

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, December 19,2024**

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- Julie Baca Commissioner- Eric Phillips Commissioner Matt Schwartz Alt. Commissioner- Bill Barvitski Alt. Commissioner Catherine McBreen BOCC- Jonathan Houck BOCC- Liz Smith BOCC- Laura Puckett Daniels	Assistant County Manager for Community and Economic Development-Cathie Pagano County Attorney – Matt Hoyt Planner I – Jena Greene Planning Technician – Caroline Danielson Others present as listed in text
--	---

Absent: None

Recused: None

Zoom: Commissioner- Julie Baca

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the December 19, 2024, a regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:45 am.

Moved by Schwartz, seconded by Phillips to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated November 21, 2024. The motion passed unanimously in support with the insubstantial amendments as noted by Niederer.

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous: Staff reminded the commission that the January meeting dates were moved.

Niederer stated that he would be stepping down as vice chair when new members were appointed in February.

Joint Public Hearing: LUC-24-00035 | Graham 2 Lot Subdivision Minor Impact

The Applicant, Kevin Graham, proposed a two-lot subdivision of the 2.19-acre lot commonly known as 225 Columbine Rd., Gunnison, CO. The resultant two lots would be: 1.12 acres (Tract A) and 1.09 acres (Tract B) acres in size. The parcel contained a 1,296 sq. ft. residence with a 720 sq. ft. detached garage and a 1,056 sq. ft. unfinished basement. The existing residence, OWTS, and existing well would remain on the resultant parcel (Tract A).

Chair Mason opened the public hearing at 9 am. He confirmed that there was no ex-parte communication.

Confirmation of Adequate Public Notice

Pagano confirmed that there was adequate public notice

Applicant Presentation

Kevin Graham attended the meeting on Zoom. He explained that this was a 2.2-acre lot that he was proposing to split into two, 1.1 acre lots. He noted that this change would be more consistent with the neighborhood, which was mostly one acre lots.

Staff Comments

Pagano reviewed the site plan and clarified that the current lot was not a part of the Panoview Park HOA, but was adjacent to it; and that was not subject to the Panoview park covenants. Both lots were to remain outside of the HOA.

The septic for the home was previously located across the street on a different lot, also owned by the applicant. As part of this application, the tank was relocated onsite, and Graham confirmed that the work was now complete.

Review Body Questions

Mason agreed that by splitting the lots, that it made the lots more consistent with the surrounding areas.

Public Comments

Mary Mast, neighbor in Panoview Park subdivision. Mast spoke to problems in Panoview Park subdivision concerning the keeping of pigs, cattle, and horses on her neighbors' properties that "shouldn't be there" and thought that the subdivision should be denied until these issues were resolved. She noted that the covenants for the Panoview Park Subdivision were recorded at Rec no 464813, and that the keeping of livestock wasn't permitted by the Panoview Park Subdivision Covenants. Further, per the LUR. 2-3 feet of manure was being piled against their fence, and that the horses didn't always have enough food or water. She noted that the manure wasn't being disposed of. Her neighbor to the northwest kept pigs and she noted that the smell of the pigs was also an issue.

Applicant Response

Mr. Graham spoke to comments concerning the livestock. He first noted that his properties were on the other side of the "loop" from Mrs. Mast's property. He expressed similar concerns about the keeping of the animals but noted that this complaint was unrelated to his subdivision. Clarified that none of his properties were keeping livestock at, and that the properties where Mrs. Mast was noting concern were not his, nor a part of this application. He stated that he would be willing to add language to his covenants that no livestock could be kept on these parcels.

Houck and Pagano clarified that Mast's concerns were separate a matter from this subdivision application. The complaint was forwarded to the Planning staff to follow-up with. Pagano also added that the covenants for Panoview Park Subdivision were expired.

There was discussion about the future keeping of livestock on the two properties in question. The applicant was agreeable to adding a condition that wouldn't allow livestock to be kept on the properties, although he noted that his intention with subdividing the property was to help prevent this type of use on this property.

There was a discussion about how the LUR addressed the keeping of livestock, noting that there was no minimum lot size and how that presented challenges throughout the county on smaller parcels, and in sage type areas while balancing the county's ranching history.

