

MINUTES

CARBONDALE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Thursday December 10, 2020

Commissioners Present:

Michael Durant, Chair
Jeff Davlyn
Marina Skiles
Nick Miscione

Staff Present:

Janet Buck, Planning Director
John Leybourne, Planner
Mary Sikes, Planning Assistant

Commissioners Absent:

Erica Stahl Golden (2nd Alternate)
Jay Engstrom
Jade Wimberley
Nicholas DiFrank (1st Alternate)

Other Persons Present Virtually

Riley Soderquist, Carbondale Center Place
Jack Schrager, Carbondale Center Place
Tom Siciliano, Sopris Shopping Center
Yancy Nichol, Sopris Engineering
John Petaisto, Sopris Engineering
Michael Noda, Architect, 3560 Walnut Street, Denver, CO
Daniel Wilde, Architect, 3560 Walnut Street, Denver, CO
Ignarri Lummis, Architect for the self-storage
Joe Davidson, Architect for the self-storage
Jackie Mierkowskip, Architect for the self-storage
Devin Gardiner of Pinon Sage, Landscape Architect
Dr. Ronald Stein, 1624 W. Olive Avenue, Burbank, CA
Mark Chain, Consultant, 811 Garfield Avenue
Amy Kimberly, Director of Carbondale Arts
Jessica, Sopris Self Storage

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Michael Durant.

September 10, 2020 Minutes:

Jeff made a motion to approve the September 10, 2020 minutes. Nick seconded the motion, and they were approved unanimously with Marina abstaining.

November 19, 2020 Minutes:

Marina made a motion to approve the November 19, 2020 minutes. Jeff seconded the motion and they were approved unanimously with Nick abstaining.

Resolution 8, Series of 2020 – Minor Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit/ADU – 2010 Eastbank Point

Marina made a motion to approve Resolution 8, Series of 2020, approving the Minor Site Plan Review/Conditional Use Permit at 2010 Eastbank Point. Jeff seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously with Nick abstaining.

Public Comment – Persons Present Not on the Agenda

There were no persons present to speak on a non-agenda item.

VIRTUAL HEARING – Major Site Plan Review, Subdivision Exemption, Conditional Use Permit

Location: 900-958 Highway 133 and 1201 Colorado Avenue (Sopris Shopping Center and Sopris Self Storage)

Applicant: Carbondale Center Place LLC by Mark Chain

Janet stated that this is an application for Major Site Plan Review, Subdivision Exemption, Conditional Use Permits and Alternative Compliance. She said that the Commission is required to hold a public hearing and recommend approval of the application or recommend denial. She stated that the Commission may also continue the public hearing.

Janet stated that the property is a 4.16-acre parcel where the Sopris Shopping Center and Sopris Self Storage facility are located.

Janet said that this past July, the Town approved an application to rezone the west side of the parcel to Mixed-Use and to rezone the east side to C/T.

Janet stated that the proposal is to demolish the Shopping Center and replace it with a mixed-use building with 76 residential units and 10,370 sq. ft. of commercial space. She said that all the residential units would be rentals and fifteen would be deed restricted.

Janet said that the three existing self-storage buildings would remain on the east side of the site and a new self-storage building would be constructed just to the west of those buildings.

Janet stated that the application includes a request to subdivide the parcel into two lots.

Lot 1 (westerly lot) – 87,031 sq. ft. or 1.998 acres

Lot 2 (easterly lot) – 93,771 sq. ft. or 2.153 acres

Janet said that the size and dimensions of the lots are in compliance with the UDC.

Janet stated that while this is one application for Major Site Plan Review, there would be two separate lots with two very different developments on each lot. She said that each lot has its own zone district, which have their own design standards, the Mixed-Use

verses the C/T. She said that in her Staff report first she went through the Mixed-Use development and then through the Self-Storage development.

Janet stated that the Staff report only covered compliance with the UDC. She said that other aspects of the development - engineering, Highway Access Plan, etc., will be covered in the next Staff report.

Janet said that the applicants have presentations on each development proposal, so she was not going to go into detail in describing each project. She continued by saying that she would just touch on each one.

MIXED USE LOT

Janet said that the mixed-use development meets the Residential and Commercial Design Standards. She stated that the buildings are well-designed and pedestrian oriented. She said that they work well with the design of 1201 Main.

Janet said that when this property went through the rezoning application it was one large building, ten feet from the property line. She said that there was a lot of concern about mass and scale of that building. She said that they included a massing study with the application. She said that the new proposal dividing the building into two reduced the mass and scale as well as being more in line with the buildings in the area.

