



Minutes

Planning & Zoning Commission

Carbondale Town Hall and Via Zoom

Thursday, August 24, 2023

Commissioners Present:

Nicholas DiFrank	Vice-Chair
Jeff Davlyn	Member
Kim Magee	Member
Jess Robison	Alternate
Cindy Suplizio	Alternate

Commissioners Absent:

Jay Engstrom	Chair
Nick Miscione	Member
Jarrett Mork	Member
Kade Gianinetti	Member

Town Staff Present:

Jared Barnes	Planning Director
Kae McDonald	Planning Technician

Guest and Attendees:

Bob Schulz	345 Fawn Drive, Carbondale
Ross Kribbs	799 Garfield Avenue, Carbondale
Patty Lecht	2500 Highway 133, Carbondale
Candace Hart	1460 Main Street, Carbondale
John Williams	778 Sopris Avenue, Carbondale

Call to Order

Nicholas DiFrank called the August 24, 2023, meeting of the Carbondale Planning and Zoning Commission to order at 7:01 in Room 1 at Town Hall.

Roll Call

Consent Agenda

Minutes of the August 10, 2023, Meeting

Motion to approve the Planning and Zoning Commission August 10, 2023, meeting minutes.

Moved by: Jess Robison

Seconded by: Kim Magee

Aye Jeff Davlyn, Nicholas DiFrank, Kim Magee, Jess Robison, and Cindy Suplizio

Absent Jay Engstrom, Nick Miscione, Kade Gianinetti, Jarrett Mork

Carried 5-0

Public Comment for Persons Not on the Agenda

Ross Kribbs, 799 Garfield Avenue, noted the large turnout at Tuesday's Board of Trustee meeting regarding the Forest Service, stating that while everyone in Carbondale loves having the Forest Service, three years ago after no public interaction, they unveiled the 90% proposed site plan and building design. He explained that he gave a letter to the Acting Supervisor at that time and summarize the letter's content:

- Poor design with no primary entrance on Main Street.
- To keep the Blue Spruce at the corner of 4th and Main Streets, the visitor entrance is located on Weant Boulevard, and requires visitors to park and walk around the building to the entrance.
- The other two Blue Spruce along Main Street will not be saved.
- Requesting that the Planning and Zoning Commission look at the proposed plans and offer guidance to the Board of Trustees.

Patty Lecht, 2500 Highway 133, asked that the Planning and Zoning Commission review the "enhanced" plan she provided that proposes the new building is rotated on a north/south axis along the western edge of the lot. She explained that by moving the building, the existing buildings would not need to be demolished and could be repurposed at the Forest Service's leisure and by keeping the existing building basement "as is" it would protect the root balls of the trees. She suggested coordinating utility and demolition work with the adjacent pool project as a way for both projects to reduce construction costs and noted a suggestion by another citizen that a heat pump system to serve the pool be installed under the parking lot.

Candace Hart, 1460 Main Street, noted her bewilderment at the process and questioned why Town Staff and Officials aren't working harder to have a stake in the process. She added that they have well over 1,000 signatures petitioning to change the design and the trees. She stated that while they understand the Forest Service doesn't have to follow the Town's codes, their goal is to have the Forest Service slow down and work more closely with the Town, so it is a win-win for everyone. She

noted that, in her opinion, the public outreach wasn't adequate, considering it was a single open house on a First Friday right before Covid.

Jared responded that the Town doesn't have a Location, Character, Extent process, which is the typical avenue to accept and review other jurisdiction's plans. He noted that the Forest Service began the planning process more than ten years ago and previous Town Staff did have the opportunity to review and comment on the design as recently as 2017. He pointed out that based upon that review, the Forest Service altered their design as reflected in the final document, including bringing the building up to Main Street, adding additional glazing along Main Street to encourage streetside interaction, and possibly flip the interior spaces so the community-activated space fronts along Main Street. He added that the Forest Service has been transparent about the necessity of removing trees. Jared suggested that like several other boards and commissions, the Planning and Zoning Commission could forward a letter to the BOT but reminded them that at Tuesday's meeting the BOT made it abundantly clear that it was a listening session, and they wouldn't take formal action or have a definitive stance on the application.

Jeff asked if the Forest Service would be required to apply for a building permit through the Town. Jared surmised that, like the school district, the federal government has their own set of standards and inspections for building projects.

