MINUTES
Carbondale Zoning Board of Appeals
Wednesday, April 17th, 2024
Room 108, 6:00 p.m.
200 South Illinois Avenue

MEMBERS PRESENT: Litecky, Allee, Lilly, Love, Shukites

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sheffer, Carrier, Weiss

STAFF PRESENT: Gibson, Lenzini, Bollmann

---

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**

   Roll call was completed and the determination of a quorum was made.

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

   Ms. Lilly made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 20th, 2023 Zoning Board of Appeals meetings, seconded by Mr. Love. The motion was passed with unanimous voice vote.

3. **Citizen Comments or Questions:**

   There were none.

4. **Hearing:**

   ZBA 24-02: The City of Carbondale is requesting a Variance from sections 15.2.23 of the City of Carbondale Revised Code as it pertains to the minimum front yard depth requirements for new construction in a BPR, Primary Business, zoning district for the following described property: 220 South Washington Street, Parcel Numbers: 15-21-258-007 & 15-21-258-009

   Ms. Litecky declared public hearing ZBA 24-02 open and asked Ms. Gibson to read the legal notice.

   Ms. Gibson, Planner for the City of Carbondale, read the Legal Notice.

   Ms. Litecky asked Ms. Gibson to present the staff report.

   Ms. Gibson read part A of the staff report for ZBA 24-02.

Ms. Litecky asked if the Board had any questions for the staff.

Ms. Allee asked the width of the sidewalk in the area being discussed.

Mr. Lenzini stated that the sidewalk on Washington Street is 5 foot wide.

Ms. Allee asked for clarification as to where the loading and unloading zone location is planned.

Mr. Mark Bollmann, project manager for the City of Carbondale, stepped forward and stated that the loading zone is intended to be on the east side of the property.

Ms. Allee questioned the intention behind the loading area having an elevated platform.

Mr. Bollmann explained that the building was designed due to the slope of the lot and that the elevated loading dock is for trucks or trailers to be able to back directly up to the facility to unload.

Ms. Allee asked what size the trucks were expected to be.

Mr. Bollmann stated that it will likely be trucks smaller than a semi, similar to a U-Haul style rental truck.

Ms. Litecky asked if the applicant would like to make a statement in favor of the request.

Mr. Bollmann is present and willing to answer questions

Ms. Litecky asked if the Board had any questions for the applicant.

There were none.

Ms. Litecky asked if anyone wished to speak in favor.

There were none.

Ms. Litecky asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition.

There were none.

Ms. Litecky asked Ms. Gibson to read the staff analysis.

Ms. Gibson read Part B and C of the staff report for ZBA 24-02, with a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Litecky asked if the Commissioners had questions for staff.

There were none.

Ms. Litecky asked if there were questions from anyone to anyone.

Ms. Deborah Bridges stepped forward and expressed concern about Washington Street being closed for events and stated that a detour sign would be helpful for businesses in the area.

Mr. Steve Mitchell, Economic Development Director for the City of Carbondale, stepped forward and discussed the issues that Ms. Bridges expressed concern for. Mr. Mitchell stated that Washington Street will likely be closed for a shorter period of time once the event plaza is constructed, as part of the reason the street is closed so early for events currently is due to the stage needing erected each time.

Ms. Litecky asked if detour signs were to be used if it would solve Ms. Bridges problems.

Ms. Bridges stated that a large part of the problem is the length of time that Washington Street is closed for an event, sometimes covering an entire business day.

Mr. Love asked if Washington Street can be closed and reopened as needed on days of events.

Mr. Mitchell stated that it was possible but that it was a conversation that Public Works would need to be involved in.

Ms. Litecky declared ZBA 24-02 closed and asked for a motion on whether the applicant has standing to make this application.

Mr. Love moved that applicant has the standing to make this application, seconded by Mr. Shukites.

The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Litecky asked for a motion on the finding of fact.

Mr. Love moved that Parts A and B, and the applicant, and zero people spoke in favor, zero people spoke in opposition, zero letters in favor or opposition were submitted, and one citizen provided comment, all be accepted as the findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Lilly.

The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Litecky asked for a motion on whether the board would like to vote consider all five criteria as one or separately.

Mr. Shukites moved to make a motion to consider all five criteria as one, seconded by Mr. Love.

Roll Call Vote

Yes – 5 (Shukites, Love, Lilly, Allee, Litecky)
No – 0

Ms. Litecky stated the motion carries and all criteria will be considered as one.

Ms. Litecky asked for a motion on if the applicant has met all five criteria.

Mr. Love moved that the applicant has met all five criteria, seconded by Ms. Lilly.

Roll Call Vote

Yes – 5 (Shukites, Love, Lilly, Allee, Litecky)
No – 0

Ms. Litecky stated that the Board finds the applicant has met all five criteria for granting a variance.

Ms. Litecky asked for a motion on granting the variance.

Mr. Shukites moved to grant the variance of ZBA 24-02, seconded by Mr. Love.

Roll Call Vote

Yes – 5 (Shukites, Love, Lilly, Allee, Litecky)
No – 0

Ms. Litecky stated that the variance has been approved.

5. **Old Business:**

   Mr. Doherty gave an update on City Council.

6. **New Business**

   a. Vote on By-Laws update – Mr. Love questioned the exclusion of various portions of the previous bylaws in the proposed update. Mr. Love inquired about sections of the proposed update pertaining to elections, officer terms, and attendance of commissioners. Mr. Love also questioned why a section pertaining to seating at the

Commission table being limited to Commissioners and Commission Staff was not included.

Mr. Lenzini explained that the bylaws were being updated in an attempt by the City to give all Commissions and Boards cohesive bylaws so that all committees acted similarly.

Ms. Gibson stated that her understanding is that many of the things removed from the proposed bylaws update are already included or covered by Title 1 of the Carbondale Revised Code. Ms. Gibson explained that Title 1 includes clerical and code of conduct standards that apply to all committees or boards for the City. Ms. Gibson stated that she was unsure if the portions Mr. Love questioned were part of Title 1.

Mr. Lenzini asked if the Commission would like to revisit the bylaws at the next meeting so that their questions may be answered.

The Commissioners agreed unanimously to revisit the Bylaws Update.

b. Hold Officer Elections – Officer Elections were postponed for a future meeting.

7. Adjournment:

Ms. Litecky asked for a motion to adjourn

Mr. Love made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Allee.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.