

GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PRELIMINARY AMENDED AGENDA: Friday, May 4, 2018

Board of County Commissioners Meeting Room
Gunnison County Courthouse
200 E. Virginia Avenue

- 8:15 a.m.**
- **Call to order; determine quorum**
 - **Approval of Minutes**
 - **Unscheduled citizens:** A brief period in which the public is invited to make general comments or ask questions of the Commission or Planning Staff about items which are not scheduled on the day's agenda.
- 8:30 a.m.** **Adventure Headquarters, William Cote,** continued public hearing, request for a commercial service business, providing stand-up paddle board instruction, rental, tours and misc. retail. Located approximately 27 miles west of the City of Gunnison, 12299 Highway 50, Blue Mesa Point, legally described as 6.43-acres in the NE/4SW/4, Section 5,T48N, R4W, NMPM **LUC-18-00008**
- 9:00 a.m.** **Board of County Commissioners/Planning Commission,** work session, discussion of issues of mutual interest
- 10:00 a.m.** **Rocky Mountain Biological Lab,** continued public hearing, request to host weddings and conference/workshops in Gothic, as well as expand winter use in Gothic to increase structured education programs and research. North Pole Basin improvements would permit up to 3,000 square feet of new construction, spread across six structures, to expand research and education programming. Schofield Park improvements would permit construction of up to 2,500 square feet of new construction, spread across two structures (one existing) limited to only research and education.
LUC-17- 00026
- Lunch**
- 1:00 p.m.** **APT Brush Creek Road, LLC,** continued public hearing with BOCC, request for the development of 240 rental units on the subject parcel. 65% (156) of the units will be deed restricted to qualifying households earning less than 180% of the Area Median Income. The remainder of the units (84) will be free market rental units, located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Brush Creek Road and Highway 135, approximately 1.5 miles south of the Town of Crested Butte. The parcel is approximately 14.29 acres and is legally described as all of land in Section 12, Township 14 South, Range 86 West, 6th p.m., lying south and east of Brush Creek Road, and west of Larkspur Subdivision **LUC-17- 00034**

Adjourn

The applications can be viewed on gunnisoncounty.org,

link to <http://204.132.78.100/citizenaccess/>

- Public access
- Projects
- Application #
- **LUC-18-00008**
- **LUC-17- 00026**
- **LUC-17- 00034**
- Attachments

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
May 4, 2018

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting in the Planning Commission Meeting Room in the Blackstock Government Center, 221 N. Wisconsin, Gunnison, Co. **Present:**

Chairperson- Kent Fulton Commissioner- AJ Cattles Commissioner-Vince Rogalski Commissioner-Molly Mugglestone Alternate Commissioner- Daniel Spivey Alternate Commissioner- Diego Plata	Director of Community Development- Cathie Pagano Asst. Director- Neal Starkebaum Planner- Rachel Sabbato Manager of Administrative Services- Beth Baker Others present as listed in text
---	--

Recused/Absent; Commissioners- absent Jack Diani, recused from APT Brush Creek Rd. item Kent Fulton

With a quorum present Chairperson Fulton opened the May 4, 2018 regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Fulton seated commissioners Plata and Spivey for the Adventure Headquarters agenda item.

Approval of Minutes: Moved by Rogalski seconded by Plata to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes dated, April 6, 2018, as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

Adventure Headquarters (LUC-18-00008): The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a continued public hearing, to discuss the request for a commercial service business, providing stand-up paddle board instruction, rental, tours and misc. retail. Located approximately 27 miles west of the City of Gunnison, 12299 Highway 50, Blue Mesa Point, legally described as 6.43-acres in the NE/4SW/4, Section 5, T48N, R4W, NMPM.

Present representing the Planning Commission: Commissioners Fulton, Mugglestone, Rogalski, Plata and Spivey

Present representing staff: Assistant Director of Community Development Neal Starkebaum and Community Development Services Manager Beth Baker.