Janet said that the common open space created a lot of concern during the rezoning application. She stated that the two common open space areas are next to the buildings and each building has its own common open space. She said the building to the south, where the commercial portion is going to be, has some of the common area for the commercial and some for the residential.

Janet said that it appears that the applicants incorporated comments provided during the rezoning process into the new design. She said overall, the proposed development is in compliance with the UDC.

Janet stated that there are several requests for alternative compliance. She said one is that the UDC requires a 10 ft. wide landscape strip in the Mixed-Use zone district along Highway 133. She said that there is a conflict between the setback and the required 10 ft. landscape strip.

Janet said that the other Alternative Compliance is the 5 ft. wide landscaped area required between the parking lot and the rear lot line. She said that the proposal is for a landscape strip that ranges from 2.4 ft. and 4.3 ft. She said that typically that is required when you have another use on the adjacent property, which in this case it is the wall of the self-storage facility.

Janet said in addition, there is a deviation in the provision of required street trees around the south building due to the location of utilities in that area. She said that the utilities make it difficult to plant street trees.

Janet said that one thing she would like to point out is that the MU zone district has a maximum 10 ft. front yard setback. She said each building along the highway has portions of the building within the 10 ft. but not the entire length of each building. She said that she thinks this is an outcome of the discussions during the rezoning process so it's not one long wall along the front. She said that she thinks it works well.

SELF-STORAGE LOT

Janet said that the self-storage development is generally in compliance with the UDC and the development standards. She said that she likes the façade facing Colorado Avenue and that it has improved since the rezoning application. She stated that there are large display windows on the ground floor and a generous landscape area in the front. She said that a number of design features were added since the rezoning review, including the living wall on the west side.

Janet said that another feature is the facility will be as close to net zero as possible.

Janet said there is one request for alternative compliance for this lot. She said that the UDC requires 20% of landscape area or 18,754 sq. ft. and 13,090 sq. ft. is being provided. She said that the narrative explains that the landscape around the storage keep in front of the building along Colorado Avenue is really where it is visible, so it doesn't make a lot of sense to have the landscape inside the fence in the interior of the site.

Janet said that she wanted to note that the allowed front yard setback is five feet and that this building is set back about eighteen feet, which provides for the larger landscaped area along Colorado Avenue.

Janet said that Staff is supportive of the application and that both developments have evolved since the rezoning and that they reflect input from Staff, the Commission, and the Board. She said that because this is such a large and complex project that she is recommending that it be broken up into two meetings. She said tonight's focus on the larger designs aspects as well as compliance with the UDC. She asked are you in agreement that it complies with the design guidelines in the UDC, are there changes that you would like to see?

Janet said that the applicants will have a large presentation on both sides of the parcel. She said that the hearing will be opened for public comment and then Commission questions and comments. She said that she would recommend that the hearing be continued to January 14, 2021.

Janet said that she wanted to note that we received a letter from Linnea Fong and that she sent that letter off to the Commissioners and development team this afternoon.

Janet said that she also received comments from Jay Engstrom, one of your fellow Commissioners. She said that she can briefly go through his bullet points when there are Commissioner comments after the presentation.

Marina asked for clarification regarding the rezoning and if the lot split had been done at that time.

Janet explained that there was a line, but it was a zoning boundary rather than a property line. She said that it looked like two parcels, but it was still one large parcel with two different zones on the same parcel.

Nick asked how the referral comments were going to be addressed.

Janet said that the one from John Plano about the drywells is currently being addressed. She said that the property owner is going to be getting the drywell cleaned up, which she can follow up with and address at the next meeting.

Janet stated that the Fire District said that the existing water system is capable of providing adequate water flows, the location of the new hydrant is acceptable and the access for the development is adequate. She said that Kevin Schorzman, the Public Works Director will be reviewing comments before the next meeting.

Michael said that when he looks at referral comments that they don't have anything to do with what we are deciding but that they are included in the packet because we want to hear from these referring agencies.

Janet noted that an agenda item, the ten-plex application and public hearing, was not going to be heard tonight.

Michael said that if anyone watching on YouTube tonight was waiting to hear about the ten-plex application that it will be re-noticed whenever it comes back before the Commission.

Michael said regarding the Alternative Compliances with this application and that we get something in return for something that they cannot comply with and what was it in this case.

Janet said that the criteria is that they meet the standard to a greater effect and that it is supposed to provide flexibility and that it meets and exceeds it is the way the language in the code reads.