Staff Response

Pagano noted that the #8 condition of the draft decision document was originally an error, and proposed a revision to say, "No livestock, other than chickens and 4-H project animals, shall be permitted on the property."

Pagano also noted the Sage-grouse and Colorado Parks and Wildlife comments that were specific to this application.

Next Steps

After further deliberation on the issue concerning the keeping of livestock on the property and reviewed the draft decision document, the planning commission expressed support for the draft decision document as amended.

Schwartz made a motion to approve the draft recommendation document as edited. Seconded by Phillips. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Mason closed the public hearing at 9:40 am

Joint Public Hearing: LUC-24-00036 | Knerr 2 Lot Subdivision Minor Impact

The Applicant, Gary Knerr, represented by Michael O'Loughlin Esq., proposed to subdivide the existing 7.5-acre parcel, commonly known as 967 Ute Ln., Gunnison, CO, into 2 parcels. The resulting parcels were: Parcel 1 (4.87 acres) and Parcel 2 (2.51 acres). Parcel 1 contained the Applicant's existing single-family residence, and Parcel 2 contained an existing dwelling unit (log home). The existing parcel was residential in use and the resulting 2 parcels would remain residential. Traffic impacts would be negligible as there was an easement in place to access resultant Parcel 2, and no significant increase in traffic was expected from this minor subdivision. No new structures or construction were planned for either resultant parcel.

Chair Mason opened the public hearing at 9:45 am.

Confirmation of Adequate Public Notice

Pagano confirmed that there was adequate public notice.

Applicant Presentation

Gary Knerr was present. He purchased the property in 2001 and built a house on the property. He later began to build a second house on the property. He proposed to subdivide the property

in order to sell the second, partially completed home with 2.5 acres of land. The applicant mentioned that there was adequate water per the Upper Gunnison Water Conservancy District.

Staff Comments

Pagano noted that a more formalized water agreement was still needed but that it could be a condition of approval before the application was reviewed by the board of county commissioners.

Public Comments

Steve and Carmen Steinke, 1013 Ute Ln – Expressed concern about the water, noting that their property shared Mr. Knerr's well, and concern for the possibility of future water issues with the future Gunnison Rising Subdivision construction.

Applicant Response

The applicant stated that his well had sufficient water, and he had confirmed that with the state water board. He noted that there had been issues with the water rights in the past, which resulted in the 1998 agreement between Mr. Knerr (Tract A) and the Steinke's (Tract B).

Staff Response

Pagano expanded on the details of the water sharing agreement between Mr. Knerr and the Steinke's from 1998. The comments from the Division of Water resources from July 2024, stated that there wasn't concern about the water supply.

Pagano noted that before the second, incomplete home was permitted, Mr. Kneer would have had to demonstrate that there was adequate water, and that there was a letter the stated that there was enough water supply for 4 residences and irrigation, and therefore was sufficient for the second home. Future residences would still be reviewed by the community development office, and well adequacy would be a part of that review.

Mr. Steinke expressed that he would be more comfortable speaking with an attorney concerning the water and the well. Mason and Puckett Daniels noted that if the Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners at this meeting, that it would still need to be reviewed by the BOCC, and there was the possibly of another public hearing with the BOCC before the subdivision was approved.

Next Steps

Pagano reviewed the draft decision document. There was a condition concerning a need for a water sharing agreement within Tract A before the application would be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners for review.

Schwartz made a motion to approve the recommendation document. Seconded by Phillips. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Mason closed the public hearing at 10:14.

BREAK

Joint Public Hearing: LUC-22-00028 | Major Impact | Star View

The applicant proposed subdivision of a 96-acre parcel into 129 residential lots to include 84 single family lots, 40 multi-family units, 12 commercial units, 4 residential units above commercial, 1 lot for CB South Metro District which were proposed to maybe include employee housing. The parcel included a “high density” area that was proposed to include 44 units, 22 of which would have some type of deed restriction for local workforce. The remaining 22 units will not be restricted but were proposed to be smaller in size and according to the applicant would be more affordable than the rest of the neighborhood. The applicant was working with the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District for water service and wastewater treatment.