Present representing the application: Summer Clark.

With a quorum present Chairperson Fulton opened the continued public hearing.

Clark described the signage and noted it is 5' x5'. She has submitted photos as requested at the previous meeting.

Starkebaum said Colorado Department of Transportation has granted an access permit.

Moved by Mugglestone seconded by Rogalski to approve Adventure Headquarters LUC-18-00008, as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant is requesting a commercial service business, providing stand-up paddle board rentals, instruction, tours and ancillary sale of miscellaneous retail products, including the use of a small portable office/storage building. The business will operate seasonally, during daylight hours, summer months.

LOCATION:

The site is located on a portion of a 6.43-acre parcel, adjacent to Highway 50, approximately 27 miles west of the City of Gunnison, 12299 Highway 50, Blue Mesa Point, legally described as being in the NE/4SW/4, Section 5, T48N, R4W, NMPM

ADJACENT LAND USES:

North: Agricultural

South: Residential

West: Commercial (Old Blue Mesa Point gas station & RV park)

East: Residential/Commercial

PLANS/REPORTS/SUBMITTALS:

Plans, reports, and other submittal documents informing this Decision include, but are not limited to:

- Minor Impact Land Use Change Application and site plan

This review and Decision incorporates, but is not limited to, all the documentation submitted to the County and included within the Planning Department file relative to this application; including all exhibits, references, testimony and documents as included therein.

SITE VISIT:

The Commission members determined that they were familiar with the site and a site visit was not necessary.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A public hearing was held on April 6, 2018 and continued to May 4, 2018; at that time, no public was present.

MEETINGS WITH PLANNING COMMISSION:

March 16, 2018 – Work session

April 6 & May 4, 2018 - Public Hearing

COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF THE GUNNISON COUNTY LAND USE RESOLUTION:**Section 9-301: Commercial and Industrial Uses.**

The applicant is proposing a commercial service business.

D. General Standards:

D.1: Non Residential Accessory Uses: The proposed use is not accessory to a residential use.

D.2: Food Service Requirements: No food service is proposed as part of this application.

D.3: Electrical Disturbances: No use of equipment that creates electrical disturbances is anticipated at the site.

D.4: Fire and Explosive Hazards: No materials or products that decompose by detonation are proposed to be stored at the site.

D.5. Glare and Heat: No glare or heat producing activities are anticipated or expected at the site.

D.6. Exterior Lighting: No exterior lighting is proposed.

D.7. Odors: No odors are anticipated or expected.

D.8. Radioactivity: No radioactive materials are proposed to be stored on site.

D.9. Vibration: No activities that cause vibration are expected to occur along the property boundaries.

D.10. Noise: No significant noise is anticipated as a result of this application.

Section 10-102: Locational Residential Development:

Not applicable. No subdivision of the property or additional residential use is proposed.

Section 10-103: Residential Density:

Not applicable. No subdivision of the property or additional residential use is proposed.

Section 10-104: Locational Standards for Commercial, Industrial and Other Non-Residential Development

B. PRIMARY LOCATIONAL STANDARD. Proposed commercial, industrial and other non-residential development shall be reviewed for its location relative to existing development. In order of priority, this new growth should be located:

1. ADJACENT TO INCORPORATED MUNICIPALITY. A proposed commercial, industrial, or other non-residential development should be located adjacent to a municipal boundary on land that qualifies for annexation into the municipality by meeting the criteria of the *Colorado Municipal Annexation Act*, C.R.S. 31-12-101.

• The property is not located adjacent to an incorporated municipality.

2. CONSISTENT WITH A MUNICIPAL THREE MILE PLAN AREA. When the proposal is for development located within a municipal three-mile plan area, the development proposal shall address how it comports with the objectives and policies of the applicable municipal three-mile plan. The County shall consider how the proposed development has addressed those objectives and policies, and any further intergovernmental agreement between the County and the municipal government regarding the three-mile plan area. Where there is a conflict between the objectives or policies of a three-mile plan or the intergovernmental agreement, and County standards, County standards shall apply.

