

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, July 11, 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:**

Chair - Roland Mason	Director of Community and Economic Development- Cathie Pagano
Vice-Chair- Fred Niederer	Director of Planning- Hilary Seminick
Commissioner- Julie Baca (Portion of Meeting)	Planner- Rachael Blondy
Commissioner- Eric Phillips (Portion of Meeting)	Planning Technician – Jena Greene
Alt. Commissioner- Catherine McBreen	Others present as listed in text

**Absent:** Bill Barvitski, Matt Schwartz

**Recused:**

**Zoom:** Eric Phillips

**Regular Meeting**

Chairperson Mason opened the July 11, 2024, special meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:45 am. This meeting was held at the request of staff because the first Thursday was the July 4<sup>th</sup> Holiday.

Since Commissioners Baca and Philips were absent for the beginning of the meeting, Chair Mason sat alternative commissioner McBreen and determined a quorum.

**Approval of Minutes**

Moved by McBreen seconded by Niederer to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated June 20, 2024, with insubstantial changes as noted by Niederer and Mason. The motion passed unanimously in support.

\*\*\*

**Unscheduled Citizens**

None

\*\*\*

**Work Session: LUC-24-00023 | Minor Impact | Levary Building over 5000**

Applicant Presentation - Jim Jose and Anna of SHM Architects; and Kaitlyn Ziff of Wright Construction, were present at the meeting on behalf of the applicant. The proposed building was to be a single-family residence with an attached garage and a detached guest house. Jose described the property as an open meadow that was adjacent to 135. Jose presented a rendering of what the proposed building would look like from 135. The collective total was under the allowable from the Whetstone ranch. Planned to expand landscaping and berm to help hide the view of the residence from the highway.

Staff Comments - Rachael Blondy was the planner assigned to the project. Blondy further reviewed the LUR requirements of approval. Seminick noted that the primary building was over the 5000-sf max due

to the attached garage, and that the visual impacts of having the garage detached verses attached as proposed was something that the commission should consider.

#### Planning Commission Discussion

Niederer - appreciated the placement of the house and the location of the berm, noted the attached garage vs. the detached garage.

McBreen – agreed that the attached garage looked better.

Mason – added that with the screening of the berm from the highway, and the fact that the berm and home were set back from the highway. Also appreciated that the max height was only proposed to be 22 feet high, with the roof sloping towards the highway to also help block the home for 135.

Neighborhood context: similar size homes, fit in with the neighborhood.

Next steps: Overall support. Determined that a site visit wasn't needed, and that another work session wasn't needed. The planning commission directed staff to work with the applicant to schedule a public hearing, and to additionally directed staff to draft a decision document to have available for review at the public hearing.

\*\*\*

#### **Work Session: LUC-24-00020 | Minor Impact | Larkspur/Terraplen subdivision Work Session**

Applicant Presentation – Applicant Sebastian Puente, and attorney, Jacob With of Law of the Rockies, were present at the meeting. With began by noting that this was an infill project. This project was originally approved for a rec center, with an estimated over 500 trips/day; but they were now proposing to subdivide the parcel into 6 single family lots with trails for the neighborhood. The new proposal would utilize existing infrastructure and the proposed lots would be similar in size to others in the neighborhood. The applicants were also asking for an impact classification reduction from a major impact to a minor since it had spent a lot of time working with the community on the final proposal. Puente added that they had worked with the Larkspur Community to amend the covenants of the Larkspur HOA, it was voted on in November 2022 with 64 to 0 in favor of approval. Gave an overview of the timeline of community outreach to get to this point. Outlined community improvement goals that were identified by the community. The final plan was six lots with trails and a pavilion for the Larkspur Community to be able to use.

Staff Comments - Blondy added that all resulting parcels would be tying into east river sanitation.

#### Planning Commission Discussion

McBreen – were there any conversations or concerns about there not being a rec center? Note that there was no obligation to have the rec center. Puente added that the original thought had been that there was going to be a tennis facility that would support the country club, then there had been a possibility of having an ice rink. It was noted that there were still recreation amenities such as trails and pavilions.

Mason - Appreciation for neighborhood outreach and conversation about property history. Comment that after the development of the neighborhood, it no longer seemed like as good of a fit to have a commercial rec facility in this location.

Next steps - Overall support. Determined that a site visit and another work session weren't needed at this time. Directed staff to schedule a Joint public hearing with the BOCC and to draft a decision document.

BREAK

\*\*\*

### **Work Session: LUC-24-00028 | Minor Impact | Kunes 3 Lot Subdivision**

Applicant Presentation - Jim Kunes was present at the meeting. The current property was a 4.1-acre lot with an existing single-family residence and detached garage. The proposal was to subdivide the land to create two, 1-acre parcels, and one 2.1-acre parcel with the existing structures. They had worked with the state to determine that there was capacity for two additional wells through the Gunnison Water District.

