

**MINUTES  
CARBONDALE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
November 4, 2021**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Nick Miscione called the in-person/virtual November 4, 2021, meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

The following members were present for roll call:

Members:	Nick Miscione, Chair John Williams, Member Eric Sechrist, Member Kim Magee, Member Melissa Jones, Member Jess Pederson, Member Eric Doud, Member Heather MacDonald, Alternate
Town Staff Present:	John Leybourne, Town of Carbondale Staff Liaison Kae McDonald, Boards & Commissions Clerk
Guests:	Lindsey Flewelling, History Colorado Certified Local Government Coordinator

**CONSENT AGENDA**

***Motion Passed:*** John Williams ***moved*** to approve the Carbondale Historic Preservation Commission (CPHC) meeting minutes from October 7, 2021. Eric Sechrist ***seconded*** the motion, and it was ***approved*** with Eric Doud abstaining.

**PERSONS PRESENT NOT ON THE AGENDA**

There was no one present, not on the agenda, to address the CHPC.

**PROPOSED LETTER TO SOM OWNERS**

John Williams announced that the plaque design and pricing have been finalized and is ready to go (see included attachment on the next page). He noted that there are several ways to display the plaque which will give the property owner options to locate it where they want.

Eric Sechrist asked if the QR code was linked to the Structure of Merit Survey or to the specific property.

John Williams replied that it is linked to the SOM survey and the specific property can be looked up.

Melissa asked if the SOM survey is user friendly, noting that if it requires several steps to access property information the interested party may give up.

Nick thought the design looked great but wondered if the QR code might be a passing fad and thought it would be better to have the plaques individualized.

Jess asked if the plaques would be available in bronze because it is more historically appropriate.

John Williams replied that the homeowner will get to choose the material.

Eric Doud pointed out that the plaques should be one material because it will be more uniform and less costly. He added that the plaque will be located on a property with an address, so there is no need to individualize each plaque.

Kim noted that that was also why they wanted to use the QR code rather than individualize each plaque.

John Leybourne commented that the cost of the plaques was figured into the 2022 budget.

**Motion Passed:** Eric Doud **moved** to approve the design of the plaque as presented in aluminum and with/without the garden stake, the cost structure and the Structure of Merit letter as presented at the October meeting. John Williams **seconded** the motion, and it was **unanimously approved**.



Prices for plaques only (no stake) including shipping:

- Quantity (1) = \$206
- Quantity (10) = \$162 each
- Quantity (20) = \$145 each
- Quantity (30) = \$135 each

36" gardens stakes @ \$80 each when ordered with plaques.

You could conceivably order some with stake mounting and some pre-drilled for screw mounting. I think two screws at the left and right between the borders would be sufficient.

## **LETTER RESPONSE ADDRESSING CARBONDALE CPU KEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Nick reminded the commission members about the Comprehensive Plan Update process and noted that the consultant has done a good job meeting scheduled deadlines. He noted that much of the October HPC meeting was dedicated to discussing the key recommendations specifically addressing historic preservation published in the Key Recommendations Draft dated September 30, 2021 and Nick was charged with drafting a letter of support for review at tonight's meeting. Nick shared his screen with the draft letter and asked for suggestions as he read the letter; the intent is to include the letter at the upcoming November 18<sup>th</sup> Planning and Zoning meeting so the consultants can incorporate the recommended language in the Comprehensive Plan Update.

As he read the letter, Nick noted that the key observations were distilled data provided by the consultants. He asked if the commission members understood the concept of tiered frontage design.

Eric Doud replied that the design guidelines are quite clear and allow for HPC review. He added that the language that he had problems with was allowing a fourth story—that is beyond the small-scale design of downtown and he doesn't support it.

Kim agreed with Eric Doud that she doesn't want to see a fourth story allowed.

John Williams also agreed that four stories are incompatible with the current scale of downtown.

Jess commented that he could support a fourth story if it was stepped back.

Eric Doud countered that the alleys were just as important and shouldn't be shadowed by a fourth story.

John Leybourne pointed out that stepping back is only allowed on the south side and is not applicable to the north side to allow for snow removal.

Eric Doud commented that the Dinkle Building is the most important building in town and any new construction should respect that. He added that the fabric of the town will be lost if taller buildings are allowed.