Chair Mason opened the public hearing at 10:22 am.

Confirmation of Adequate Public Notice

Pagano confirmed that there was adequate public notice.

Preliminary matters: Puckett Daniels noted that the following members of the public had reached out to her individually: Gail Mancuso, Jennifer Rose, Bill Smith, Brian Lavine, Shamay Buckle, Carrie Young, Gareth and Linda Roberts; and Thomas Hamilton. She responded to all that she could not comment on an application while in land use review, and that the best place to comment was in the public hearing process. She included the planning department in those replies so that their comments could be included in the record.

Pagano began by giving an overview of the Major impact process, including giving an overview of what the applicant was and was not allowed to have the planning commission review as part of the sketch plan phase, noting that traffic studies and engineered designs were not required or accepted at the sketch plan phase.

Applicant Presentation

Gary Huresky, Mike Dawson, and Norman Whithead were present on behalf of the applicant, and owners Russ and Celina Harrison, who were also present in the room.

Huresky gave an overview of the project. The application was originally submitted on May 10, 2022. The first work session with the Planning Commission was in February of 2024 for an original proposal of 76 lots on the 96-acre parcel, where the Planning Commission requested adding density and more affordable housing. The application then evolved to be 84 single family lots with homes at 1600 and 2500 sf each; 40 higher density units including 20 multi-family units and 20 freestanding townhomes ranging from 800 sf to 1400 sf were proposed closer to the 135 and cement creek road intersection; 20 of which would carry a deed restriction and prohibit short term rentals. 12 light commercial units were proposed totaling in 13,500 sf, and a proposed gas station, with a store and 4 residential units above was proposed totaling at 5800 sf. The proposal included 55% open space remaining. No river access would be granted within the subdivision. The applicant had proposed a berm system with interconnecting trails through the berms and throughout the subdivision. The applicant met with Gunnison Valley Regional Housing Authority on July 16, 2024, concerning the deed restrictions for the 20 units in the high-

density area, which favored a live/work scenario, an AMI of 120 to 220 percent; and a 4% resale cap.

The applicant was working with Crested Butte South Metro District to tie into their Wastewater Treatment Plant, noting that this would include a mutually beneficial expansion of the existing infrastructure. The water and wastewater were proposed to be carried over the East River using a new pedestrian foot bridge.

Noted that they were planning to work with CDOT in the future concerning improvements to the HWY 135 and Cement Creek road intersection, which would most likely mean a roundabout, but did intend to make improvements to make the intersection safer until CDOT was ready to make those improvements. The RTA said they would like to see flag stops on Cement Creek road, which would also serve as pick up and drop off areas for school buses.

The Star View HOA would be responsible for maintaining all of the roads and common areas in the development. The multi-family units would have party wall agreements and would be a part of the planned community. The developer did not intend to build any ADUs, but the applicant was willing to allow 25 of the SFRs to be able to construct them. The applicant didn't anticipate that the ADU's would be deed restricted.

Colorado Parks and Wildlife asked for vegetative screening, down lighting, trees and brush at the south end of the development, along with educational materials leash laws, and bear proof trash containers; all of which would be a part of the covenants and HOA documents. CPW was more in favor of development closer to the highway instead of the backcountry.

Space dedicated was dedicated for pocket parks as well as structured playground type parks. This would be included in a detailed open space master plan at the preliminary plan stage.

Staff Comments

Pagano gave an overview of the staff memo. She noted that some of the areas of concern including the increased density, affordable housing, and commercial areas were added after suggestions for the Planning Commission to the applicant on how they might better meet the standards of the LUR neighborhood serving commercial uses, since during the sketch plan phase, the Planning Commission had the opportunity to negotiate and make recommendations, and that it was at the discretion of the applicant if they chose to make any changes. Ultimately the Planning Commission and BOCC had the responsibility to make the determination on whether or not the proposal met the standards of the LUR. Pagano recommended that the review bodies review the community character standards, especially concerning the proposed commercial space.

Noted public concern about technical details concerning water supply and the intersection at Cement Creek and Highway 135. Pagano explained that a lot of that information would be determined at the preliminary plan if the sketch plan was approved, as it was not allowed to be submitted at this time.