326 S. 3rd Approval Documents

Jared explained that at the August 10th meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commission approved a Minor Site Plan Review for 326 S. 3rd Street to build an attached garage with an ADU above it. He stated that Resolution No. 3, Series of 2023, brings forth the conditions and findings of approval; to formalize the resolution the Commission needs to move to approve the resolution and included in the meeting packet are the findings of fact and the granting of the Conditional Use Permit will be approved in conjunction with the Minor Site Plan Review.

Move to approve Resolution No 3, Series of 2023 for an Accessory Dwelling Unit to be located at 326 S. 3rd Street.

Moved by: Jess Robison

Seconded by: Cindy Suplizio

Aye Jeff Davlyn, Nicholas DiFrank, Kim Magee, Jess Robison, and Cindy Suplizio

Absent Jay Engstrom, Nick Miscione, Kade Gianinetti, Jarrett Mork

Carried 5-0

PUBLIC HEARING: Impervious Lot Coverage Code Text Amendments

Staff Presentation

Jared noted that this was a noticed public hearing, referring to the July 13th work session where the following topics were discussed:

- Add language that prevents stormwater flows from leaving the property;
- Modifying the definition of the term Principal Building;
- Determining if overhangs should be included in impervious lot area;
- Determining how decks should be considered; and,
- Consideration of "green roofs" and "pedestal paver systems" as pervious spaces.

Jared explained that at that meeting, the Commission directed staff to consider a simplified version of the code and one that provided additional requirements for pervious paving systems and, ultimately, the Commission moved to initiate a Code Text Amendment to the UDC for the purpose of reviewing changes to Section 3.8.5, Impervious Lot Coverage. Jared pointed out that to facilitate this discussion, several attachments were included in the meeting packet such as Unified Development Code Zoning regulations, a draft redline version of UDC Section 3.8.5, examples of other jurisdiction's interpretation of impervious lot coverage, the City of Aspen's Urban Runoff Management Plan, and the minutes from the July 13th meeting.

Jared addressed UDC §3.8.5, noting this section largely defines how impervious lot coverage is calculated including categorizing improvements into various buckets of impervious improvements and works in tandem with UDC Tables 3.7-2 and 3.7-3 which list the maximum impervious lot coverage requirement as a percentage of the total lot area. He explained that in all the residential districts, the percentage increase as the lot size decreases ranging from 1.5% to 60% while in commercial zone districts it is a flat percentage ranging from 80%-100%. Jared identified those regulations that Staff has identified as needing clarity:

- Subsections 3.8.5.A and B don't define how roof overhangs are addressed. For example, some buildings are designed with large roof overhangs for improved outdoor living which impact overall site permeability and should be considered in relation to impervious lot coverage.
- Subsection 3.8.5.E sets forth the patio exemption which only pertains to "any impervious covered or uncovered deck and/or patio" and limited to 10% of the floor area of a dwelling units excluding the basement and garage. This language is confusing as it implies that an uncovered deck should be counted as impervious area, but decks are not included in subsections A-D.
- Subsection 3.8.5.F sets forth the pervious paver exemption which applies to "parking, driveways, and walkways" if a pervious paving system is used. This exemption is limited to 10% of the pervious surface required (the inverse of the maximum impervious lot coverage) and although the Director is required to approved manufactured pervious paving systems, there is no guidance provided on the minimum acceptable standard.

Jared pointed out that zoning reviews don't take place until after a building permit application is submitted, potentially requiring a resubmittal that could range from simply omitting a planned patio to redesigning the entire house. He noted that his goal would be to create a more predictable outcome for the applicant while also streamlining staff review.

Jared highlighted how other jurisdictions regulate lot coverage:

- The City of Glenwood Springs does not have an impervious surface calculation and only applies a maximum lot coverage requirement to infill residential development. Infill residential development is defined as residential development on a parcel that shares a common lot line with at least two existing single-family homes. Given that definition the maximum lot coverage standards are relatively limited in their applicability in Glenwood.
- The Town of Avon regulates maximum lot coverage as the area rendered impermeable by buildings compared to the total area of the site, less those rendered undevelopable. Driveways and patios are excluded for the maximum allowed area. Avon's zoning code includes a maximum lot coverage percentage for each zone district and type of residential use.
- The Town of Eagle also regulates development through a maximum lot coverage requirement. In certain residential zone districts, Eagle's codes include both a maximum lot

coverage for buildings and a separate maximum for all other impervious surfaces. Eagle defines lot coverage to mean the portion of a lot or site covered by materials forming any unbroken surface impervious to water, including: (A) Buildings, decks, patios, structures; (B) Streets, driveways, parking lots, and other impervious materials. In addition, Eagle's codes limit the maximum floor area in certain residential zone districts.

