

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, February 15, 2024**

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. and on Zoom

Present:

Chairperson-Roland Mason Vice-Chairperson- Fred Niederer Commissioner- Eric Phillips Commissioner- Julie Baca Commissioner Matt Schwartz Alt. Commissioner- Bill Barvitski Alt. Commissioner Catherine McBreen BOCC – Jonathan Houck BOCC – Liz Smith BOCC – Laura Puckett Daniels	Director of Community and Economic Development- Cathie Pagano Director of Planning- Hilary Seminick Planner-Rachel Blondy Planning Technician – Jena Greene Others present as listed in text
---	--

Absent: None

Recused: None

Zoom:

With a quorum present Vice Chairperson Mason opened the February 15, 2024 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:45 am. New alternative planning commissioners Bill Barvitski and Catherine McBreen were welcomed, and it was noted that Eric Phillips was now appointed as a Commissioner.

Moved by Niederer seconded by Phillips to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated January 18, 2024. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Election of Officers

Chair - Moved by Baca, seconded by Schwartz, to elect Mason as Planning Commission Chair. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Vice Chair – Moved by Baca, seconded by Phillips, to elect Niederer as Planning Commission Vice Chair. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Unscheduled Citizens

None

Schwartz noted that he was now serving on Gunnison City Council as a Council member, and that issues would arise where he would need to recuse himself; City Council would be his priority, and that he would recues himself from County matters in order to participate on City Council.

Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners Joint Work Session: Greater Gunnison

Community Plan Draft Review. Review of the draft Greater Gunnison Community Plan, a detailed plan for long-term future land use and potential development north and west of the City of Gunnison within unincorporated Gunnison County.

Also present: Andie Ruggera, City of Gunnison Planner; Anton Sinkewich, City of Gunnison Community Development Director; Martin Schmidt, Gunnison County Public Works Director.

Staff Presentation: Seminick and Pagano gave an overview of the project. The state of Colorado allowed for the county to plan to fit the community. The City of Gunnison had set zone districts, maintains Right-of-Ways, offers utility services, has parks and rec. The intent with this plan was to have a similar plan for the greater Gunnison Area. The Three-mile plan had context-sensitive rules, which lessened with transition to rural area farther away from the city. The idea was to create more community areas, protect agricultural areas, and preserve natural resources.

Where are we now: The project kicked off in September 2022, with Houseal Lavign for the subarea and three-mile plan. The contract with Houseal Lavign was terminated in late summer 2023. The sub area plan still needed to be completed. There was feedback/concern from city staff about cost. Pagano noted that no additional resources had been needed so far, with the exception of Seminick's time for making the draft. County and City staff met 2.14 to make sure they were aligned, and to adjust the schedule.

Clarification for terms: Sub area plan = greater Gunnison community plan; N Gateway sub area plan = N Gateway Community; US 50 gateway subarea = West Gateway; Not previously studied = TBD (not east river) – City wanted to further discussion for this area.

Key Findings:

- Infrastructure and utilities – how; where; cost?
- Housing – a persisting community issue; foster a sense of community; implement the regional goals outlined in OVR?
- Connectivity and mobility – enhance and extend current ped and bike infrastructure; promote walkability and inclusive design in future development; safely link neighborhoods across highway 135 and highway 50.
- Neighborhood commercial – allow for commercial uses that are compatible in residential areas, commercial uses should create pedestrian traffic.
- Preparing for the future – formulate compact efficient development policies; incentivize affordable housing development; implement policies against sprawl.
- Image and Identity – policies that foster a sense of identity for N and W gateway communities, explore ways to improve entrances to enhance the feeling of arrival or departure.

Discussion – many in the room were involved during early planning for the project and agreed with the data from the outreach efforts. The data seemed to match what elected officials were hearing from

constituents. Asked for clarity on values guiding development. Recommended merging key findings and guiding principles into one section. Defined location efficient development – development that is close to transit, can be served by utilities, takes less resources to make it a part of the community. Recommended condensing the list for communication purposes. Asked for a mixture of housing types and incomes in neighborhoods. Connectivity for people to people, work, school, activities. Seemed to match what people wanted.