Pagano added that the county did receive safe streets for all grant which gave funds of \$15 million for improvements for this intersection in addition to improvements at the Brush Creek

intersection and other areas along highway 135. Anticipated that there would ultimately be a roundabout there but that process had not begun.

Planning Commission Questions

The proposed 12 commercial units with four residential above at 13,500 sf. were discussed. This was added to the application at the suggestion of the planning commission after a work session and site visits. The applicant proposed the commercial units to be able to serve the subdivision, and noted that none of it would be built out right away, including the gas station. All lighting would be required to be down shielded and the times for commercial business could be restricted. Discussed the commercial viability and how this would impact the existing commercial in CB South. The applicant said that they were open to adjusting this plan, but noted the negative feedback received from the public comments.

Barvitski mentioned that the water could potentially be used to benefit CB South and asked the applicant to explain that further. Whitehead explained that CB South was about 2 CFS short and needed to drill 3 or 4 more wells to meet the needs for CB South. The wells on this property would meet the needs of the subdivision as well as helping to fill the water need for CB South.

BREAK – due to technical difficulties and attendance for this public hearing, the meeting was recessed at 10:55 pm and moved to 200 E Virginia to the BOCC meeting room.

Mason called the meeting back to order at 11:30 am, and asked the planning commission to continue with questions for the applicant.

Schwartz requested that the applicant further give further explanation of the proposed berms along highway 135. The applicant explained that the intention with the berms was to create separation from the highway and the development by using mounds of various sizes. The plan would also include a trail system winding throughout. The applicant reviewed the renderings which showed how the berms would look from highway 135. They also added that the intent was to have single story homes behind the berms to help with the view corridor.

Some neighborhoods that were surrounded by the development on three sides would be surrounded by park space to help preserve their view, and to comply with a view corridor easement that they had in place.

McBreen asked the applicant to compare the size of the proposed lots to those in CB South. Whitehead stated most of the lots would be smaller in comparison, except for the larger lots by the river which would be closer in size to the CB South lots.

The roads would be paved. The developer would pay for all of the infrastructure including the paving of the roads. A road maintenance fee would be included as a part of the HOA fees for the subdivision. Plowing was discussed, and the applicant was still working with the CB South Metro to determine if they could manage that. Funds available to plow the roads. The developer would pay for plowing of the vacant lots until they were sold.

The developer was intending to develop each residential lot and sell as a finished product. Looking to build the vertical, so they would control the design and the square footage. The developer didn't necessarily want to develop the gas station, but wanted to keep it in the plan. No phasing was proposed at this time.

Puckett Daniels asked about the changes from the July staff report to present. The applicant noted that the resale cap would be 4%. The minimum square footage was proposed to be 1200 sf with a two-car garage for the larger lots, the smaller lots would be a minimum of 1000 sf with a 1 car garage and a minimum of 800 sf with a 1 car garage for the multifamily, high-density units. Every unit in the multi family would have 2 off street parking spaces. Clarified that the county had no minimum sf for the homes. Anticipating that the maximum allowed would be around 2500 sf total per lot, with the exception of the lots that were allowed an ADU which may be 3500 sf.

The applicant clarified that the proposed ponds would be constructed, they didn't exist. The topography would need to be built out. The applicant would line the ponds and pump water to keep them full. One would be to meet Fire Protection District standards for water supply, the rest would be amenities.

Puckett Daniels asked for more information on how wildlife would cross the property, since the CPW comments spoke to the need and concern for wildlife to be able to cross the subdivision. Whitehead noted that the berms would allow for wildlife crossing across the subdivision.

The roundabout/highway straightening was discussed. Potential roundabouts were brought up so the room could see. Puckett Daniels noted that with the multiple possibilities, the applicants were open to a variety of designs for the area that would most likely become a roundabout.

Puckett Daniels asked the applicant if there was any data used, or market studies conducted to drive their proposal. Huresky spoke to the real estate data for the CB South area for the single-family homes, noting that there were no single-family homes on the market in CB South at the time and that there was an overall lack of inventory.