Michael said for clarification that they don't meet the setbacks in one area but that they will far exceed it in other areas.

Janet said that they meet the setbacks and that they don't meet the landscape strip. She said that the offset is that it allows them to provide a pedestrian access and hardscape. She said that with the setbacks that they are providing variation with the

building along the setbacks. She said that the Alternative Compliances are all regarding landscaping.

Marina asked about the difference between an Alternative Compliance and a Variance.

Janet explained that there are only specific code sections that you can ask for, for Alternative Compliance. She said that you cannot do Alternative Compliance for zoning parameters like building or fence heights. She said that you can apply for Alternative Compliance for Open Space, Landscaping and Screening, Transportation and Connectivity, Design Standards for Residential and Commercial, Off-Street Parking, Signs and Lighting. She said that this was created when we did the UDC so that the code provided flexibility while not making it a hard and fast variance. She said that with the variance criteria is where there is a hardship.

Janet said to address Michael's question, she read the criteria in the code; *that it achieves the intent of the standard to a better degree than the subject standard, it advances the goals and policies of the Comp Plan to a better degree, results in benefits to the community that exceeds benefits associated with the subject standard and opposes no greater impact on adjacent properties.*

Mark Chain, **811 Garfield Avenue** said that it was nice to be here again and that it has been several months since you heard from us. He said that we have had a lot of discussions and public outreach has continued to occur. He introduced the team.

Mark said that Janet gave a good outline of all the application. He said that he would touch base on one or two of them;

- Two Conditional Use Permits, one for ground floor residential in the Mixed-Use Zone District and the other is self-storage in the Commercial/Transitional District
- The parking reduction in the Mixed-Use District, a 15% reduction for having a mixed-use project and a 15% reduction for proximity to a transit stop, which is only related to the parking for the residential.
- Public outreach has been considerable, which was done primarily by Jack and Riley, with discussion with fifty individual residents, presentations with Carbondale Arts, Carbondale Environmental Board, Chamber of Commerce, and a Zoom public outreach held on November 23, 2020, which was recorded.
- The design has changed considerably since the last meeting.
- Previous input from the Planning Commission, Board of Trustees, and the public.
 - Highway 133 elevation was a bit massive and one long building.
 - The location of the open space could be improved.
 - Concerns of loss of affordable commercial.
 - How do you keep this area Carbondale, keep the funk in Carbondale?

Mark said that the applicants have been transparent with the tenants in the current commercial spaces. He said that they are trying to help them find temporary space if that is necessary as well as permanent space. He said that in the new commercial

space that the units could be as small as 1500 square feet, which could help some of the current tenants.

Mark said that some of the biggest changes are that there are two buildings along Highway 133. He said that the building to the north has been pulled back a little bit from the highway, which will be forty-eight residential units. He said that the southern building, closer to Highway 133, has twenty-eight units on the second and third floors with approximately 10,000 square feet of commercial on the first floor as well as the amenities for the residential with a gym and offices. He said that putting the commercial on the south end helped frame the corner to help the commercial work as much as possible.

Mark said that the open space is in three different areas, with each building having its own tucked pocket, one at the north building, one at the south building, public plaza that is 1500 square feet in the southern portion of the project, close to the commercial spaces.

Mark said that access has changed, with the main intersection moving one hundred feet to the south, with a right in and right out. He said that there is still an easement being granted on the north part of the project. He said that there is also an access from Colorado Avenue, which has been moved seventy-five feet to the east from where it presently is.

Mark said that the other thing we heard at the rezoning from the public comments were about growth and traffic. He said that in the packet there is an extensive traffic study. He said that the results of it are that traffic is reduced with the change in use. He said that the morning rush hour, the peak traffic hour, traffic in and out of this property is reduced by 13% compared to the present usage. He said that the afternoon rush hour is decreased by 37%. He said that the change in use should generate less traffic for this part of Highway 133 and less carbon as well as being more pedestrian oriented.

Mark said that there are various pedestrian and bike approaches to the property. He said that there is the bike path along Highway 133, sidewalks on each entry, including a useful sidewalk along Colorado Avenue.

Mark explained the Alternative Compliance with the storage, and he explained the history with the PUD and the landscaping. He said that having the landscaping by the right-of-way will help screen the storage facility.

Michael Noda at neo Studio, 3560 Walnut Street, Denver CO showed a slide with the first design and the second slide, which is a result of the Commission's comments and the Board of Trustees. He said that the current design is from all the comments and where we are today.