• The property is not within a municipal Three Mile Plan area.

C. ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONAL STANDARDS. When the applicant has demonstrated that a proposed commercial, light industrial, industrial or other non-residential development cannot satisfy the primary locational standard, the location may be approved if the Board finds that in addition to meeting all of the other applicable requirements of this *Resolution*, the cumulative impacts of the proposed development and existing development will result in no significant net adverse impact to neighborhood uses, wildlife, visual quality, air or water quality, and the proposed use complies with the following:

1. LOCATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.

a. NECESSARY LOCATION. The location is necessary because of specific circumstances including location of minerals, unique transportation needs or geologic conditions; or

b. NO SITE IS REASONABLY ATTAINABLE IN OR ADJACENT TO THE NEAREST MUNICIPALITY OR EXISTING PERMITTED BUSINESS OR INDUSTRIAL PARK. There is no site reasonably attainable within or adjacent to the municipality or existing permitted businesses or industrial park nearest the proposed development site, in an area that qualifies for annexation, or is consistent with a municipal Three Mile Plan area. Evaluation of suitability shall consider size of parcel needed, reasonable availability of necessary utilities and other infrastructure, and the applicant shall provide documentation of comparable sites. Economic feasibility or practicality of comparable sites may be considered, but shall not be the deciding factor in determining suitability; or

c. LOCATION WELL-SUITED TO SPECIFIC USE. The proposed location is particularly well-suited for the specific use (recreational facilities, including dude ranches or resorts); provided, however, that location in a high traffic area or on a highway artery shall not, in and of itself, qualify a proposed commercial development for approval; or

• The location is well-suited to provide a commercial recreational stand up paddle board rental or tour options for visitors to the Blue Mesa Reservoir, Curecanti National Recreation Area and the Black Canyon National Park, as the property is located in the immediate vicinity.

d. NEED OR USE IS WELL-SUITED IN A PARTICULAR AREA. There is a documented need for the specific use in the proposed location; or

e. USE IS DESIGNED TO SERVE A SPECIFIC RESIDENTIAL AREA. The development will be located and designed primarily to serve an integral part of a specific residential area or development, and shall provide services that are reasonably likely to reduce vehicle trips between the residential area and population centers.

2. COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING USES ESTABLISHED IN IMPACT AREA. The proposed use is compatible with uses established in the impact area.

- Several existing commercial uses are established adjacent to the property, including a gas station, and RV park.

3. NO SIGNIFICANT NET ADVERSE EFFECT. There will be no significant net adverse effect, including cumulative impacts when there is a reasonable probability that there are cumulative impacts, of the proposed and existing developments on adjacent land uses, County or other infrastructure, or public health, safety or welfare, or the environment.

- The operation of the business will result in no significant net adverse impact to neighborhood uses, wildlife, visual quality, air or water quality

Section: 11-102: *Voluntary Best Management Practices*

Voluntary; not mandated.

Section 11-103: *Development in Areas Subject to Flood Hazards.*

The site is not located within an area subject to flood hazards, according to County mapping.

Section 11-104: *Development in Areas Subject to Geologic Hazards.*

The subject parcel is not located within an area of geologic hazards, according to County mapping.

Section 11-105: *Development in Areas Subject to Wildfire Hazards.*

The subject parcel is in a low wildfire hazard area, according to County mapping.

Section 11-106: *Protection of Wildlife Habitat Areas.*

The site is adjacent to an existing residence and developed neighborhood. No additional impacts to wildlife at the site are anticipated.

Section 11-107: *Protection of Water Quality.*

Not applicable. The site is not located within 125 feet of a water body.

Section 11-109: *Development That Affects Agricultural Lands.*

No additional impacts to the limited agricultural use to the north.