Smith asked how the applicant would ensure that the gas station would comply with the community character if the developer didn't intend to build the gas station. Whitehead stated that it would be in the design guidelines.

Phillips asked if any commercial studies were conducted to inform the commercial component of the application. Huresky stated that they conceptually didn't have a real plan for the commercial space, that it was included after the Planning Commission suggested it. The purpose of the commercial was to serve this neighborhood, and to alleviate some of the traffic going into CB South. The idea was that these units would be live work, the applicant would not designate what type of commercial would go into the space. It would be a flexible space that could serve the needs of the neighborhood.

Phillips asked if the intended on placing any restrictions related to the ADUs and short term rentals. Huresky stated that short-term rentals would not be allowed in the high-density area. The possibility in the single-family areas was still a possibility as were ADUs, still needed to speak with water and sewer before putting a number of lots with the possibility for ADUs, but

were working with the number of 25 at the time, but the developer wouldn't be building the ADU's, but would allow for the possibility for the homeowner to build one after the fact. The applicant wasn't planning to require that the ADU's be deed restricted.

Phillips asked if there was a possibility of putting more of the open space along the highway to help maintain the view corridor. The applicant planned to keep a lot of the open space within the subdivision to maintain it as an amenity. Some of the comments asked if there could be room for programable space like a soccer field. The applicant needed to check if it would fit with parking, but they thought that there could possibly.

The lighting was discussed. The applicant would require down shielding as part of the covenants, which would meet county requirements and perhaps go stricter. The streetlights would be minimal and downlit.

McBreen asked if the single-family homes would be custom homes or picked from a selection of models. The applicant stated that at this conceptual state that they hadn't determined yet.

Smith asked about the pedestrian bridge that would also support the sewer line and how the applicants envisioned pedestrian access from the neighborhood. Looking to have a bridge and sewer on the upstream side. They were willing to double or triple the sewer line, and it would have safeguards and shutoffs along the line, along with holding tanks, to help prevent drainage in the river. Concerns about the pedestrian crossing of cement creek road and working towards safe crossings were discussed.

Addressed river and wetland access and trespassing. The applicant stated that they were not planning to give river access to any of the lots in the subdivision. Also stated that there would be fencing along the south side to prevent trespassing.

Pagano acknowledged that there were some public comments about a perceived policy concerning the setbacks from 135 and the view corridor and the 2005 Corridor Plan. She explained that the corridor plan wasn't codified into the LUR, noting that it was discussed as an objective when the plan was created, but the BOCC at the time did not want to add that to the LUR.

Public Comment

Margret Lorber – Adjacent property owner. Surrounded on 3 sides by the development. Expressed concern about keeping their views. Acknowledged the need for housing but asked to see the project to be downsized, or that preservation of their view be considered throughout the process and asked the developer to be considerate of their view.

Ned Stitt – Adjacent property owner. Expressed opposition to the commercial zone and suggested that it should be repurposed to accommodate more high density and affordable housing. Compared to other mountain communities in Colorado, which were focusing on the lack of affordable housing.

Sean Hartigan – CB South Business Owner. Expressed concern for his business, that people would not come into CB South for a beer if they could get one closer to the highway. Thought that the scope of the project was too big and there was no need for the commercial.

Patric Wallace – CB South resident. Expressed concern for the sequencing of the project before a new corridor plan was conducted. He also expressed concern for the safety of Highway 135 and Cement Creek intersection with added density, stating that the intersection should be updated before any development began.

Kevin Chedd – Gunnison resident. Expressed opposition to the proposal out of concern for the wildlife in the area, and concern for additional fencing that would impact the wildlife. Also expressed concerns about the increase in traffic and demands on the school systems.

Ann Johnston – Town of Crested Butte resident. Noted that this project was surrounded on 3 sides by protected lands and open space. Expressed concern for how this development would impact all of the money and effort that had gone into conserving the surrounding land. Expressed opposition to the proposed commercial. Expressed concern for the impacts on wildlife and their quality of life since the property was in an important elk migration corridor. Expressed concern about how the additional water use would impact the East River.

Fae Davidson – Gunnison Valley Resident, Owner of Davidson Wildlife Services. Spoke to a variety of wildlife encounters in this area over the years, with a significant amount being along either side of the highway. Expressed opposition to the proposal for these impacts.