Nick replied that he understood the concerns but pointed out that there is a need to incentivize developers to take on projects in the Historic Commercial Core. He noted that the current development standards are strict with regards to the commercial/residential balance and affordable housing requirement and the commercial use must be propped up by adding residential units. He added that while his comments might seem pro-developer, the community isn't willing to pay higher taxes to facilitate affordable housing.

Eric Doud responded that he understands the concern but pointed out that there are other incentives that could be used to attract new development including a change in zoning and easing the parking requirement.

Jess commented that zoning is a sticky subject, and no one wants to see it changed.

Nick was willing to remove that bullet point but noted that his perspective was directed at preserving the historic pedestrian vitality of Carbondale's downtown versus just thinking of it in terms of architecture.

John Leybourne clarified that residential units require parking within 300 feet while commercial units do not. He added that the first 25 feet of store front must be dedicated to commercial units, but residential units are possible in the back next to the alley.

John Williams acknowledged that there is some juggling between the economic vitality and historic value, but thought it was just as important to work to keep the historic value. He pointed out that the purpose of the HPC is historic preservation, not economic vitality.

Nick commented that he was trying to shift the focus of development from Highway 133 back to Main Street. He pointed out that this is more a higher-level conversation about planning, not architecture and planning is first and then followed by architecture.

Eric Doud mentioned the email he sent to commission members about Downtown North (see attached) and how that term is mislabeled. He noted that there hasn't been any conversation about how development in that area will also detract from the vitality of the HCC.

Nick thought that should be a standalone letter and to date there have not been any development proposed for Downtown North.

John Leybourne confirmed that there aren't any conceptual plans on file yet, and added he liked Eric Doud's proposal to rename that area.

Eric Doud commented that it was his perception that the CPU consultant is pushing retail and residential development for the Downtown North area, and it is unsettling. He added that for the TOC in general the enterprise zone should be preserved.

John Leybourne clarified that the focus of the CPU is just the area north of Town Hall that is currently zoned industrial.

Jess asked if the HCC might ever be converted to a pedestrian mall.

John Leybourne replied that with the pushback from owners over the Main Street closures he didn't foresee that happening anytime soon.

Nick added that he would be interested to see how Downtown North relates to the HPC noting that connectivity is a challenge. He didn't think that Downtown North should be addressed in the letter currently under consideration but thought it was a topic for discussion.

***Motion Passed:*** Kim Magee ***moved*** to adopt the letter as presented with the approved edits. Eric Doud ***seconded*** the motion, and it was ***unanimously approved***.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The November 4, 2021, regular meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for December 2, 2021 at 6:30 pm.

From: Eric Doud  
To: Kae McDonald  
Cc: Eric Sechrist; Heather Macdonald; Janet Buck; Jess Pederson; John Leybourne; John Williams; Kim Magee; Melissa Jones; Nick Miscione  
Subject: Re: HPC Agenda/letter for packet?  
Date: Thursday, November 4, 2021 2:01:01 PM

Nick and All,

This is a comment I wrote in the discussion section of the Com Plan Update concerning North Downtown. It, I believe, has seen very few visitations but plays into planning background for the Historic Core.

"I believe this area is misnamed. Carbondale has a Downtown which is currently underdeveloped. Its empty lot inventory can meet future needs for a very long time. What we do NOT need additional zone which potentially competes with this existing commercial core. And with a re-zone, we do NOT need to displace existing uses that houses many small business and local jobs.

I believe the area needs a name that has connotations which retain and actually improves Carbondale's small business, craftsman and artistic base ... a name like an Enterprise Zone that provides an incubator environment for existing and emerging creative enterprises. This would have a "mixed use" of small warehouses, live work studios, artist collectives and the pre-existing light industrial businesses. Coupled with this would be housing component specifically targeting essential service families and local wage earners. It could also contain neighborhood scale retail such that those working and living in the area could walk to services. All of this needs to be kept at a 2 story level and have a good mix of open green spaces such that Carbondale retains is "small town" character.

It has been said the Carbondale is looked to as a leader in progressive thinking. We really need to apply some creative thinking to what this area becomes. The above description of an Enterprise Zone is not typically found in zoning language and if successfully written, it could become a leading vision of a great future. We certainly don't need more of the same commuter driven development."

