GUNNISON COUNTY, COLORADO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT
for MINOR IMPACT

Land Use Change Permit Application: Ragged Mountain Fire District
Application No: LUC-12-00003
Date application scheduled with Planning Commission: May 18, 2012
Prepared by: Cathie Pagano, Planner

APPLICANT NAME:	Joanne Fagan, Consultant
PROPERTY OWNER NAME:	Ragged Mountain Fire District
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Ragged Mountain is requesting the approval of a new 6,750 square foot building to store fire equipment. The facility will primarily be used as secondary staging and storage area to service remote areas. The facility will function as an annex to the Paonia fire facilities and most fire fighters will be transported to the site via van when needed. The 2,250 square foot basement will be used primarily for water tank, mechanical equipment and storage of rescue gear.
PROPERTY LOCATION:	The parcel is legally described as being approximately 5.331 acres in the NW1/4 SW1/4, Section 11, Township 13 South, Range 90 West, 6th p.m. and is on the old Highway 133 (which is across the North Fork of the Gunnison River from the existing Highway 133).
SURROUNDING LAND USES:	Uses adjacent to the subject parcel include Oxbow Mining and federal land.
AGENCY AND DEPARTMENT REVIEWS:	• Gunnison County Public Works • Division of Wildlife • Emergency Services • Gunnison County Environmental Health • CDOT • Colorado Geological Survey
PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE:	Staff met with representatives from Fire District in 2011.
STATUS OF APPLICATION:	• Complete
ATTACHED EXHIBITS:	• Copy of Minor Impact application • Comments from Gunnison County Wildlife Coordinator dated Dec. 6, 2010
PLANNING COMMISSION TASKS AT INITIAL WORK SESSION:	— Acknowledge receipt of application by applicant name, name of development (if applicable) and date of application — Hear applicant presentation — Identify and consider issues — Determine impact classification, considering both by definition and criteria of Section 3-111: B. 1. — Create list at end of meeting of items to be addressed at next meeting, and the date by which related information is to be submitted — Set site visit date — Determine if application is ready to be set for public hearing, or if other work session is required

INITIAL IMPACT CLASSIFICATION:		Application is initially classified as Major Impact based on Section 7-101: B. Applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission change the impact classification to Minor Impact based on their responses to Section 3-111.B.1. found on page 2 of the cover letter.
OTHER CRITERIA OF IMPACT CLASSIFICATION (SEC. 3-111. B. 1.)		**Demand for public services.** The proposed land use change is expected to generate a minor or a major demand for public services, including roads, transit, schools, water supply, sewage disposal, fire and police protection, and emergency services. **Impacts on impact area and the environment.** The proposed land use change is expected to generate a minor or a major impact on the impact area. **Impacts related to all existing and proposed development and proposed development in impact area.** The impacts of the proposed land use change, when considered in conjunction with existing and proposed land use changes in the impact area, are expected to be minor.
EA or EIS is required for this project	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Project located in Special Geographic Area	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Phasing proposed	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Is a Partially Exempted land use change (Section 1-106)	☐ Yes ☒ No	

APPLICABILITY OF *LAND USE RESOLUTION* STANDARDS:

STANDARD, BY LUR SECTION, DIVISION AND/OR ARTICLE	Plan complies, or compliance will be determined during review	Staff Comments/ References to specific documentation
9-101: E. and F.: Secondary residences are allowed, and standards are addressed in covenants	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-102: Home occupations	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-103: Bed and breakfast	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-203: Mobile home communities	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-302: Farm or ranch stand	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-303: Dude ranches and resorts	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-304: Adult-oriented uses	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application

9-305: Seasonal recreational vehicle parks and campgrounds	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-400: Minerals and construction materials	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-501: Special events	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-502: Temporary structures	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-503: Satellite dishes	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-504: Attached wireless communications devices	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-505: Freestanding wireless communications structures	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-506: Child care center	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-507: Group home	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-508: Keeping of livestock not on an agricultural operation	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-509: Camping on individual parcel	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
9-600: Essential housing	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
10-102: Locational standards for residential development	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
10-103: Residential density	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	Not requested as part of this application
10-104: Locational standards for commercial, industrial or other non-residential uses	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Proposed location is not within a three mile plan area and shall be reviewed under the Alternative Locational Standards. The applicant submitted the following responses to those standards: a. The fire district selected this site due to its proximity and access to the state highway and to its service area. b. The purpose of the facility is to provide better response times to fight fires within the Ragged Mt Fire District. The only close municipality is Somerset and the district did not find an appropriate parcel there. The site selected also provided better emergency response for the district as a whole. c. The facility is intended to store fire-fighting equipment