Brian Downs – Expressed concerns for how the increased population as a result of the development would impact the existing healthcare system. Also expressed concerns for the increase in density and the impacts on traffic.

Jason Hogan – Gunnison valley resident. Expressed opposition to the gas station. Expressed concern that the proposed housing wouldn't address the needs of the "missing middle". Advocated for the commission to use the guidelines outlined in the 2005 Corridor Plan.

Sue Wallace – CB South Resident. Expressed opposition to the proposal for the impacts on water, sewer and overall capacity of the valley.

Damien Holdcroft – CB South resident. Expressed concerns for the impacts on a resources and livability in the CB South area including water, sewer, mail, and internet.

Jim Starr – Crested Butte resident and former Gunnison county commissioner. Expressed concerns to the impacts on the surrounding conserved lands. Expressed concerns that the commercial area would take away from tax revenue in CB South, further delaying its ability to become its own municipality. Preferred that a corridor plan be in place before the commissioners decided. Expressed support for development of the eastern half of the proposal.

John Hess – CB Resident. Former planner for Routt County. Encouraged the commission to use the guidelines in the 2005 Corridor Plan even though it wasn't incorporated into the regulations. Encouraged the incorporation of programmable field space.

Mark Schumacher – Gunnison County Resident. Expressed opposition to the commercial. Expressed support for the concept of building housing with private money to meet the needs of the missing middle.

Derek Harwell – CB South POA Manager. Expressed appreciation to the applicant that level of openness and transparency so far in the process. Inquired if the 2005 Corridor Plan may apply in matter similar to case law if it had been applied to projects in the past. Noted that the roads would have to be privately maintained as the Metro and the County would not be able to.

Rebecca Harrington – Expressed concerns for access and traffic, noting that there was only one way in and out of CB South. Expressed concern for having another HOA.

Craig Gipel – Alpenglow rentals owner. Expressed opposition to the roundabout, soccer field, gas station, and commercial. Stated that what the valley needed was affordable housing and visitor parking.

Gary Fenneman – adjacent property owner. Expressed opposition to the commercial, noting that there was still room to develop more commercial in CB South and allowing for commercial in this location would take away from that commercial area. Encouraged the Planning Commission and applicant to look affordable housing caps for CHAFA projects which used a 90% AMI.

Doug Duryea- CB South Resident. Expressed opposition to the proposed density due to impacts on the environment. Expressed opposition to this type of development in this location.

Merdith O'Connor – adjacent property resident. Expressed concern for the process that led to the increase from 70 to 184 units. Noted the existing pressure on local hospital, grocery stores and youth activities.

Elise Meier – CB South Resident. Expressed concern that this development would be sprawl too suburban. Expressed concern that there was no “escape route” out of CB South and for how dangerous the Cement Creek/135 intersection already was. Expressed concern for the precedent that approving this project may set for the rest of the corridor.

Ian Havlick – CB South resident. Stated that he was strongly against the development. Expressed concern that it was a “cookie cutter development” that didn’t belong.

Gail Mancuso – Gunnison County Resident. Expressed opposition to the project as proposed, including the commercial. Expressed concern for the density, and for the future of the highway 135 corridor. Expressed the need for more affordable housing and concern for the existing condition of the entrance to CB South.

Donny Davol – Expressed support for the density, stating that it would reduce sprawl and supported that the proposal was close to existing public transportation. Expressed opposition to “dark homes”.

Tully Burton – Restaurant owner in CB South. Expressed opposition to the proposed commercial. Expressed support for the applicant’s original proposal for 70 homes.

Marsha Thorson – CB South resident. Expressed concerns about the exiting failures of mail and delivery of packages in the CB South area. Asked if this subdivision would be joining the CB South POA.

Aaron Huckstep – attorney present on behalf of the Hunter Family who were adjacent property owners; and was also a CB South Property Owner. Commented that the CPW letter was nearly two years old and “light” on comments. Added that the Hunter’s echoed concerns about the proposed commercial. Also expressed concerns about the staff memo.