His presentation included the following;

- Access from Highway 133, access between the two lots off of Colorado Avenue.

- Pedestrian circulations, sidewalks around the building, through the building, and along Colorado Avenue.
- Traffic analysis of a reduction from the present to the new proposal.
- People can live, work, and play within this project.
- Building sizes and location as it relates to Highway 133 and how it compares to other buildings along Highway 133.
- Building to the east, being longer and bigger.
- How to keep the buildings Carbondale Funky, UDC spells it out, mass and form, buildings should vary in size and shape, no long unbroken façades with the corner being important with the mercantile architecture.
- The gateway on Colorado Avenue with a mountain mercantile building.
- North building, building shape to reminisce a gable kind of boarding house.
- Modern elements on either ends of the two buildings would be more modern.
- Per the UDC each unit has a balcony to have private outdoor space for each one of the units.
- All of the first floor in the south building is commercial and residential amenities, with commercial consolidated in the south building with more parking.
- North building having a bigger buffer from Highway 133.
- CDOT's access in the middle of the site.
- The developers wish to have smaller footprints and acknowledging efficient units and attainable units, adding an elevator, two more sets of stairs.
- We listened to Planning Staff, The Commission and Board of Trustees to make it Carbondale.
- Window sizes are different in proportion, some are historic, some are long and linear, some are punched, and varied roof forms.

Daniel Wilde, Architect, 3560 Walnut Street, Denver, CO finished up their presentation showing the following;

- A 3D tour of the Mixed-Use buildings.
- An aerial view of the site showing the location of the buildings, parking, sidewalks, and the common open space, including the plaza.
- Materials on the south building as it relates to the 1201 Main Street project across the street and the historic Main Street, using the red bricks, stucco and black metal facia for texture and variety around the building.
- North building with contemporary masonry, darker and tan bricks, metal panels adding color. Sopris views, nice finishes, which will be the same in both the deed-restricted and non-restricted units.
- Comparisons to surrounding properties and their sizing.

Joe Davidson, Architect, Self-Storage Building outlined the following;

- Elevations of the new storage building.
- Three story climate controlled self-storage building.
- This new building is in addition to the existing one story drive-up self-storage building.

- 49,000 square feet of net rentable storage units, with 342 units.
- Secured state-of-the-art and energy efficient self-storage building.
- Entrance on the east side of the building.
- Covered loading area and elevators for access to the storage facility.
- Colorado Avenue side stepped down, with a mercantile façade to reduce the mass.
- West and east sides are long and narrow, with material changes and steps in elevation heights to break up those façades.
- West side facing the mixed-use buildings has vegetative green screens to soften the size of the building.
- Materials chosen will soften the size of the storage facility using brick at the base, followed by simulated wood in various colors with corrugated metals for accent features.

Commission Questions and Discussion

- Storage facility looks fantastic, great to have the storefront along pedestrian route.
- Concept and materials work well with the UDC and the pedestrian nature of Colorado Avenue.
- Access discussion between the two buildings on Highway 133.
- Provisions for future restaurants with vertical shafts for hoods and make-up air units with the funky shape of the south building with the possibility of smaller spaces.
- Façade on Colorado Avenue with the historical design looks great until you turn the corner onto Highway 133. Corner at Colorado and Highway 133 should be a corner piece, neo Studio said that brick could be added to the west side.
- Corners are tricky, it's a major intersection with too much going on.
- The plaza is going to be a terrific place with a successful outcome.
- The north building has an opportunity for a second plaza. Developers wanted to keep the lower level as residential to deliver efficient housing with fifteen affordable housing units. Outdoor space is more for outdoor activities for the residents.
- Terrific job of upgrading the design since the last meetings.
- There will be corridor entrances, lower balconies will be gated to access the common space.
- Average size of the current shopping center, 1000-2000 square feet with the gym having two units equaling 4000-5000 square feet each.
- Flexible square footages could accommodate a larger unit, anywhere from 1000-10,000 square feet with multiple entrances.
- There is one 10 x 25-foot parking space for deliveries.
- Location of the current access on Highway 133 and the west side of Highway 133 access doesn't exist.
- Snow storage is a shaded area on the civil drawings, would it interfere with winter use of the plaza. There is a grassy area to pile snow if the plaza area needed to be plowed.

- Trash pickup for the commercial units is across the parking area on the mixed-use lot.

Public Comments

Amy Kimberly, Director of Carbondale Arts, 85 N. Seventh Street said that the developers have done an excellent job on listening to everybody to please everybody. She said that this project has her full support.