- The Town of Basalt uses a combination of maximum lot coverage and FAR for residential developments. In most residential zone districts either a maximum lot coverage or FAR is used, but in some districts, both are used to govern development. Although not defined well, building footprints, decks, and patios are included in the maximum area, while driveways are not included.
- The Town of Crested Butte uses a combination of FAR and required open space rather than a maximum lot coverage. These regulations serve the same purpose as maximum lot coverage as a required open space of 50% would limit the structures lot coverage to 50%. Open space is defined by all unoccupied land which does not include any structure above grade. However, decks 18" or higher above grade do count as "structure area". The regulations do not include driveways and other miscellaneous impervious improvements "structure area".
- The City of Aspen uses a combination of FAR, floor area maximums, and maximum site coverage to regulate lot coverage in zone districts. The specific combination of regulations varies depending on the zone district. For example, the Medium-Density Residential district contains a maximum site coverage and FAR with square foot caps based on the size of the lot. The Low-Density Residential district only uses FAR with a maximum square foot cap to regulate lot coverage. City of Aspen also uses a complex and prescriptive policy to regulate permeable pavers. Section 8.5.1.4 of the Urban Runoff Management Plan (Attachment D) describes three categories of pervious pavement solutions: modular block pavement (MBP), cobblestone block pavement (CBP), and reinforced grass pavement (RGP). The regulations contain numerous regulations and design and construction considerations for installing the various systems to ensure permeability, including but not limited to minimum void spaces, fill material, sub-grade material and size. MBPs require a minimum void space of 20%, while CBPs require a minimum of 8% and RGP do not require any void space. A minimum of 12 inches of sub-grade material is recommended to resist freeze-thaw damage.

Jared explained that he developed three options for the Commission to discuss:

- The first option proposes code language to simplify how impervious lot coverage is calculated. Subsections A and B are modified to include any roof overhang more than 2 feet. The intent is to include larger roof forms as impervious area. A new subsection E is included to better define what types of decks and patios are considered impervious. Both exemptions (subsections E and F) are removed from the regulations. The result of this proposed regulation will simplify what areas are considered impervious and make the calculation easier for applicant and staff to understand. It will however have an impact on the total amount of developed areas a lot can contain, by including more portions of the development as impervious (decks, patios, large roof overhangs). It will also remove both exemptions which have been widely used to allow for more development on a site, thus further restricting the gross amount of development.
- The second option proposes code language which provides additional clarity for the calculation of impervious lot coverage is calculated, while keeping the patio exemption. Like Option 1, Subsections A and B are modified to include any roof overhang more than 2 feet, while a new subsection E is included to better define what types of decks and patios are considered impervious. In Option 2, the pervious paver exemption is removed from the

regulations, while the deck and patio exemption is clarified to reference the new definition of which decks and patios are considered impervious. This proposed regulation will still provide the clarity of Option 1, while keeping the patio exemption largely as implemented today. It will still have an impact on the magnitude of development on a lot by increasing the impervious portions of the development (decks, patios, large roof overhangs), but the impact will be less than Option 1 given the continuation of the patio exemption.

- The third option proposes code language which provides clarity for impervious lot coverage while keeping in place both existing exemptions. The proposal is the same as Option 2, with the exception that the pervious paver exemption remains with additional requirements. This option includes minimum design standards for three types of pervious pavement systems: modular block pavement (MBP); cobblestone block pavement (CBP), and reinforced grass pavement (RGP). The minimum standards are borrowed from the City of Aspen's Urban Management Runoff Plan and intend to set standards related to minimum surface voids, void fill materials, and base course depth and materials, among others. This proposed regulation will still provide the clarity of Options 1 and 2 while keeping both exemptions. The additional minimum standard for pervious pavers is intended to provide direction to applicant, improve the ease of review for Staff, and create more predictable outcomes during the building permit review. It will still have a minor impact on the magnitude of development on a lot by increasing the impervious portions of the development (decks, patios, large roof overhangs), but the retention of the exemptions will help keep development magnitude largely at what is seen today.