Staff Comments - Blondy reviewed the location of the property. The property was accessed via Evalynn lane from HWY 135. There was a letter of support from Bruce Hoffman, owner of the Evelyn Lane road, which stated that he would grant access for the two new parcels.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Mason noted that there were two letters in the record: one from Hoffman granting access, and one from the neighboring HOA, Mitzel's Green Acres, which expressed concern for increased impact to the road without being required to contribute to the cost of the maintenance. There was a discussion which clarified that the Hoffmans, owners of 125 and 121 Evelyn Ln, also owned the Evelyn Lane Road; however, the cost of the maintenance and snowplowing of the road was paid for by Mitzel's Green Acres HOA. The properties owned by Kunes and the Hoffmans, 121, 125 and 127 Evelyn Lane, weren't a part of the Mitzel's Green Acres HOA, and neither the Kunes' nor the Hoffmans paid HOA fees.

Staff noted that the applicant would need to purchase sufficient augmentation water, submit a draft plat, and secure an easement on the road before the public hearing could be scheduled.

Next Steps – Kunes would work with staff to get the needed documents and information, then staff would get the public hearing scheduled. The commission encouraged the applicant to try and work with the HOA in regard to their road maintenance concerns ahead of the public hearing.

BREAK

\*\*\*

### **Work Session: LUC-22-00028 | Major Impact | Avalon**

Applicant Presentation – The Harrisons were present at the meeting along with attorney, Michael Dawson, and members of their project team, Gary Huresky. Engineer Norman Whitehead attended the meeting on Zoom.

Huresky reviewed the updated site plan. They had added 44 additional units and space for light commercial and a gas station after the planning commission suggested that they increase density and consider adding commercial. 22 of the new units were to be deed restricted, and the applicants were planning to supply three levels of housing: deed restricted, attainable, and free market.

Short term rentals would not be allowed in the deed restricted areas, and STR allowances in the free market section of the neighborhood hadn't been decided yet leaning towards allowing the future homeowners decide. The setbacks for affordable housing were defined, and they planned for each unit to have 2 parking spaces to help get the cars off of the road.

The possible need for a second entrance into the subdivision was discussed. Since the estimated increase in traffic was 12%, they anticipated that they wouldn't need another entrance unless the increase in traffic was closer to 20%. Whitehead reviewed possible entrance redesign options including a possible round-about.

Letter from adjacent property owner concerning fishing access. Applicants determined that they weren't going to allow access into the river for the neighborhood. There were other adjacent landowners who reached out with concerns as well.

Staff Comments – Pagano reviewed the staff report.

The staff report was reviewed. The minimum unit size needed to be defined, the applicants had addressed the workforce housing with the addition of 22 deed restricted units, needed clarification as to if the applicant was considering ADU's

Standard for Residential Development and Residential Density: This application couldn't meet the standard since the location wasn't adjacent to CB South. Overall density, 1.25 units/acre. Mitigate impact of increased density with addition of light commercial.

CPW had provided comments. This was an elk migration corridor. The applicants needed to address CPW's comments.

Water supply would be coming from CBS Metro, and the Division Water resources would weigh in later in the process. Needed more clarity on residential building size. Parking as proposed conceptually complied. Berming along highway would need to be discussed

Planning Commission Discussion:

Baca requested that the application also be referred to the Housing Authority (GVRHA)

Mason asked about the Pedestrian connection to CB South. The applicants said they were looking to add a new pedestrian bridge over the east river.

Mason – Commented on the community compatibility requirement. Noted that this was in close proximity to CB South, but not adjacent. This development was standalone and was different than CB South. Visual impact would be dramatically different.

Mason - Asked the applicants if they would consider height restrictions for the homes closest to 135. The applicants noted that they planned to drop the grade and add Berms. Mason expressed concerns for public comment on this subject

The wetlands and open space were discussed. Noted that there were a lot of wetlands onsite, and the commission asked for more specific plans and details for programmed open space; and what the percentage of the overall open space was wetlands.

Baca expressed concern about ensuring that the high density/deed restricted and phasing. Pagano noted that DIA's would help ensure that. The applicants also stated that they were planning to have them built first.

Mason – question about transportation. How will this neighborhood access the RTA; and school bus stop.

Next Steps: Pagano asked the applicants to provide details in writing back to her concerning: percentage of open space that wasn't wetlands, clarification on overall open space plan, clarification on garages and high density, how many lots would be allowed ADUs, conversations with GVRHA and CPW, clarification for the plan for the berms, approval from CBS Metro concerning adequate supply for water and sewer – including numbers for AUDs.

\*\*\*

Meeting Adjourned at 12:19 p.m.