Section 12-103: *Road System.*

There is existing commercial access from Highway 50. No additional improvements are necessary at this location. CDOT has issued State access permit #318030, May 1, 2018.

Section 12-104: *Public Trails.*

Not applicable. The applicant has not proposed any public trails on the property.

Section 12-105: *Water Supply.*

Not applicable. No water use is proposed.

Section 12-106: *Sewage Disposal/Wastewater Treatment.*

An onsite porta let will serve patrons of the business.

Section 12-107: *Fire Protection.*

The parcel is in the Gunnison County Fire Protection District and subject to their regulations and standards.

Section 13-103: *General Site Plan Standards and Lot Measurements.*

The proposed location complies with property line setback requirements. Site Plan submitted with application.

Section 13-107: *Installation of Solid Fuel-Burning Devices*

Not applicable. No installation of solid-fuel burning devices is proposed.

Section 13-108: *Open Space and Recreation Areas*

Not applicable. No open space is required for this use.

Section 13-109: *Signs.*

The applicant has submitted a specific sign proposal. The signage is compliant.

Section 13-110: *Off-Road Parking and Loading.*

The site provides sufficient off-road parking and loading.

Section 13-111: *Landscaping and Buffering.*

Landscaping and buffering is not specifically required. There is existing vegetation at the site, between the property and the highway.

Section 13-112: *Snow storage.*

Not applicable. This is a seasonal use.

Section 13-113: *Fencing*

No fencing is proposed.

Section 13-114: *Exterior Lighting.*

No exterior lighting is proposed.

Section 13-115: *Reclamation and Noxious Weed Control.*

Not applicable. No site disturbance is proposed.

Section 13-116: *Grading and Erosion Control.*

Not applicable. No site disturbance is proposed.

Section 13-117: *Drainage, Construction and Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff.*

Not applicable. No site disturbance is proposed.

Section 13-118: *Standards to Ensure Compatible Uses.*

The site has been designed in a manner that will not adversely affect the character of nearby residential areas.

- There are no residences within proximity to the use (other than the owner's). The closest residence is approximately 500 feet east of the site.
- Other commercial businesses are within the immediate area, including a gas station and RV park to the west.

FINDINGS:

The Commission finds that:

1. This application is a Minor Impact Project.
2. The proposed use meets the locational standards for commercial use.
3. The proposal is compatible with the existing neighborhood and the proposed development has been designed in a manner that will not adversely affect the character of nearby residential areas:
 - There are no residences within proximity to the use (other than the owner's). The closest residence is approximately 500 feet east of the site.
 - Other commercial businesses are located within the immediate area, including a gas station and RV park to the west.
4. This permit is limited to activities described within the "Project Description" of this application, and as depicted on the site plan as submitted. Expansion or change of this use will require either an

application for amendment of this permit, or submittal of an application for a new permit, in compliance with applicable requirements of the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*.

5. This review and decision incorporates, but is not limited to, all the documentation submitted to the County and included within the Planning Office file relative to this application; including all exhibits, references and documents as included therein.

DECISION:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission, having reviewed all the documentation submitted to the County and included within the Planning Office file relative to this application, including all exhibits, references and documents as included therein, and including provision of a public hearing, and having reached the above cited Findings, classifies LUC No. 2018-08, Cote – Adventure Headquarters as a Minor Impact Project, approves the Land Use Change Permit with the following conditions, and that said approval shall be memorialized by recordation of a Minor Impact Certificate with the Gunnison County Clerk and Recorder:

1. This permit is limited to activities described within the "Project Description" of this application, and as depicted on the site plan submitted as part of this application. Expansion or change of this use will require either an application for amendment of this permit, or submittal of an application for a new permit, in compliance with applicable requirements of the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*.
2. The applicant shall obtain any necessary permits, as may be required by the National Park Service for conducting commercial tours within the Curecanti National Recreation Area or the Black Canyon National Park.
3. This permit may be revoked or suspended if Gunnison County determines that any material fact set forth herein or represented by the applicant was false or misleading, or that the applicant failed to disclose facts necessary to make any such fact not misleading.
4. The removal or material alteration of any physical feature of the property (geological, topographical or vegetative) relied on herein to mitigate a possible conflict shall require a new or amended land use change permit.