Gary Fenteman – Asked for an explanation of the commissioner’s view point on the substantial changes of the application from the original submission.

Mason closed public comment.

Applicant Response

Dawson addressed some of the comments. Noted that the proposed development had adequate water and that it was planning to deliver water to the POA. The applicant was open to looking at different types of park amenities in the next phase. Addressed that this subdivision would be a separate owners association and that it would not be joining CB South POA. The applicant would figure out the plowing either with the CB South Metro, or work with a private group.

Whitehead clarified that the Planning Commission recommended that the applicant consider proposing higher density for the application, and that the applicant was not forced to propose the increase in density.

Staff Response

Pagano addressed other concerns from the public, citing LUR section 7-102: Compatibility with community character, adding that staff had expressed the need for affordable housing. The applicant amended application after July work session and the planning commission expressed comfort with increase in density due to the added affordable housing component. The commercial was added after it was discussed in a work session as well and suggested by the planning commission.

Pagano noted that the 2005 Corridor Plan had not been used as a guiding document.

Pagano clarified that the county did not accept maintenance or ownership of roads in new developments.

Pagano added that a recent housing needs assessment identified a need of 1500 units and 75% would need to be subsidized.

Board Discussion

Puckett Daniels asked for clarification about the direction/recommendation for increased density and commercial for the proposal, noting that there was no perfect solution when it came to affordable housing, there were only trade-offs.

Niederer took ownership for the suggestion of increased density, noting that the idea came from the proposal's proximity to services: transportation, sewer and water. The applicant originally proposed 1 acre lots for the whole project, and they suggested that the applicant explore increasing density because of their proximity to those services.

Mason added that the increase in density didn't necessarily have to result in the increase in units and noted that he agreed with Niederer's recommendation.

Houck asked if more details about the commercial aspect could be provided.

Baca asked about the trail access, people would get to the commercial district of CB South, and how to not over burden CB South with the new subdivision. She added that density was the answer to cleaner water and cleaner environment.

Phillips spoke about the suggestion for commercial, adding that the commission was thinking of trades people and trying to fill gaps in commercial spaces that were needed in the community.

Mason asked about how this project would work around the future corridor plan. Pagano noted that there was not plan in process or moratorium on current applications and so the planning commission and planning department were required by law to continue with the review of the application.

The commission discussed the proposed commercial and gas station. Schwartz noted that commercial would typically be important for a neighborhood like this, but given the proximity of this neighborhood to CBS, didn't think it was necessary for this application. Mason suggested that the commercial could shift to be more maker spaces, Puckett Daniels and Smith suggested some of that space could be some for in home child care, speaking to the need of infant and toddler care in the valley.

Next Steps

There was a general lack of support for the gas station from the commission. Whitehead thought that there may be a future need for a gas station/convenience store. Intended for the commercial spaces to be smaller for startup businesses, maker spaces, like a small bike shop. Dawson wanted to get more data before removing the opportunity all together, noting that the space for the opportunity could still just be preserved. Phillips suggested EV chargers as an alternative. Puckett Daniels asked that the commercial proposal be more data driven. Smith added that the addition of a gas station would increase the traffic, which was brought up as a concern multiple times in the public comment.

Houck noted that CB South had grown tremendously because of the increase in prices in the Town of Crested Butte. There was a need for commercial in the area overall, but supported that the bulk of the commercial be pushed to CB south, stating that he didn't think that commercial was a key component of this area.

Mason recommended continuing the public hearing, stating the need for more information and time to consider the commercial, defining the neighborhood, density, minimum sf, updated CPW

comments, open space designed in a way that it could serve the broader community. Smith wanted to be realistic in expectations of the applicant to build affordable housing. The density was important, the development would help fill in the infrastructure that was lacking. It may not bring in 300 new people, but it might trigger movement within the valley. The commission also wanted more information on the connection to CB South, pedestrian and other. Pagano noted that the applicants could propose a mail center to address the post office concerns.

Continue the Joint Public Hearing

Phillips made a motion to continue the public hearing to...February 6th at 9am in the BOCC meeting room. Second, by Schwartz. The motion passed unanimously in support

Meeting Adjourned at 3:23 pm.