Eric Doud

:

<20211104 - HPC Comp Plan Updates Support Letter - Rev 1.pdf>

November 4, 2021

To: Town of Carbondale Planning & Zoning Commission  
Attn: John Leyborne, Kae McDonald, Town Staff  
Via Email: [jleybourne@carbondalecto.net](mailto:jleybourne@carbondalecto.net), [kmcdonald@carbondalecto.net](mailto:kmcdonald@carbondalecto.net)  
(970) 510-1248

**Re: Comp Plan Update -- Suggested Edits to Select Key Recommendations:**

Fellow Commissioners, Colleagues and Residents of Carbondale,

This letter is intended to provide support to the P&Z, acting as the Steering Committee to the comp plan update, by providing suggested edits to some of the key observations and recommendations in the CT draft report. CHPC believes that these suggestions will help to shift the focus from development along Highway 133 back to the more historic and sustainable development patterns of Carbondale, specifically the HCC zone district and along Main Street. The CHPC firmly believes that some of the more recent developments along the highway are not in keeping with the historic fabric of the town and if long term development continues to expand along the highway, many of the core values of town residents will erode into a “city built for cars rather than people”. Furthermore, The commission believes that if development standards are not updated to favor the HCC, rather than Highway 133, there will be long lasting negative impacts to the historic and economic vitality of downtown Carbondale that will not be easily rectified in our lifetime.

CHPC is fully aware that the town of Carbondale is moving into a new chapter of urban growth. The fact that the global population is expanding and will potentially increase more rapidly in the near future. Accessibility and technological advancements, combined with the trend that Carbondale has its own self-sustaining economy and transportation system, are all signs that we now live in a growing urban landscape. The hope of this commission is that P&Z shares our sentiment and that we can work together to promote and protect the historic and economic vitality of the HCC, by finding ways to shift the focus off of the unfortunate trend of highway development back into the historic downtown area before it's too late.

The suggested edits contained herein generally relate to pages 14 & 15 of the Carbondale Comprehensive Plan Update Key Recommendations Draft, which was published By Cushing Terrell on September 30, 2021. The HCC zone district is the topic of the section referenced. CT's Key Recommendations Draft can be viewed at the following link: [here](#)

**CHPC Supported Key Observations to Edit and Prioritize:**

- Carbondale has a historic and pedestrian friendly downtown asset that town residents have expressed an overwhelming desire to preserve and protect.
- An estimated four acres in the HCC zone are vacant or undeveloped land. Despite several proposals in recent years, the Downtown area has not seen significant development.
- Many projects have been proposed within the HCC zone, but nothing has been proven constructible for a variety of reasons including ownership, the marketplace and development standards.

- Community sentiment stated downtown vitality may be affected if additional commercial and mixed-use projects are developed in peripheral areas of town.
- Carbondale has a rich historic trend of organic lower income neighborhood development that is connected to, and bolstered by, the historically dense pedestrian scaled downtown core.
- Carbondale and HPC supports the preservation and protection and further promotion of historic models of economic development in the historic core.

CHPC supported Key Recommendations that are in direct response to the aforementioned observations. These recommendations have been modified or simplified from their original version in most cases:

- Consider ways to direct future development toward key areas of vacant or underutilized parcels in the downtown area.
- Consider language that promotes pedestrian connectivity between HCC and downtown North, which has possible but uncertain future development potential.
- Consider ways to promote the HCC zone as a mixed-use hub of activity with small, local and essential businesses, food and beverage establishments, entertainment destinations and a diverse mix of housing.
- Consider adopting language that provides a credit for on-street parking to support retail and residential uses, as well as community events.
- Consider tiered frontage design strategies for the HCC zone that allows for taller buildings, but preserves the historic charm and pedestrian scale of Main Street.
- Consider ways to adopt form-based code language that places larger emphasis on character, massing and scale, building articulation and adjacencies rather than enforcing building use as the basis of requirements.

The CHPC hopes that these suggested edits to CT's key recommendations will help the P&Z commission steer the consultant in a direction that promotes the public good of Carbondale, and shifts the focus back to more historic models of pedestrian friendly development standards for the future. Please feel to contact CHPC representatives if we can be of any further assistance.

Respectfully,



Nick Miscione, AIA, CHPC Chair  
The Carbondale Historic Preservation Commission