Board of County Commissioners/ Planning Commission: The Gunnison County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners conducted a work session to discuss issues of mutual interest.

With a quorum present Fulton opened the work session

Present representing the Planning Commission: Commissioners: Fulton, Cattles, Mugglestone, Rogalski, Plata and Spivey. Board of County Commissioners: Jonathan Houck, Phil Chamberland and John Messner.

Present representing staff: Director of Community Development Cathie Pagano, Assistant Director of Community Development Neal Starkebaum, Planner Rachel Sabbato and Community Development Services Manager Beth Baker.

The Planning Commissioners and the Board of County Commissioners discussed:

- The new river put in by Garlic Mikes
- LUR amendments
- Linkage fee nexus updates
- New septic regulations
- Transportation impact fee nexus
- Tiny home communities / mobile home communities
- Long term camping updates- limitation on how long one can camp, creating categories that makes sense

- Sage-grouse updates: Litigation is ongoing, and we are continuing with our regulations because it is good land use management policy
- Oil and gas permits
- How to address public access, developing trail access, and creating tools for encouraging providing public trail access
- Affordable housing projects and deed restrictions
- Three Mile Plan
- Development of affordable housing in the City of Gunnison
- Conducting meetings with the other municipalities

Fulton closed the work session at 10:00 A.M.

Rocky Mountain Biological Lab (LUC-17-00026): The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a continued public hearing, to discuss the request to host weddings and conference/workshops in Gothic, as well as expand winter use in Gothic to increase structured education programs and research. North Pole Basin improvements would permit up to 3,000 square feet of new construction, spread across six structures, to expand research and education programming. Schofield Park improvements would permit construction of up to 2,500 square feet of new construction, spread across two structures (one existing) limited to only research and education.

Present representing the Planning Commission: Commissioners Fulton, Mugglestone, Rogalski, Plata and Spivey.

Present representing staff: Planner Rachel Sabato, Assistant Director of Community Development Neal Starkebaum and Community Development Services Manager Beth Baker.

Present representing the application Ian Billick.

With a quorum present Chairperson Fulton opened the continued public hearing.

Sabato explained the last meeting was conducted December 1, 2017, the meeting was continued because of the outstanding winter road use issues. She said the applicant has the option to separate the winter uses from the application and proceed or wait until the Board of County Commissioners has concluded their review of the winter road uses.

Billick summarized the documents he submitted:

- Winter Travel Management Plan
- Compatibility with Neighborhood both Schofield and North Pole Basin
- Summer Traffic and Parking Management
- Winter Safety Travel Plan
- Winter Snowmobile Uses

He said the summer events traffic numbers were based upon previous years. The larger group conferences would be conducted August 15th to November 1st. Mission related conferences in the fall are currently allowed. The parking is enforced using parking passes. He said the larger buses and trucks have two areas to turn around. There are multiple parking lots, three large and several smaller throughout the campus. Staff members enforce the parking.

He explained they would like to continue using the cabins in North Pole Basin and Schofield for the scientists. He has asked if the cabins could be replaced if they are removed. He noted there is a conservation easement on the property, and they are constrained to 3000 sq. ft. of structures. There is not sufficient need to rebuild any structures at this time.

He said they would be using the existing winter safety travel to determine when travel should not happen, ensuring winter travel would be carefully managed. He said they used the Maroon Hut last year.

Billick explained why they have expanded into hosting weddings. RMBL must have a financial model which allows them to be successful. The fees from the weddings help to fund the operations and cover maintenance costs generated from the general pressure on the site. Weddings are conducted from August 15th through the fall.