Plan Goals: complete neighborhoods; walkability/mobility; live/work communities; create a destination; use mix/density; 18-hour community (a place that is active 18 hours a day (coffee-work-happy hour-dinner); ped-scale; neighborhood commercial. Balance of residential vs. business. Ratio of mixed-use areas. What would the density look like to sustain business. Focus on creating opportunities.

Comment: Density vs. ratio – ex of eagle where there is essentially a second downtown where the residential is full and the commercial feels empty. Another piece to consider was balancing short-term rentals vs. residential. Comparing the situation to CB south, trying to add in commercial now that in residential area- something that we should try to avoid.

The city has changed a lot of zoning to allow for businesses to build residential above commercial, but a lot of the new businesses in the city had decided against it. The City was working to make more efficient use of land and infrastructure. Hard to have a vibrant 18-hour community without a good mix of commercial and residential. Identified that there was not a report for the scope of commercial needed like the housing report that identifies how much housing is needed now, knew that there was a desire for more industrial space, but unsure of what else, definitely not a desire for office space. Could take years for the commercial to become more viable after a residential area is developed, like in CB South. Noted dire need for trades people/fundamental services in the valley, thoughts about dedicating space for light industrial. Identified need for community facilities, diversify housing choices, pocket parks, maker spaces, removing barriers.

Seemed that the identified items were universal, were there any elements missing that could be more specific for our community. For example, Gunnison was a college town, how encourage students to come here to stay. Lacking vibrancy. Baca noted that Western wants a vibrant downtown that's walkable, student friendly, recreational trail connection. Consider faculty and staff that live north of town. Incorporate public lands.

Plan Goal: Housing for all – create the opportunity. Build community, housing for diverse incomes, preserve and protect, co-locate housing and transit, compact development, access for all, increase density protect existing inventory, incentive development, reduce bureaucracy, housing diversity, best practices.

Noted that there was a strong need for senior housing; specifically important in all income levels and creating accessible housing (single story). Will the housing be flexible enough to meet the needs of the community in 100 years. Also, there was a lot of substandard housing in the valley, reluctant to touch it due to the housing shortage; lack of availability allows for expensive substandard housing. Pagano replied that the hope was that the creation of new, higher quality housing, would help to solve that

problem by incentivizing landlords to make improvements or lower rents. Sinkewich added that part of the plan was to make land available for the uses to come into. Noted that all around affordability would help appeal to developers. Look towards using incentives, building costs would make it difficult for a developer to come in and make something in a low rent category. Pagano mentioned the Colorado Affordable Housing project, how governments can work to incentivize/create affordable housing.

The current opportunity zone was near the city limits, didn't include north Gunnison. Identified areas are part of legislation, and that would take an act of congress to change. Not a clear policy on what the City required to be fully tapped into utilities, didn't always require annexation, the city was working on fixing that. Currently, need a contiguous boundary to be eligible for annexation/ utilities. *didn't include easements.

Plan Goal: Mobility Connectivity. Pedestrian friendly, improve road network, go slow, trad street grid, improve existing transit, rec paths, make sidewalks work/network, deemphasize parking, micromobility. *Considerations for EV charging, since the new code required it.

Land Use Typologies – no zoning in the County, entrepreneurial and maker space, neighborhood commercial, mixed-use, multi-family, medium density residential. *discussion about difference of mixed use vs. intraparietal/maker space. No determination on ideal lot size yet, further analysis was needed to help figure out ideal lot size, dimensions, setbacks, distribution of types. Overall level of comfort with density. Comparison of pitchfork vs. van tyle areas balancing parking and snow storage...all other things that go with density. Room for cars and dogs. Not putting the parking burden on affordable housing. Room for snowmobile trailers, bikes, etc. Coming up with creative solutions for parking.

