

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, August 1, 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             | Planning Technician – Jena Greene                             |
| Commissioner- Matt Schwartz          | Others present as listed in text                              |
| Commissioner-Eric Phillips           | County Attorney – Matt Hoyt                                   |
| Alt. Commissioner- Catherine McBreen |   |
| Alt. Commissioner- Bill Barvitski    |   |

**Absent:** Commissioner – Julie Baca

**Recused:** Schwartz and Barvitski (for LUC-23-00032)

**Zoom:** Catherine McBreen

**Regular Meeting**

Chairperson Mason opened the August 1, 2024, meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:50 am. and determined a quorum.

**Approval of Minutes**

Moved by Niederer to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated July 18, 2024, Seconded by Schwartz. The motion passed unanimously in support.

\*\*\*

**Miscellaneous**

Chair Mason made a note that there was an error in the original agenda that was posted. Staff reminded the Commission that there would be an additional meeting on August 29<sup>th</sup>.

**Unscheduled Citizens**

None

\*\*\*

**Work Session: LUC-23-00032 | Centennial Storage**

Couty Attorney Matt Hoyt was present. Matt Schwartz recused himself due to having a general discussion with the applicant’s attorney, Michael O’Loughlin while playing golf. Bill Barvitski recused himself since his wife was listed as an agent for the applicant.

Chair Mason sat Alternative Commissioner McBreen and redetermined a quorum.

Applicant Presentation The property owner and applicant, Centennial Storage Partners, LLC, represented in person by attorney Michael O’Loughlin, was requesting an expansion of commercial use

to allow for approximately 115 outdoor vehicular storage spaces adjacent to the existing Discount Storage at 1825 State Highway 135, Gunnison, CO.

The expansion of commercial use was approved in 2018 with not setbacks or variance required. The applicant had filed litigation concerning the setbacks. The applicant had reviewed proposal with the City of Gunnison planning and zoning commission. Originally had no support from staff, then received unanimous support from the City Commission.

O’Laughlin noted that staff was encouraging this type of use in industrial areas, adding that there wasn’t enough space in those areas to accommodate the storage. In addition, the cost of those spaces was more expensive adding cost to the community members using the storage areas. The current storage area had no availability and a long waiting list.

Staff Comments Seminick gave an overview of the history of the parcel and storage area, showing the original approval was from the 1980s, and the expansion from 2018. She added that the approval from 2018 did not, per current staff interpretation, accurately apply the 50-foot setback from commercial as required by the LUR; and allowed for parking storage to be developed along the zero-lot line. The applicant applied for the proposed expansion in 2023, was denied, and appealed the decision to the Board of Adjustment, who upheld the decision for denial.

Seminick also mentioned the Violation when the area was expanded without a land use in 2019 which involved the placement of 4 feet of structural fill and placement of a culvert. The applicant would need to apply for a major impact or remove the improvements in order to cure the violation.

Seminick overviewed the staff memo with the planning commission which included:

- 2019 BOCC policy concerning expansion of commercial used concerning development in the 135 corridor.
- Fencing issue – notes from Biologist Rumel concerning fencing and wetland delineation in Sage Grouse Habitat
- Location within the three-mile plan area- noted July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024, letter of support from the city of Gunnison, encouraged review and discussion
- Landscaping and buffering

Seminick added that if the applicant was to apply for a variance for the setback, that the variance application would need to be considered in a joint hearing with the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

#### Questions from Planning Commission

Mason – Major impact, large tract. Might be good to have a site visit and evaluate the structural fill, size of parking lot, slatted fence, overall scope of space. Look at the ditch.

McBreen – Clarified if the 2019 violation was resolved. Seminick said no. The applicant needed to restore the site or submit for a Major Impact Land Use Change. The curing of the violation would require:

- Possible wetland delineation.
- Residential property – owned by Mr. Tucker Roberts. Oloughlin spoke to ongoing conversations with Mr. Roberts , but there was a possibility of BLA

- O'Loughlin – working with an engineer concerning the culvert, would work with staff to see if she could comply with wetland delineation
- Phillips – variance would not be considered by the pc, to be considered by the BOA. But could still discuss the screening and buffering.
- Mason – 2019 BOCC policy, (exhibit 1, staff memo)

O'Loughlin other commercial parks didn't have enough space to accommodate. Noted by Pagano that the industrial area had special area regulations that had zero lot setbacks.

Mason – Three-mile plan concept and infrastructure. Future connectivity for future development. Converting a parking lot in 20 years would not be difficult compared to other types of development, this area may not be a parking lot in perpetuity. Compared Gunnison's growth to Montrose's. Also mentioned consideration of the visual impacts of fencing.

Niederer – Stated that need for storage was linked to affordable housing. Looking at the existing approved use for the property and neighboring. Sub area master plan -not approved yet/draft – not consistent with the proposed use.

Phillips – future

McBreen – support for having a site visit.

Acknowledged that the city was in support of this project.

Next Steps – Schedule a site visit and a work session. Concerns from the commission about view sheds and neighboring properties, could the applicant work with neighbors to get permission for the PC to \$12000 payment for violation, under impression that the payment cured the violation. Pagano no, fee to cover staffs time for the violation.

BREAK

Commissioner Schwartz and Alternative Commissioner Barvitski rejoined the meeting. Chair Mason sat. Commissioner Matt Schwartz and Commissioner McBreen remained seated for this project.

**Work Session: LUC-24-00021 | Harmels Major Impact**

Commissioner Niederer disclosed for the record that the owners of Harmels were past clients, but that he no longer owned the company and didn't feel that there were any concerns. Attorney Hoyt agreed and didn't recommend recusal. There were no concerns from the rest of the Board.

Applicant Presentation – Jacob With from Law of the Rockies was present on behalf of that applicant. Randy Dailey, Terri Reynolds, Brandon Reynolds, Jerry Greene and David Reynolds were also present.

With noted that the applicants were expecting and excited to have the commission onsite for a site visit for this project.

With showed aerial photos as well as photos showing the views of the proposed areas from the road, since there was a variety of topography. Impression of natural screening/buffering

Overview of site plan showing existing and proposed cabins, new glamping sites and RV parking. Noted that there was a plan to provide employee housing onsite to help with employee retention. Possible concerns – rockfall hazard evaluation needed.

Workforce housing – intent to have a restriction in the title, not necessarily a deed restriction, the intent was that the units would be limited to being affordable employee housing. Would work with County Attorney Matt Hoyt

Received CPW comments, hadn't had a lot of time to review, but noted that they were negative which was a surprise. Applicants planned to work with CPW to remedy comments. Seminick noted that those issues would be discussed in greater and further detail during the preliminary plan phase.

Noted help of having impact on Harmels as opposed to having impact in forest service land. Allowed for more people to enjoy natural environment.

Staff Comments – Seminick had nothing to add.

#### Planning Commission Comments

-waste water treatment plant – support, ability for the general public to be able to access, possibility for dump station.

Mason, CPW report, need to be worked out encouraged a site visit with CPW as well.

Schwartz – suggested something that could represent heights be available during the site visit.

Noted that Harmels having year-round presence would be a big change from the current use.

Next steps – schedule a site visit, followed by a work session. Would it be possible to get the BOCC present at the site visit, due to timing and possibility of BOCC review being when snow is on the ground. Staff would extend the request to the BOCC once a time for the site visit was set.

\*\*\*

Meeting adjourned at 11 am