Bill Oliver asked about the increased snowmobile use in the corridor. Fulton said it be decided by the Board of County Commissioners and RMBL will adhere to the BOCC regulations.

Billick suggested going ahead with the application and guaranteeing RMBL would adhere to the BOCC decision. Public Works Director Marlene Crosby and Director of Community and Economic Development Cathie Pagano were not in favor of that option, noting the potential for conflict is possible.

Fulton asked if we wait for the BOCC does that hinder the summer uses: Billick said it could.

The commissioners agreed they were ready for a draft recommendation of approval of the summer uses.

The commissioners directed staff to prepare a draft decision of approval for everything that does not concern winter uses.

Fulton continued the public hearing to June 15, 2018 @ 9:00 A.M.

APT Brush Creek (LUC-17-00034): The Gunnison County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners conducted a continued joint public hearing to discuss the request for the development of 240 rental units on the subject parcel. 65% (156) of the units will be deed restricted to qualifying households earning less than 180% of the Area Median Income. The remainder of the units (84) will be free market rental units, located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Brush Creek Road and Highway 135, approximately 1.5 miles south of the Town of Crested Butte. The parcel is approximately 14.29 acres and is legally described as all of land in Section 12, Township 14 South, Range 86 West, 6th p.m., lying south and east of Brush Creek Road, and west of Larkspur Subdivision.

Chairperson Kent Fulton has recused himself from the review of this application.

Commissioner Diani has been appointed Chairperson for this review and Commissioner AJ Cattles has been appointed Vice-Chairperson. Chairperson Diani was absent from the May 4, 2018 meeting.

Mugglestone moved to appoint Cattles as acting Chairperson seconded by Rogalski, the motion passed unanimously.

With a quorum present acting Chairperson Cattles opened the continued joint public hearing.

Present representing the Planning Commission: Commissioners Cattles, Mugglestone, and Rogalski,

Present representing staff: Director of Community and Economic Development Cathie Pagano and Community Development Services Manager Beth Baker.

Present representing the application: applicant Gary Gates, application representative John O'Neal, attorney Kendall Burgemesiter, designers Margaret Loperfido and Andrew Hadley, Gatesco representatives Ben Van Someren and Jeff Moffitt, and engineer Tyler Harpel.

Hadley explained the changes made as result of public input:

- Unit count reduced from 240 to 220
- 20 units converted from rental to deed-restricted for-sale
- Increased minimum setback along Brush Creek Road from 30' to 45'
- Reduced bedroom county from 408 to 341

- Decreased building density along Brush Creek Road
- Decreased building square footage by 10%
- Decreased building county from 32 to 26

Hadley presented a power point illustrating the project renderings.

- Southbound Hwy 135
- Southbound Hwy 135 at Brush Creek Rd.
- Northbound Hwy 135
- Westbound Brush Creek Rd.
- Hwy 135 and Brush Creek Rd.
- Eastbound Brush Creek Rd.
- 10 Plex Buildings (2)
- 4-Plex and 10-Plex Buildings

Hadley said the average unit size is 800 sq. ft. He compared it to house sizes in Skyland which can be up to 10,000 sq. ft. He compared the maximum height at 32 ft., and Skyland at 42 ft. He compared the screening used in the Riverland Subdivision, describing it as minimal versus the significant screening proposed at the Corner of Brush Creek. He noted there is great density surrounding the proposed project. He compared the density in the Town of Crested Butte to the Corner at Brush Creek. He added the Anthracite Place affordable housing units were not originally well received by the Town, but now it is very successful. He acknowledged there have been parking variances allowed, but noted that affordable housing requires some variances.