North Gateway community neighborhoods: overview. Catalyst sites review. Building envelopes pushed towards highway, parking in the middle, helps delineate town and gets traffic to slow down. Connectivity to the highway is tricky. Thinking about the road network is important. Support for commercial closer to the highway, and residential being further away. Could act as a sound barrier. Schmidt noted that he was working on access plan with CDOT, which included looking at having a secondary road network. Safety action plan for intersections. Depends on the amount of traffic anticipated. Concern that secondary road dead end at private property. This was intended to be a concept. Wanted to show having connectivity to a grid. Emphasis on contemplating connectivity with future development. Acknowledgement that increasing the density would require a secondary road network. No catalyst sites modeled for the west gateway neighborhoods. Services west of Gunnison. Opportunities for connectivity to either city or county services.

Conclusion. Staff would regroup and possibly come back to the commission in a month.

Break

Work Session: LUC-22-00028 | Avalon Subdivision

The applicant proposes subdivision of a 96-acre parcel into 76 residential lots. Single-family homes and secondary residences are proposed to be allowed on each lot. A maximum size of 5,000 square feet is proposed and a minimum of 1,400 square feet for the single-family homes with a two-car garage required. The applicant proposes that 67% of the land will be open space and that there will be an

internal trail system. The applicant is working with the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District for water service and wastewater treatment.

Gary Huresky, Mike Dawson, Norman Whitehead, Eric Frockman were present.

Staff Presentation: Pagano, Overview of the major impact process. Three phases: sketch plan, preliminary plan, final plan. The applicant has submitted a sketch plan. Exploratory/conceptual. High level design, concept, no engineering. Engineering designs were not required or accepted at this part of the process. A joint public hearing with BOCC would be held in the future for this project. Noted that the commission had the opportunity to allow public comment for the work session, but they weren't required to.

Applicant presentation: Huresky gave a presentation. Felt that the location of residential units could benefit the nearby commercial CB South area. The plan was to connect to CB South water and sanitation. Concept that the RTA stop could move there, and a new maintenance building for CB South metro. The developer was thinking of developing the housing units with potential offerings for affordable essential housing. The applicants had toured Saw Tooth and had met with Fading West and would like to create a winning scenario for the community and the developer. 76 lots in concept, potentially 3 different levels: affordable housing, attainable housing-, free/open market. Not sure of ratio for housing breakdown right now.

Whitehead: This project has shifted since covid. Potential for over 100 parking spaces and RTA bus stop near the entrance to CBS. Thought of having higher density closer to the entrance (north) transition to single family residences further down. Working with the district on a new pw building and possible workforce housing. Would like to add berms along the highway for screening with possible connector to CB to CBS trail. Proposed paths interweaving through the development.

Water/Sewer: Test wells drilled onsite tested favorably, thinking to have two to have redundancy and accommodate a 6-inch fire flow, thought to have an onsite potable water treatment plant, and then pump to CB South. Have room to install treatment lines where CB South only treats water out of the wells. Would be taken over by CB South.

Stations for sewer to be pumped to CB South metro. Irrigation would function similar to larkspur. Would be taken over by CB South.

Roads/Connectivity: The plan was that the new roads through the subdivision would be maintained by CB South Metro district.

Entrance to CBS would need to be reconfigured with either a stoplight or roundabout. Pagano recommended that the planning commission conduct a site visit, to which the commission agreed was necessary. Though it would be a good opportunity look at the potential impact to 135 and view the location of the proposed beaming, which the applicants thought would be a 125 ft. buffer from 135 to beginning of residential. Discussion concerning the intersection of Cement Creek Rd and Highway 135. Potential for adjusting the road and creating a true T. Schmidt noted that CDOT was the critical stakeholder and ultimate decider for the intersection. Potential for the intention to have a roundabout or traffic light. CDOT favored a roundabout.

Mason noted they should be cognizant how the pedestrian interacted with the road. Huresky noted the potential for new pedestrian walk way, but that would require easements.

POA: Not sure about joining POA, planning to have their own HOA and pay into the CB South Metro District.

Next Steps:

Schedule Work sessions and site visit. Asked for a more defined breakdown for affordable housing. Huresky noted that they would like to work on a better path forward for residents looking to buy affordable housing than deed restricted lots.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:55 am