Public Comment

Bob Schulz, 345 Fawn Drive, commented that the Code historically interpreted impervious lot coverage as a measurement denoting a building's outside wall measurements and it was only a few years ago that one of Carbondale's Building Official added the stipulation that driveways of any composition be considered impervious. He noted that regarding roof overhangs, he often designs a larger overhang on the south or west side of the building for passive protection from the sun. He pointed out that the construction of an accessory dwelling unit on a property will also shrink the buildable space and the recently approved project at 326 S. 3rd Street couldn't happen under the three proposed options. He added that he agreed with the deck exception if there is a demonstrated pervious surface underneath it. Bob explained that he advises his clients not to use pervious pavers because they don't function well in this climate because of the temperature fluctuations.

Motion to close the Public Hearing.

Moved by: Jess Robison

Seconded by: Kim Magee

Aye Jeff Davlyn, Nicholas DiFrank, Kim Magee, Jess Robison, and Cindy Suplizio

Absent Jay Engstrom, Nick Miscione, Kade Gianinetti, Jarrett Mork

Carried 5-0

Commission Discussion

Jeff asked for clarification on the interpretation of "Option 1" and "Option 2" with reference to decks and patios of pervious materials be exempt from the impervious lot coverage calculation. He also asked for clarification on where overhangs greater than two feet would be measured.

Jared replied in the affirmative, noting that the intent of Subsection E is that if the deck is truly impervious or the deck is situated over an impervious surface, the entire area needs to be calculated as such.

Jess questioned why decks over a pervious surface would be exempt when a gravel driveway is not. Jared replied that the current regulations reflect interpretations from previous Town staff, adding that driveways are typically used a lot which compacts the surface and moisture sheetflows off it rather than soaking in.

Cindy preferred Option 1 or 2, recommending a simpler approach.

Nicholas asked if Jared knew about permeable concrete. He suggested an option that uses the building's outside walls as the primary metric while acknowledging surfaces intended to receive versus repel water. He also suggested clarifying the definition of a deck (traditionally a wooden material) and a patio (hardscape element).

Jared replied that technology is constantly changing, pointing out that not only does that make it difficult for Staff to keep up but that not every system is created equal.

Kim agreed with Jess regarding the distinction between in pervious surface between a deck and driveway.

Cindy asked how driveways are counted in Options 1 and 2.

Jared replied that driveways are counted as impervious in both Options 1 and 2. He pointed out the simplicity in Avon and Crested Butte's lot coverage definitions as a comparison.

Nicholas suggested requiring a "heat" map that identifies the various lot coverage elements according to their permeability while using a gray shading to highlight those areas that might require additional discussion.

Jess stated her preference for calculating impervious surface as a building's outside walls, pointing out the need for balance between zoning regulations and more housing.

Jeff questioned the wisdom in excluding driveways, pointing out the potential for a driveway to be a massive element in some neighborhoods.

Jared noted that in Avon's hillside zoning, a driveway had to be able to connect with the buildable space on the lot regardless of length but added that the trend is to build to the maximum allowable lot coverage. He emphasized the function of an impervious lot coverage calculation is two-fold: 1) accommodate water retention, and 2) control the size of the structures being built.

Jess suggested creating a table that calculates lot coverage based on lot size and the differentiation of driveway material.

Nicholas suggested a table that differentiates between lots accommodating water within the boundaries versus a percent of allowable lot coverage.

Bob pointed out the small size of Carbondale's planning staff and reiterated the need for simpler regulations.

Jared agreed, noting that exemptions making interpretation difficult for both sides.

Motion to continue the public hearing to September 14, 2023 for Amendments to the Unified Development Code related to Impervious Lot Coverage and Section 3.8.5.