In response to the photos of Gatesco properties submitted by Mr. Eastwood at an earlier meeting Van Someren presented a power point of the Gatesco portfolio in the greater Houston area. He explained the area:

- 6,652 total units
- 21 with fire/foundation issues
- 75 hurricane damaged
- 16 down units acquired in the last six months
- 6,529 total habitable units
- Percentage uninhabitable is 1.8%
- Percentage habitable is 93.8%
- Gatesco does not own Belfort Village

Van Someren invited Mr. Eastwood to Houston view the Gatesco properties.

Gatesco representative Jeff Moffitt provided a research and analysis report. He said there is a lot of support for the project. They sent flyers out to registered voters asking if the recipient was in favor of affordable housing, the flyer did not mention the Corner at Brush Creek. They also went door to door and collected 1,400 signatures in favor of the Corner at Brush Creek project, the majority from the south valley. Following an explanation of the survey he concluded there is overwhelming and widespread support for the Corner at Brush Creek development.

Pagano noted the Town of Crested Butte had submitted revised comments. Burgemeister said they have not prepared responses to the Town's revised comments yet. Pagano clarified her reference to the Homeowners Association (HOA,) explaining an HOA was not required before the applicant agreed to 20 for-sale units. The HOA will include the 20 for-sale units and the Corner at Brush Creek development. Covenants have been submitted for review. The specific details are expected at preliminary plan. The County is party to enforcement if the HOA is unable to do it.

Rogalski asked cable and wi-fi fees would be included: Burgemeister said no.

Public Comments: The speakers where all in favor of the concept of affordable housing.

Tom Hamilton was not convinced the conclusion being made by the surveys is accurate. He asked if the questions were about this particular proposal. The people most affected by this are not in line with this plan at this point in time. The problem is density.

Deidre Witherell questioned the comparisons of density of the surrounding areas. The density will impact the schools and traffic. She agreed with Hamilton on the surveys taken.

John Strute was concerned the project would not be all rented. What assurances do the citizens have it will not be half built and stop there?

David Leinsdor for the FOBC said Moffitt is misrepresenting what the postcards really represented, the postcards only asked if one supports affordable housing not this particular project. He read a letter in response to the applicant's response, dated May 4, 2018. He defined compatibility and said this project is too dense and not compatible with the surrounding development. He encouraged a recommendation of denial.

John Hess agreed with Leinsdorf. The proposed density is way too much for that particular parcel. He asked why it is not required to be part of the East River Sanitation District.

George Gibson submitted a compatibility and density memo. He challenged the density comparisons made by the applicant and the county staff. He cited incompatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods. He added concerns with buses running late at night, noise, increased traffic and density. He requested a denial of the project.

Jim Schmidt, Mayor of the Town of CB has never seen an application or an applicant that has created such overwhelming dissention. The postcards asked if they were in favor of affordable housing not this particular project. The parking lot and transit center has been withdrawn. Neither the Town of Crested Butte or Mt. Crested Butte have agreed to sell this property. The school is already overcrowded. He asked for a denial of the project.

Bob Pannier was concerned the flyers did not address this project, just affordable housing. Pollsters going door to door was not appropriate. This is not the right project.

Eileen Whitley cannot support this project. She identified her concerns as density, insufficient parking, increased traffic, possibility of the wastewater treatment plant failing, and congestion at the corner of Brush Creek Rd. and Highway 135. She requested a denial of the project.

Jim Starr supports the project, noting the density makes it more affordable. The impacts to the school and traffic will be created no matter where they exist. Placing workers close to their homes is the objective. The towns need to accept more density. This site is the closest site there is to town. He urged support of the project.

Jerry Burgess was part of the design team, but spoke as a community member. This project will make a dent in the housing problem. The water and wastewater plans meet CDPHE standards. The aesthetics are good. It would be a compatible, attractive, well designed, and professionally landscaped project. Density should be placed next to density. He urged an approval.

Dorothy Eastwood lives directly across the street and will be greatly impacted. She objects to the size and density. She pointed out the majority of the units are fair market rentals. There have been other builders interested and there are alternatives. She asked for a denial of the project.

