

MINUTES

CARBONDALE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Thursday September 27, 2018

Commissioners Present:

Michael Durant, Chair
Jade Wimberley
Nick Miscione
Ken Harrington
Jeff Davlyn
Marina Skiles
Jay Engstrom
Tristan Francis (2nd Alternate)
Nicholas DiFrank (1st Alternate)

Staff Present:

Janet Buck, Planning Director
John Leybourne, Planner

Commissioners Absent:

None

Other Persons Present

Ken Olson, 410 Garfield Avenue, Carbondale
Nancy Clough, 511 Garfield Avenue, Carbondale

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Michael Durant.

August 30, 2018 Minutes:

Ken made a motion to approve the August 30, 2018 minutes. Marina seconded the motion and they were 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.

PUBLIC HEARING – Main Street Marketplace Major Site Plan Review/Variance

Applicant: Crystal River Marketplace LLC

Location: Lot 1, Carbondale Marketplace Subdivision (NW corner of Main Street & Highway 133)

Janet Buck, Planning Director presented the Staff report and noted the following items:

The property is a vacant 5.37-acre parcel. It is Lot 1 of the Carbondale Marketplace Subdivision. City Market, a 10,000 sq. ft. retail store and a fueling station will be located on Lots 2, 3 and 4 of this subdivision.

The request is to construct a mixed-use development with 115 multifamily residential units and 10,259 sq. ft. of commercial buildings.

All of the units would be rental units. Twenty-three of which would be deed restricted AMI units.

Janet indicated that the applicant will go over the Site Plan and Architectural Drawings. The hearing should then be continued to October 11th to cover additional items such as traffic, water rights, engineering, etc. The recommendation for continuance is not because of issues with the application. It is a complex project with a number of components. The continuance is to allow time to adequately review the proposal.

Janet noted that the staff report only covered zoning and development standards. A second staff report will be done for the next meeting which will cover the traffic report and engineering.

Overall, the application is in compliance with the UDC with two exceptions.

The first is the maximum 10 ft. front yard setback along Main Street. There is an existing 20 ft. ditch easement along the front of the property for the Rockford Ditch. Because of that, the buildings would be about 18-20 ft. back.

The variance criteria state that in order to grant a variance, there must be an exceptional site condition which creates a hardship to the applicant.

The second is the required number of street trees. Staff asked the applicant to follow the Tree Board's preference on spacing based on tree size. The purpose of this spacing is to ensure that tree canopies won't overlap at maturity.

Janet noted that recently the Thompson Park application used the Tree Board recommendation under the alternative compliance section of the UDC.

The public street connectivity and internal street layout looks good. Janet stated that her suggestion is that the northerly driveway have more of a street appearance.

She also pointed out that she asked for clarification of what parking would be available for the public.

Overall, Staff is supportive of the application. There is a need for rental housing in Town. This development would provide a good mix of rental housing units near the shopping areas along the highway and the Downtown while providing some commercial square footage. In addition, residential development along Main Street creates more of a buffer for the residential areas to the south.

Janet noted that the applicant had a fairly extensive presentation and suggested that the Commission take this opportunity to ask questions and provide comments. She then recommended that the Commission continue the Public Hearing to the October 11th meeting.

Bob Schultz of Robert Shultz Consulting and Andy Wisnoski from Poss Architecture presented the project through a virtual flyover.

Ken Harrington asked the applicants if the plan they were currently reviewing was the same that they had reviewed previously during the rezoning. Bob responded that there was an increase in the number of units from 97 to 115 but that the units were smaller in size.

Ken asked if the colors and materials that were being presented were what was actually going to be installed on the buildings. Andy stated that the materials and colors may change but that the materials are meant to help make the development look like it did not all happen at one time and to provide diversity to the buildings.

Ken asked if the snow storage areas had been indicated and also commented these areas can turn into ice sheets as the snow melts. Bob indicated that the areas were indicated on Sheet M in the submittal. Ken also commented that the entrance of Shorty Papst Way and the driveways for the interior area could be designed better.

Tristan Francis asked what the community demand was for the commercial units. Bob replied that he has watched the market for some time and that there was not that much of a demand currently.

Marina Skiles commented that it is good that the project complies with the UDC but that it is unfortunate that the open field is no longer going to be an open field anymore. She stated that she anticipates a lot of public comment on the project. She also pointed out that the setback variance does not give her pause.

Jeff Davlyn asked what would be constructed after buildings A and B. Bob indicated that if a tenant came forward, then other aspects of the development would be constructed on a demand basis.

Janet asked the applicants to explain the phasing of the public improvements. Bob stated that the improvements would include the water lines and sewer lines as well as the sidewalks and trails. He also stated that the parks phasing would be detailed at the next meeting.

The public hearing was opened at 8:11

There was no public comment.

Ken noted that there were three items to discuss: the Conditional Use Permit, the Variance and Alternative Compliance.

Ken stated that he felt the setback variance meets the intent of the code as the buildings are within a few feet of the ditch easement.

Michael read the variance criteria and noted that the request makes sense as the foundation for the buildings will need to be offset from the easement to allow construction and as such would not harm the public.

Nick noted that the Conditional Use would create an added benefit for urban housing.

Michael noted that, with the request for Alternative Compliance, moving the balconies tightens up the building.

Nick stated that the open rooftop patio would still be a private space as the public would not have access to the area.

Jeff stated that he liked the look of the architecture of the building without the decks and was a fan of rooftop spaces.

Marina pointed out that the balconies would provide more of a private space for single parents to have kids go. She stated that she agreed with Jeff.

Tristan stated that he liked the balconies for private space.