Moved by: Jeff Davlyn

Seconded by: Cindy Suplizio

Aye Jeff Davlyn, Nicholas DiFrank, Kim Magee, Jess Robison, and Cindy Suplizio

Absent Jay Engstrom, Nick Miscione, Kade Gianinetti, Jarrett Mork

Work Session: Accessory Dwelling Units Code Text Amendments

Jared explained that the 2022 Comprehensive Plan identified ADUs as an area that needed to be reviewed. He noted that in the Implementation Matrix, ADUs are listed in three of the “near-term” actions related to Community Character and Housing and Jobs. Jared pointed out that he and Jay met with the Board of Trustees at their August 15th work session to discuss the topic and in return, the BOT provided Staff with a few goals to help guide additional work on ADU regulations:

- Overarching goal to expand opportunities for additional ADUs.
- Streamline the process.
- Review the need for a conditional use or special use permit to determine if it is needed or value is added.
- Do ADUs need to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission or could an Administrative Site Plan review be acceptable.
- Review the parking requirements with the goal of reducing and potentially eliminating required spaces.
- Ensure the process has adequate response to Structures of Merit and Historic Preservation.
- Review allowed sizes of ADUs for potential ADA-compliant units, studio, and multi-bedroom units, or tiny homes.
- Consider attached and detached units throughout Town.

Jared described how ADU regulations are regulated through the Unified Development Code based on the differences between straight zone districts and Planned Unit Developments, noting that the extent to which PUDs can be regulated is dependent upon the guiding documents for each PUD – a summary of which is included in the meeting packet. He also articulated the development review process, noting that single-family residences are required to apply for a Minor Site Plan review and either a Conditional or Special Use permit. He added that the land use applications track together, so the timeline isn’t elongated, but the public notice requirement for the Conditional/Special Use permit can add three to four weeks.

Jared pointed out that each section of the UDC that refers to ADUs is also included in the meeting packet, highlighting those items of note:

- Only 1 ADU is permitted per property;
- ADUs are prohibited for multi-family or live/work units;
- ADUs shall have a separate entrance, contain cooking, sleeping, and sanitary facilities,

but shall not have more than one bedroom;

- ADUs are not permitted to have separate ownership or utilities;
- ADUs can range in size from 300 SF – 850 SF depending on the zone district, size of the primary dwelling unit, or size of the lot; and,
- ADUs are permitted to be attached or detached but are only allowed as detached in the OTR if the primary dwelling is a structure of historical significance.
- UDC §5.9.3.A outlines the parking requirements for ADUs. ADUs are required to have 2 spaces per ADU. The number of spaces may be reduced to 1 space if the property owner can demonstrate adequate space exists for an additional parking space. If the Town receives parking complaints related to the ADU, the Town can require the parking space be constructed.

- Lastly, the UDC Definitions Section present definitions for a wide range of dwellings, including ADUs – *“A subordinate dwelling unit added to, created within, or detached from a single-family residence, but located on the same lot or parcel as a primary residential structure, that provides basic requirements for living, sleeping, cooking, and sanitation.”*

Jared highlighted the recent Senate Bill 23-213, explaining that while it didn’t pass, there are likely to be future conversations centered on this topic. He listed significant items of note, including ADU’s be a use-by-right, prohibiting rules and regulations that limit ADUs (including in PUDs), and prohibiting the off-street parking requirement. Jared pointed out that while aspects of the Senate Bill received some support, it generally wasn’t supported because it took away local control.

Finally, Jared proffered Staff’s perspective of the current ADU regulations:

- The maximum size of an ADU hasn’t been a restriction for applicants, with the exception of an ADA compliant ADU;
- The need for a noticed public hearing has increased the review time for ADU applications;
- Where permitted, Staff hasn’t received many inquiries about adding an ADU;
- Where not permitted Staff has received some inquiries, but not many regarding a desire for an ADU;
- In many cases, properties have constructed a “room with a wet bar (no cooking facilities) and bathroom” which essentially serve as an ADU but are not considered and ADU. In these cases, cooking facilities are either added illegally after a building permit has been finalized or “hot plates” have been provided for minimal cooking; and,

and bathroom” which essentially serve as an ADU but are not considered and ADU. In these cases, cooking facilities are either added illegally after a building permit has been finalized or “hot plates” have been provided for minimal cooking; and,

- P&Z review has improved outcomes of ADU development through improved architectural and site compatibility within the neighborhood and consideration of impacts on neighboring properties.