Sue Navy received eight flyers. She noted the slides did not depict any traffic, particularly during the summer when all the second homeowners are back. She cited density, traffic and the lack of amenities. She urged a denial of the project.

David Leinsdorf said there have been over 45 hours of discussion, of that 75% has been the applicant and commissioners. He asked for a continuance of the public hearing.

Norman Eastwood lives across the street from the proposed development. He was concerned with other properties Gatesco owns in Houston and the lack of maintenance on them. He urged the commissioners to visit Houston and the Gatesco properties. He requested a denial of the property.

Wouter Van Tiel submitted a photograph of a 20 ft. post on the property for height and density comparison. He urged denial of the project.

Kent Cowherd Crested Butte Town Council was concerned with the lack of compatibility, insufficient parking, and views along the highway. He urged denial and coming together to work on affordable housing projects.

Mike Wright was concerned with the lack of compatibility, density, and the applicant should be required to tap into the East River Sanitation District.

Robert McCarter was concerned with the petition only asking about affordable housing but not referring to this project. He submitted signed petitions agreeing affordable housing is needed but not this project.

Grant Bremer said Mt. Crested Butte, the Town of Crested Butte, and CB South should allow more density in their municipalities. He urged the denial of the project.

Applicants Responses

Moffitt said the underlying issue is population growth. At 1.2 % increase per year there will be about five to six thousand more people in 20 years. There would be 2,100 housing units to even have a 0% vacancy rate.

Burgemeister:

- They did compare similar projects for their density comparison numbers. They included Pitchfork and the Dos Rios golf course multifamily units.
- Impacts on school and roads- the Highway 135 intersection and the school will have to be expanded and improved upon no matter what.
- Traffic preliminary analysis has been done a thorough analysis will be done at preliminary plan.
- A turn lane could be done.
- Concerns it will not be filled up- there is no minimum income level set, they will use the AMI.
- Will not allow ski crash pads.
- If the demand is there county residents will rent them.
- Density that is similar exists in the county. It works there and it can work here.
- They did not arbitrarily pick the density comparisons.
- The parking lot and transit center have not been lost, the transit center will still be built by the applicant. The bus loop is there. They have proposed to not pave the park and ride lot at this time.
- All four partners agreed to have this applicant present a plan, at the time of the RFP.
- The structuring of the HOA is complex and will be specific at preliminary plan.
- The County could operate the wastewater system with an agreement with the property owner.
- There will be no time shares or short term leasing.

Staff Responses

Pagano explained:

- The Memorandum of Agreement is not a planning commission issue. The sketch plan has been presented and that is what the planning commission decision will be based upon.
- A Development Improvements Agreement bond is collected from the applicant, estimated at 125 % of the cost of development. If the development is not completed, the County would use that money to complete the development.
- The HOA will be talked about specifically in the preliminary plan. The pro rata share of water and sewer fees will be addressed and the risk an owner could take on.

Mugglestone asked Mt. Crested Butte would be reviewing and voting on this project again: Pagano said they still have a vacancy on their board. It could be June before they look at it again.

Cattles noted the commissioners would be reviewing the applicants' response to the revised Town of Crested Butte comments at the next meeting. He urged the commissioners to be ready to give direction to staff at that meeting.

Mugglestone requested the Town of Crested Butte representatives be at the next meeting.

Pagano said the applicants' response to the revised Town of Crested comments should be submitted by May 11, 2018.

Bob Nevins Crested Butte town planner asked the commission, applicants and staff to respond to their questions by addressing the Land Use Resolution.

Cattles continued the joint public hearing to June 1, 2018 at 10:00 A.M. in the Gunnison County Courthouse.

The regular meeting of the Gunnison County Planning Commission was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

/S/ Beth Baker
Community Development Department Services Manager
Gunnison County Community Development Department