Mark Chain commented about the separation of the buildings occurred from the comments and to get away from having one long building to reduce the massing. The access point did push that along and it works better because there's more of a separation. He said that Jack and Riley were always trying to come to a middle ground for the people that were making comments.

Commissioner Comments

Janet read the highlights of Jay Engstrom's comments;

- Liked the two separate buildings, the site has a totally different feel that is much more pedestrian friendly and usable, nice update.
- We need that second round-about, the right-in and right-out of the access on to the site is good because it limits traffic crossing, however it doesn't allow vehicles to go south bound in any way. To go south you would have to take Colorado Avenue to Eighth Street and then to Main Street and then to the round-about.
- Eighth and Colorado is a problematic intersection and discusses maybe a four-way stop there.
- He said that there is no way to avoid this until we get the new round-about.
- Given the straight parking access through the site, he recommends some sort of traffic calming through there.
- The wall for the self-storage is massive, the wall will look massive in person. As much as I like them the green walls are only seasonal. Other options, murals space, climbing wall for residents, sound dampening to reduce noise bouncing off the highway. Would more material variations help, horizontal variation is part of the code but vertical is not.
- Concern with reduction on parking that's allowed by the mixed-use, reduction uses the assumption that the residents leave during the day to open up parking for commercial. He said that he is usually for minimizing parking spaces but that this site makes me a little nervous because there is very little parking anywhere near the site so there is no overflow.
- He said that he does like the small commercial spaces.
- He said potential discussions for UDC revisions.
- He pointed out that with the current events, residents are working from home and the spaces don't open up as much for commercial use.
- He said that with the property's proximity to the bus stop, people are more likely to leave their car at home and use the bus to commute.
- More bike parking should be required for residential units especially the multi-level units, where it is difficult to get your bike to your apartment.

Janet said that is the sum of Jay's comments.

- Marina said that the storage facility on Highway 133 was based on a lot of art installations and murals on the warehouse. She said that is a key component of making Carbondale, Carbondale and imprinting Carbondalism on to whatever we build. She said that since we have the support of Carbondale Arts that she would love to entertain one of the suggestions from Jay of adding a mural to the face or down the corridor of the new driveway. She said that instead of the landscape screens perhaps, it's just an idea. She said like what City Market did to commission a local artist for a mural.

- Michael Durant asked where the elevators were?

Michael Noda answered that each building would have a single elevator.

- Michael Durant said that extra bike storage makes sense when you are riding your bike to the grocery store. He said that with a residential building it will be brought back up the elevator to a secure place, he said that he wasn't in favor of extra bike storage for the residential areas. He said others might have different opinions and that is why we are discussing it. He said that Marina's ideas of the arts sound great.

- Jeff said that he had a similar reaction to the corner as Marina but for a different reason. He said that he is not an architect but that his concern was the height of the metal façade and that Michael from neo Studio suggested that could be changed to brick. He said that the three-story façade with a single material could feel somewhat overwhelming even with a good bit of glazing. He said that he had a similar reaction to the tan brick façade with the gable roof on the north building. He said that the lack of variation on that façade. He said that he wondered if other architects on the Commission had similar reactions. He said that he really appreciates the brick façade on the south side and its reference to the historical past as well as the texture and indentations in the brick work. He said that he also shares the concerns of Jay and his message of the size of the wall on the storage building. He said that it is difficult to feel how big that three story wall will be on the renderings instead of real life. He said that he would be in favor of murals and art and that the living walls just take some time. He asked how long that building was?

Jeff said that the elevation labeled south building, northwest perspective, the vertical differentiation in the facades that makes a big difference in breaking up the mass of the building, which is what is lacking in the metal façade on the south side on the corner of Colorado Avenue and Highway 133 as well as on the tan brick façade of the gabled roofed residential building.

Daniel Wilde said that the living walls would be of a species that wouldn't lose their leaves in the winter. He said that it would take awhile for these plants to come to maturity to cover the wall but that our intent was to have a flowering plants and something that would maintain its greenery throughout the year.

- Nick said that he would like to reinforce Jeff and Marina's points about the south facing brick façade. He said that ironically it feels very urban to him but that it

really is successful. He said that he appreciates the attempt to add variations to the design, especially the façade facing Highway 133. He said that you are substituting variation for continuity and that he would like to see more continuity in the design. He said that he would like to reinforce Jeff's comments about those gable ends, testing more of what is on the south end, which might add continuity to your design. He said that variation could come from continuity between the two buildings, the north building would have its own language and the south building would have its own language but not necessarily with the same language. He said that he would want to enforce his fellow Commissioners comments about the south façade being so successful and maybe it could be continued in-lieu-of those gabled ends.