Bob commented that there is a rich history of ADUs in Carbondale, noting that previously there has been a lot of consternation over ADU applications and the current regulations found in the UDC reflects those concerns and conversations. He noted that ADUs have gained more acceptance recently and updated guidelines will serve the community well. Bob pointed out that Senate Bill 23-213 references ADU as Additional Dwelling Unit versus the Town of Carbondale’s acronym Accessory Dwelling Unit. He added that one parking space should be adequate under the current ADU size limitations, noting that in his experience the size of an ADU should be between 500 to 600 feet because anything much larger just becomes an unpermitted two-bedroom dwelling. Bob supported an administrative review process with public notice because it gives the neighbors a chance to comment on the project. He suggested one strategy would be to give public notice and if no one commented, it could go through an Administrative Review without the P & Z’s input, but if there were comments it could go through the public review process as currently established.

John Williams noted that upon his return to Carbondale in 2017 he built a detached shop on his property with the intention of renting it as an ADU. He noted that his property is in the Old Town Residential zone district which has specific restrictions on where ADUs can be located on a property. He stated that most of the properties in the OTR are single family residential and he would like to see those properties be treated the same as any other residential zone district. He also suggested lowering the ADU minimum size threshold while maintaining the off-street parking requirement. Candace asked if there was a way to ensure ADUs are used for housing local workers rather than being converted to short-term rentals.

Jeff replied that that stipulation deserves consideration.

Jess encouraged the consideration of allowing smaller units, noting that construction costs deter property owners from adding ADUs.

Nicholas commented that the code needs to ensure that basic needs are accommodated and that the units are so small there is an overflow of “stuff.”

Jeff added that maximum size could also be fluid depending upon the lot size.

Nicholas reminded the commission members of past hearings where neighbors commented upon the claustrophobic aspects of an ADU that is too big.

Jeff recognized that there can be tension over perceived space and parking, but pointed out that the community prioritized the concept of infill to preserve the surrounding open space.

Jess stated that there should be regulations that prioritize ADUs for local housing as opposed to short-term rentals.

Cindy commented that when the Lincoln PUD was developed, all the participating property owners built ADUs and in her experience they have worked well.

Kim didn't think the parking requirements for ADUs should be two spaces. She agreed with John that the OTR shouldn't have distinct regulations compared to other residential zone districts.

Jeff thought there could be justification for only requiring one parking space, but pointed out if the maximum size could accommodate a two-bedroom unit the parking should be proportional.

Jared asked if the P & Z Commission brought value to the design of an ADU.

Jeff replied that he could think of several examples where the Commission provided thoughtful design consideration, but most of the conversations centered on infill and where the Town's zoning codes conflicted with private covenants.

Jess wondered if that could be taken care of with an Administrative Review and Jared only referring it to the P & Z Commission if there is a threshold of public comment.

Jeff replied that if private covenants were in play, Staff should seek the Commission's input.

Nicholas pointed out that the Town doesn't get involved with private covenants and must approve or deny based on the UDC.

Jared reminded the commission members that private covenants aren't all created equal and there is discretion in what the Town chooses not to enforce or take a position on, but noted this isn't settled law. He commented that this was good feedback and there will be opportunity for additional input. Jared pointed out that oftentimes short-term rentals allow a property owner to meet their mortgage, but at the same time it is in contradiction with the goal of increasing housing in the community.

Staff Update

Jared announced that the September 28th meeting was cancelled because he will be at the state planning conference and Kelley resigned, effective at the end of August. He noted that the initial public outreach for MAP Carbondale will be wrapping up at the end of August and the stakeholder working group is scheduled for September 12th. He added that they have had positive feedback from LatinX businesses and Radio TriColor.

Jared added that the Artspace public outreach has also been initiated with jv DeSousa and Bldg Seed architects leading the local aspects of the project. He reminded the commission members that information on both Artspace and MAP Carbondale can be found on the Town's landing page under “Carbondale Connect.” He explained that there will be design charrettes through the fall, followed

by design work after the new year that will support funding assistance applications. He noted that there will be a joint work session with the BOT in October to discuss initial feedback.

Jared pointed out the ANB Bank public hearing is scheduled for September 14th and encouraged everyone to plan on attending.

Commissioner Comments

Nicholas announced that his business was awarded the Chacos Park Mater Plan contract and he planned a listening session for input. He noted the project timeline is short to allow for an infrastructure line item in the 2024 budget.

Adjournment

Move to adjourn the August 10, 2023, meeting of the Carbondale Planning and Zoning Commission.

Moved by: Jess Robison

Seconded by: Jeff Davlyn