

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, October 3, 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 Catherine McBreen Alt. Commissioner- Bill Barvitski	Assistant County Manager for Community and Economic Development-Cathie Pagano Planning Director – Hillary Seminick Planner I- Sean Pope Others present as listed in text
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Absent:

Recused: Commissioner Matt Schwartz, Alt. Commissioner- Bill Barvitski for LUC-23-00032

Zoom: None

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the October 3, 2024, regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 12:05 pm.

Approval of Minutes – Approval of three meeting minutes:

August 15, 2024: Moved by Baca to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated August 15, 2024. Seconded by Niederer. The motion passed unanimously.

August 29, 2024: Moved by Schwartz to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated August 29, 2024. Seconded by Phillips. The motion passed unanimously.

September 19, 2024: Moved by Niederer to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated September 19, 2024. Seconded by McBreen. The motion passed unanimously

Unscheduled Citizens

None

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

Chair Mason begins the worksession and turns over the presentation to Jacob With.

With begins by discussing the uniqueness of the project itself and the unique topography of the site. The largest structure that will be most visible will likely be the wastewater treatment plant, which is mandated by the state. With asks for thoughts and considerations from the Planning Commission to address anything prior to the preliminary plan stage.

Seminick clarifies the next steps for the process. Planning Commission could either: request another work session or schedule a public hearing with the BOCC for approval of the sketch plan. Additional public hearings may be possible.

Baca discusses the thoughtfulness of the site visit; it was very helpful to understand the project. She expresses comfortability of moving forward to a public hearing.

Schwartz and Phillips have questions about the road and if the storage units will be located on both sides of the road.

Schwartz other question is around the employee housing. One building will be very large. Will it be open year round? Will it be open

Dave Reynolds responds by saying that they need at least 20 units during the season. Wilder mentioned that they may need additional housing for employees in that area. The plan is to focus on their employees, but could also help house other local businesses employees in the winter.

Mason has a question about the power lines that crisscross the back area. Reynolds says that they would like to bury the existing lines, the new lines will be buried. Has not yet contacted the electric company yet. The aim is to remove all the hanging line and move all utilities underground.

Phillips asks if there will be any connectivity to walking trails along the back of the parcel or if the foot traffic would be near the roads. Reynolds expresses plans to include more walking trails internally.

Mason asks to show where a dump station would be anticipated and where the turnaround would be located, and expresses concerns about potential traffic impacts. Reynolds reviews the map and shows the flow of traffic pattern and that it would loop around and connect to the overflow parking. Reynolds shows the future updates to the site plan as to where the storage units will be going to the right side of the road and the housing units on the left side of the road. Schwartz comments that the RV lines for dump stations can be quite long and that the long line potential should be kept in consideration. Mason adds that this should be contemplated so that traffic does not backup onto the main highway. With adds that a traffic study will be completed to understand the traffic patterns produced by the development.

Mason asks about the above ground waterline and ask if they will be buried. Reynolds states that they have buried most of the lines and are planning to bury the rest of the lines. Mason discusses the significant screening of the storage building from spring creek.

After further discussion, Baca motions staff to coordinate a joint public hearing with the BOCC along with a recommendation document, seconded by Schwartz. The motion carries unanimously.

Phillips requests that the game cam information be brought to the joint public hearing.

Work Session: LUC-23-00032 | Major Impact | Discount Storage

Mason begins this part of the worksession by briefly reviewing the site visit. Mike O' Loughlin requests to move to the project to the preliminary plan stage, noting that they have received support from the City of Gunnison and this is a suitable location for parking and storage. O' Loughlin adds that this location is not well suited for a coffee shop or other similar commercial uses.

Mason asks if staff has any comments from the site visit, and Seminick states that that staff does not have any additional comments. She goes on to clarify that the purpose of this worksession is to review any takeaways from the site visit and to direct staff on how to proceed.

Phillips has a question about the outer part of the new parking area, will this be connected through the existing fence? Or will the fence remain. After discussion, it is found that the existing fence will be removed in this area and traffic will be able to move through to the new parking area.

Seminick discusses the access to the parcel and how the existing access will need to be relocated in order to comply with access standards. Phillips requests clarification about the internal traffic flow and access from Highway 135.

Mason observed on the site visit that the project was more tucked away than expected and the parcel is shielded by existing objects. No concerns about drainage. Mason's overall take is that this is a large flat lot with parking. This would allow for the future change of use for another business with a parking lot around it. Mason is not a fan about extending more storage units up and down the corridor like in other communities. This area does not have fixed storage units on the site at this point.

Baca asks about the ditch and wondering if there is a need for an easement over the culvert area in order to protect the ditch. O' Loughlin clarifies that ditch owners have a statutory right to do ditch maintenance. Baca is concerned about long term impacts of culverts collapsing and potentially causing damage to the water rights. She expresses concerns about how any damaged water rights will be repaired and if any mechanism is needed to be included at this stage of the project.

Seminick clarifies that the County requirements are 25' setback on both sides of the ditch (50' total), unless notarized consent from the ditch owners is obtained to reduce these setbacks. O' Loughlin states that the Applicant is working with the water district and others to find out the ownership of the ditch. Baca asks for clarification about what a retroactive ditch ownership verification looks like. Seminick does not have a clear answer to this question at this time.

Mason asks if there is a tool we can put in place now so that the ditch is protected. O' Loughlin explains the statutory regulations that allow a ditch owner to access their ditch at any time to perform maintenance as necessary. After further discussion, Mason is comfortable with the statutory requirement where a ditch owner can access the property and the ditch. Additionally, there are no structures at this point. Seminick discusses the example of ditches at Harmel's.

Seminick will look into the retroactive verification and how to address Commissioner Baca's concerns.

O' Loughlin is working to obtain all the information from the DWR website and find all of the ownership information and compile it into an accessible document.

Niederer motions to schedule a joint a public hearing with a draft recommendation document, seconded by Phillips, the motion carries unanimously.

Discussion about next steps and clarification with the Applicant follows.

Mason adjourns the meeting at 1:01pm.