		to serve the rural area in which the building is being constructed. d. As noted in our application, the facility adjoins properties owned by one mining company and is a neighbor to the West Elk mining. Note the other adjoining property is BLM. The fire equipment storage will have far less negative impact on adjacent lands than would a single family home in terms of vehicle trips, utilities, impacts on public facilities. The appearance of the building will be less obtrusive than its neighbor, West Elk. e. The intent is to store fire equipment within the district in a readily accessible location to lower the response times. This site is appropriate for those purposes. f. The intent is to store fire equipment within the district in a readily accessible location to lower the response times. This site is appropriate for those purposes.
11-102: Voluntary best management practices	No submittal requirements and no standard	
11-103: Development in flood hazard areas	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel and proposed development are not located within a 100-year floodplain.
11-104: Development in geologic hazard areas	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	The subject parcel is in an area of geologic hazards. The applicant has submitted a "Geotechnical Engineering Study, Proposed Fire Station Facility, Somerset, Colorado," prepared by Lambert and Associates, dated June 16, 2011. A copy of the application has also been referred to CGS. On May 4, 2012, Karen Berry sent staff an email noting "The rockfall hazard report does not include the model inputs. Without input parameters, it is difficult to evaluate the rockfall model. Also, the current simulation shows that is a 20% risk of large boulders passing the mitigation feature (ditch/berm). Does this amount of risk meet county requirements? The conditions of the slope (Figure 3 on page 133 is not clear on the copy) is not readable on our copy. It is also difficult to see the results at 1,521' on page 135 of the copy. How many rocks made it to the proposed firehouse location? We would like to get the missing information and readable graphics before completing our review." Staff has asked the applicant to provide the requested information.

11-105: Development in wildfire hazard areas	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	The subject parcel is in an area of high and extreme wildfire hazards. The slope at the proposed building site is approximately 15%.
11-106: Protection of wildlife habitat areas	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	A copy of the application has been referred to the Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife. In an email dated April 23, 2012 J Wenum stated, "Due to the low wildlife habitat value of the site (reclaimed coal mine site) and drainage control in the proposal (should address water quality/aquatic issues) we don't see a need to provide formal comments on this project. So you will not be receiving a formal response on this."
11-107: Protection of water quality	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel is not within 125 feet of a water body.
11-108: Standards for development on ridgelines	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel is not on a ridgeline.
11-109: Development that affects agricultural lands	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel and/or proposed development does not affect agricultural lands.
11-110: Development beyond snowplowed access	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel is not beyond snowplowed access.
11-111: Development on Inholdings in national wilderness	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel is not an inholding.
11-112: Development above timberline	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel is not above timberline.
12-103: Road system	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	A referral has been sent to Public Works and the Colorado Dept. of Transportation for review. Dan Roussin noted in an email dated April 20 that two access permits have been granted for this site.
12-104: Trails	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	No public trails exist on the property and no new public trails are contemplated in this application.
12-105: Water Supply	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	The District has applied for and received Well Permit No. 287510 and is valid for drinking and sanitary facilities and may be used to fill an enclosed storage tank provided the tank outlet is capped and locked and available only for fire fighting.
12-106: Wastewater treatment	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	A copy of the application was referred to Environmental Health. Richard Stenson submitted comments stating that "An ISDS should be feasible for this use with the following conditions: The ISDS and floor drain designs should be reviewed and be given stamped approval by the Geotechnical Engineer for slope strength and settlement considerations. The ISDS and floor drains should consider the June 16, 2011 Lambert and Associates GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING STUDY OF THE

		PROPOSED FIRE STATION FACILITY. Specifically, Section 4.0, "ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS". The section states that septic systems could "adversely influence the integrity of slope stability". 1. The ISDS design submittal will need to meet the requirements of Section 3-112 of the Gunnison County ISDS Regulations—amended 2010. 2. In reference to the "separate leachfield or holding tank" for the proposed floor drains the applicant will be required to: a. Provide a design for review and possible approval by the County; and b. Provide information from the EPA Underground Injection Program that this applied for-use is approved.
12-107: Fire protection	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Applicable, the parcel is in the Gunnison Fire District but would be served by responders from Paonia or Delta.
13-102: B.: Location within municipal three-mile plan area	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The subject parcel is not within a three-mile area.
13-103: General Site Plan Standards And Lot Measurements	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Application meets the minimum requirements of this Section.
13-104: Setbacks From Property Lines And Road Rights-Of-Way	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Proposed development complies with commercial setback requirements as identified in this Section.
13-105: Residential Building Sizes And Lot Coverages	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	No residential use is proposed as part of this application.
13-106: Energy And Resource Conservation	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	This section is not applicable because no residential structure is proposed.
13-107: Installation Of Solid-Fuel-Burning Devices	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	No solid fuel burning device is proposed as part of this application.
13-108: Open Space And Recreation Areas	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	No requirement for open space is required of this application.
13-109: Signs	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	No signs requested as part of this application.
13-110: Off-Road Parking And Loading	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	There is adequate area on the parcel for parking of the vehicles which is shown on the site plan.
13-111: Landscaping And Buffering	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	A landscaping plan is required. The applicant intends to revegetate disturbed areas with native vegetation.

13-112: Snow Storage	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Applicable, the application has been sent to Public Works for review.
13-113: Fencing	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	No fencing has been requested in the application.
13-114: Exterior Lighting	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Compliance with this Section is required.
13-115: Reclamation And Noxious Weed Control	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Compliance with this Section is required.
13-116: Grading And Erosion Control	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	If grading of the site is proposed a reclamation permit shall be required.
13-117: Drainage, Construction And Post-Construction Storm Water Runoff	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	The proposed development is required to comply with this Section. Staff has requested the applicant submit documentation from a Colorado-licensed engineer demonstrating compliance with these standards.
13-118: Water Impoundments	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	No water impoundments are proposed as part of this application.
13-119: Standards To Ensure Compatible Uses	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	To be determined by the Planning Commission during review of the application.