- Marina said that we all love the brick façade on Colorado Avenue, somehow that language could be part of a rhythm to carry it through. She said maybe there is too much variation and perhaps just simplify it. She said that we have to look at this application with regards to the whole bigger picture with what is across the street and next door.

Michael Noda said that the design team will take all of those comments and that it's nice to hear that we may have taken it too far and that it needs to be made more cohesive.

- Michael Durant said that his concern is do you have enough trash, as it appears that it appears that to be the same size that serves the 7-Eleven. He said that he would like to observe humorously that the last time you presented here the Commission hammered you because there wasn't enough variation and now, they are asking you to back off on the variations. He said good job on putting your thinking cap on. He said he likes the project and that it will be a great asset to Carbondale if it were built as it is. He said that the designers on the Commission only want to make it better, from their perspective. He said that he doesn't quite get the vocabulary thing and that's a little over his head.

Janet said that she wanted to bring up a couple of points as a heads up because she picked up on this during her review and it's in her Staff report. She said that the way our code reads is when you have general commercial over 10,000 square feet it needs to have a Special Use Permit and that this commercial square footage is 10,370 and 1500 square feet is a residential, which doesn't require a Special Use Permit. She said is it all still counted cumulatively as over 10,000 square feet. She said that her solution to it is that we have enough time before the next meeting to go ahead and adjust the noticing to throw in a Special Use Permit, so if it is all general commercial it gives them latitude or if they wanted to increase the commercial.

Michael said that he seems to recall that 10,000 square foot threshold was focused primarily on a single tenant space.

Janet said that she doesn't think we noticed this with Lot 1 of Main Street Marketplace and that it didn't really come to mind.

Michael asked what is the legal criteria with a Special Use permit.

Janet said it would be adjusting the public notice to go ahead and throw it in because we have plenty of time. She said and just to add in the language that it's over 10,000 square feet of general commercial.

Mark Chain said that he looked at this in detail once Janet brought it up. He said that a Major Site Plan has a higher bar than the Special Use Permit for the commercial and it goes to the Board of Trustees. He said that it looks at the same things, if not more, the Special Use Permit goes to 5.7 in the code, which is all the building design issues. He said that he thinks we are covered but if you would like us to advertise, we will do it.

Michael said that he wouldn't want to burden the applicant but if the applicant's fine with it, let's play it safe.

Janet said that she could talk to the Town Attorney and that this is probably her playing it over-safe. She said that when we created the code it was for the stand-alone big retail building, not a multi-tenant little building so she might be wrong.

Further discussion ensued regarding 10,000 square foot buildings.

Motion

Jeff made a motion to continue the public hearing to January 14, 2021. Marina seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Michael thanked the applicants and said see you next year.

Staff Update

Janet said that every time we meet, we tell you it's nuts, but it keeps on coming. She said that we have the new application for Thompson Park, which is parcels 3 and 4. She said that it is single family on one of the parcels and that it is different looking. Janet said that she will make sure that there is some background, so we don't start recreating the wheel again.

Janet said that she talked to Chuck Cole today about the use down on Catherine Store Road. She said that it was a land use application that she is going to take a closer look at that it going to be proposed on Catherine Store Road. She said that what Chuck told her was that it could have more trucks coming through Town because of the industrial use.

John Leybourne said that we are extremely busy.

Janet said that this is our last P&Z meeting of the year and that she hopes everyone stays safe and warm and enjoys the holidays. She said the next time we see you 2020 will be gone.

Commissioner Comments

Marina said that she had to keep turning her video off during the meeting because her internet was getting spotty. She said that other video comes through when she turns hers off.

John said that some of the presenters were getting spotty as well.

Michael said feel free to turn your camera off when you leave the room or take a drink of water and mute yourself.

Jeff said that he thinks Wilderness Workshop just hired somebody with a historical preservation background. He could be a good addition to the community.

Marina said that she misses Ken.

John said that he spoke to the Town Manager regarding the sign code and that City Market is limited to forty square feet in total for thirty days a year. He said that we are going to be contacting them to let them know there are issues with the ballard signs in front of the store. He said that he went out and measured them and that they were a foot and a half by four feet tall and there are fifteen of them.

Motion to Adjourn

A motion was made by Jeff to adjourn and the meeting was adjourned at 9:09 p.m.