Jeff asked Bob how big the balconies were and Bob stated that they were six feet by ten feet.

Ken stated that he liked the no balcony concept as the rooftop space would provide more room for larger parties and asked if the roof top space could be divided into separate areas.

There was more discussion on the option of the roof top space and the balconies. Bob stated that they could go with the balconies or could come up with another solution and bring the options back at the next meeting.

Motion

Ken made a motion to continue the hearing to the October 11th Commission meeting, Marina seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Michael called for a 5 minute break

Michael called the meeting back to order at 8:41

PUBLIC HEARING- Minor Site Plan Review/ADU

Applicant: Green Line Architects/ACES

Location: TBD Garfield Avenue/Original Townsite/Block 18, Lot 3

John Leybourne presented the staff report noting the following items:

The applicant is proposing to construct an 1881 sq. ft. residence with an attached 373 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelling Unit.

UDC Section 4.4.4.A.1-4 include the following standards for ADUs:

- Only one ADU on the property.
- ADU's are required to be attached, except in the OTR Zone district.
- The detached ADU shall be located on the side or rear of the primary structure.
- The ADU will have a separate exterior entrance.
- The ADU will be no more than one bedroom.
- Separate water and sewer service will not be provided.
- The ADU will not be under separate ownership.

The application meets the standards that are applicable.

Zoning

An ADU is allowed to be up to 500 square feet in the R/LD Zone District, the proposed ADU is 373 square feet in size.

The application meets the standards for setbacks, building height and impervious surface areas.

Parking

Section 5.8.3. of the UDC requires 2.5 parking spaces for a three-bedroom dwelling, and 2 spaces for an ADU.

The applicant is providing 5 parking spaces and 5 bike parking spaces.

Chris Lane introduced himself as the Chief Executive Officer of the Aspen Center for Environmental Studies, the owner of the property. He explained that ACES would use the property for teacher housing. He also pointed out that as a condition of the property being donated to ACES, the chicken coop and the garden were to remain in operation. Chris stated that ACES would continue to take care of the chickens and garden and were looking forward to utilizing them as educational tool in the future.

Julie Novy of Greenline Architects gave a brief presentation of the design of the main house and proposed ADU.

Michael opened the public hearing at 8:46

Ken Olsen, 410 Garfield Avenue, Carbondale

Ken stated that he owns the blue roof house to the east of the project and is excited about the proposed use of the lot. Ken stated that his only concern was that he would like to not have the parking off of the alley and to have it to the front of the lot.

Michael noted that code requires the parking to be off of the alley.

Nancy Clough, 511 Garfield Avenue, Carbondale

Nancy stated that she like the plan but would like to confirm that there will be someone to take care of the Chickens and the Garden. Chris Lane responded that the chickens would be taken care of.

The public hearing was closed unanimously.

Nick made the following motion,

Move to approve a Minor Site Plan Review for an Accessory Dwelling Unit to be located at Section: 34 Township: 7 Range: 88 Subdivision: Original Townsite Carbondale Block: 18 Lot: 3 Through: - Lot: 5 W 12.5' OF Lot 3 Carbondale, Colorado, with the findings and conditions indicated in the Staff Report.

Jeff Davlyn seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING – Minor Site Plan Review/ADU
Applicant: Green Line Architects/Peter Davidoff
Location: 275 S. Fourth Street

Nicholas disclosed that he is renting a home to the east of the proposed location and stated that he would be able to make a decision in an unbiased manner on the application.

John Leybourne presented the staff report noting the following items:

The applicant is proposing to construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in a proposed accessory structure (Garage) at 275 South 4th Street.

The property is in the OTR Zone District.

The ADU would be 599 sq. ft. and would be located above a proposed garage structure.

5 parking spaces are provided.

UDC Section 4.4.4.A.1-4 include the following standards for ADUs:

- Only one ADU on the property.
- ADU's are required to be attached, except in the OTR Zone district.
- The detached ADU shall be located on the side or rear of the primary structure.
- The ADU will have a separate exterior entrance.
- The ADU will be no more than one bedroom.
- Separate water and sewer service will not be provided.
- The ADU will not be under separate ownership.

The application meets these standards.

There are additional ADU standards in UDC Section 4.4.4.A.5 for residential structures of historical significance the OTR Zone District. Those standards have been met.

Julie Novy of Greenline Architects introduced the owner of the property, Peter Davidoff.

Julie pointed out that the structure was designed to mimic and preserve the main historic structure on the lot.

David stated that the stairs on the structure to enter the ADU were designed to mimic the neighboring property.

Michael opened the public hearing. There was no public comment.

Jeff made a motion to close the public hearing and Marina seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Marina stated that the staircase was not relevant to the historic house and should not be a focal point of the structure.

Michael stated that he agreed with Marina.

Ken stated that he really did not have any issue with the staircase.

There was a discussion with the applicant on moving the staircase to the side of the garage or providing some sort of screening or architectural features to screen the stairs.

Ken made the following motion: Move to approve the Special Use Permit, and a Minor Site Plan Review for 275 South 4th Street as proposed with the findings and conditions in the Staff Report.

The motion was seconded by Nick.

Michael asked that roll be called on the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of:

Yes – 5

No - 2

Staff Update

Janet gave a brief update on the Thompson Park application.

John stated that there were many building permits recently submitted. He also gave an update on the Tumbleweed lawsuit.

Commissioner Comments

Nick gave an update on the water conservation planning meeting he attended and stated that he would like to work with Staff to see how the UDC can be used for water resource planning in the future.

Motion to Adjourn

A motion was made by Jeff to adjourn. Ken seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.