rentals to either start operating or have inquiries on the availability of short-term rentals in the town in the near future. It would be good to get out ahead of this issue.

County Development Standards/Bulk Water.

There are really 2 issues here. They include the relationship with Garfield County in general and their development standards plus the availability of the Town's Bulk Water availability to people in the County. As an FYI, the County did a major rewrite of their development code about 10 years ago and enhanced the requirements related to the technical water analyses that is required to be put together for development projects. In simple terms, applicants for any kind of development are required to show a "legal" source of water as well as an "actual, physical" source of water. They are not always the same thing.

A related issue is the Town's bulk water system. I don't know that much about it, but it is my understanding that it is available for use to residents, including those out of town. It is also my understanding that some residential units out in the County depend on that for their domestic water either parts of the year or all of the year. I understand when certain developments or individual properties have been getting this water for a number of years. However, I think this is a topic that that is worth further discussion. I believe water supply issues are going to be at the forefront in the future – whether by drought, climate change, growth in population etc. I'm sure the Town's water rights portfolio is adequate but I was always trained that water is very precious and any development, even a single-family property, should show their source of water and capacity to have it delivered for use.

In terms of general County development standards, they are what they are and I don't see any changes in the near future. Are there any County related standards that create a "red flag" for the Town?? As an FYI, when someone under County jurisdiction and in close proximity – up to 3 miles - to the Town goes to the County to discuss land use and development, County staff often directs the property owner/applicant to talk to Town Staff and see if that development is eligible for annexation into the town or whether it should be annexed. This is especially true when someone wishes to develop at a higher density than County standards allow. Just because of available infrastructure and the way the Counties set up; the County does not "do density" very well.

Zoning Code and Standards.

Please ask yourself what is working related to zoning standards and general location, and what is not working. Do any standards or zone districts need to be reviewed and/or updated? Is anything out of date?

You will know this more than I do. I made a few notations in the zoning code. For example, for multifamily development I do not see any “guest parking” requirements for multifamily properties. You may want to rethink that. Another example is the list of permitted uses in the various zone districts. You have an awful lot, but they are ranged alphabetically and sometimes it is hard to get that information quickly. I would prefer that the list of uses was organized more by category. Examples are agricultural related, commercial, residential, accessory uses, etc. Right now, it can be tedious, especially for someone not familiar with land use terminology, to get that information quickly.

At this time I do not think you need to do a major rewrite in your zoning code. Those either take a lot of time or a lot of expense. I just want you all to be aware that given the current development climate and some of the restrictions in other jurisdictions, I believe that the Town will continue to get development inquiries. And of course, this area is a desirable place to live on its own terms so I see development pressure continuing in the future.

Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan was either updated or reworked in 2017. That’s good; it should not be out of date. Do you feel its goals, objectives and directions on future land use are working?

Land Use Review Process

Questions to ask yourself in this regard is whether you think the review process is working well? Questions can range from does the Planning Commission have enough responsibility to whether you think the forms and applications themselves require the right information. I have not reviewed many of the past applications, especially those related to major subdivisions or annexations.

One question I think you need to determine is whether you think that all of the items that should require Commissioner/ Board review actually come before you? Or do some of the reviews seem too complicated? I do note that almost any new commercial development, even small projects come to the Planning Commission

for review. Often times staff as authority to approve simple expansions or smaller establishments/buildings.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Town of Silt Planning Commission

FROM: Mark Chain, Town Planner *MC*

DATE: 01/28/2021

RE: Planners Report

The purpose of this memo is to outline to you quickly some of the things going on and what you may be seeing for review in the relatively near future. Any “current planning” item listed below should not have a discussion on actual specifics. This is just to put it on your radar. Also, there are no applications “queued up” right now but some are in the works.

Heron’s Nest. From my review of the files, the property was annexed in the past and then de-annexed. The current property owner would like to annex once again. Town Staff did meet with the owner and the owner’s representative on site. While there are of course issues to work out, this property is directly adjacent to the Town’s wastewater system as well as directly adjacent to the river. I would think it a good idea to somehow work out an agreement acceptable to all. It would be good to get this on the town system.

Possibility of tax credit multifamily housing on Old Divide Creek Center property. There has been inquiry from the present property owner of reinstating the approvals in this area for an approximately 50 multifamily unit project that would receive tax credits from CHFA. These would end up being “affordable” rentals. The Town has written a letter stating what the zoning and parking requirements are. It seems like an application will be made – it is due to the state on February 1. Awards are granted for these type of projects in June.

Silt Trade Center. The Town has been contacted and we have talked to a prospective builder was looking at building perhaps 4 buildings in the Silt Trade Center. We’ll talk to this person about the town’s architectural standards and they are starting to put together information to proceed with a site plan application.

Painted Pastures. A builder has discussed with the town the possibility of putting a modular home or 2 in the existing portions of the Painted Pastures development. This would require a Special Use permit.

Wallace Enforcement – 512 Main. There is a building at this location which was supposed to be torn down due to some building and safety code issues. It even went to town court. The town is sending a letter just asking on the status of the project.