

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, June 20, 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- Bill Barvitski	Planner- Sean Pope
Commissioner- Eric Phillips	Planning Technician – Jena Greene
Alt. Commissioner- Catherine McBreen	Others present as listed in text

Absent: Julie Baca, Matt Schwartz

Recused: Bill Barvitski (from Lalani Project)

Zoom: Eric Phillips

Regular Meeting: With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the June 20, 2024, regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:47 am.

Moved by McBreen seconded by Phillips to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated June 6, 2024. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Unscheduled Citizens

None

Special Meeting: July 11th, 2024

Staff requested that the planning commission hold a special meeting on July 11th, 2024, since there was to be no meeting on July 4th because of the holiday. All present, with the exception of Schwartz, said they could attend.

Work Session: LUC-24-00004 | Cell Tower

Chari Mason opened the work session at 8:51 am.

Applicant Presentation

Chris Stryker gave an overview of the project. The tower would be 195 ft tall and used primarily for first responders and the state. There was a lot of pushbacks from the state in previous attempts to update the existing tower. This location is unique because three counties intersect, and there was a large coverage hole for wireless cell phones. They’ve been working with Whiter River National Forrest and GMUG in addition to getting support from the counties.

A proposed design was presented at the meeting, and was based on an existing tower located

Seminick – NEPA process and need for 3 alternatives. Alternatives analysis was required for any NEPA review. Neither the forest service nor ___ had accepted the project yet because of impact classification on the federal level. NEPA hadn't given any evaluation at this point in the process.

Stryker: reviewed the alternative locations, the access, and the amount of coverage that could be provided, as well as visibility impact. The state existing tower was the preferred location base

Replacing the existing tower with a new 175 ft multiuser facility.

Considering doing just one 12x40 shelter instead of 2. 1 generator and 2 propane tanks, the design is often updated

Scott Morrill, Gunnison County Emergency Management, noted that they had been trying to expand the site since 1996, many attempts have been made to expand the site and expand coverage, this area is one of the largest holes in the state concerning coverage, should help improve public safety for the public (not need to drive several miles to dial 911) and for first responders.

Staff Presentation

Pope reviewed the LUR standards from the staff report, highlighting 10-104 and 11-108, both of which allowed for an exception for utilities, requiring that the pc evaluate if this project qualifies for that exception.

Planning Commission Discussion

Niederer, have to be considered a public utility considering that it provided communication for emergency services.

Buffering: Weather the commission needed to shield the project adjacent properties. Existing location due to impacts, highlighted the wireless tower

Mason – photo of existing compound to get a better understanding of what was already existing, and what was the visual from the neighbors. Reviewed renderings using helicopter photos.

Seminick – buffering standard considered impacts to property and neighboring properties. Noticed that this location was completely surrounded by trees.

There was overall support for the project as proposed without additional buffering.

Impact classification reduction: Pope reviewed the standards for impact classification reduction from \ the LUR from a minor impact to an admin review, the request for the reduction was per the applicants request.

Support from PC based on remoteness, and that this project would be evaluated by the forest service,

McBreen – what had stopped this project in the past? Morrill – the Federal Partners had been more helpful, and there was a solution-based approach for the project this go-around, in addition to significant personnel change at Whiter River National Forrest. There was reluctance from CDOT for digging for utility extension, but with bike path extension, the timing was good to accomplish this.

Extra disturbances would be bringing in powered fiber using the exiting highway for new distribution lines. Because Pitkin county was working with White river national forest on a bike path, they had expressed that this was good timing to get the lines in. this was a much longer route, but much more feasible. All utilities would be underground. Line would follow 133 and then ragged mountain road all the way to the site.

Niederer – would expand coverage outdoor to the base of McClure to Redstone, reach into marble, referenced coverage map. There would still be coverage holes? Morrill – yes but would be a vast improvement.

Motion from Niederer, second from McBreen to Reduce the impact classification from a Minor Impact to an Administrative Review. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Next step, receive and admin review certificate, which would have a condition concerning the federal permit requirements.

Work Session: LUC-23-00021 | Minor Impact | CBS block 6 subdivision

Staff Presentation:

Seminick – Application for an 11 lot subdivision in CB South. All uses and design standard were governed by CAMP (CB South Special Area Regulations). The county only reviewed a number of elements fro. Was noticed and reviewed by the CBS POA. County had reviewed the application against the applicable LUR Standards.

CAMP master plan stated that an application that went through the CAMP would need to receive a Land Use Change. Application was processed as a Minor Impact, but considering these regulations and the CB South review. This area of CB South had always been contemplated for this use. The CAMP said that this project should be reviewed as an admin review.

The applicant would continue to work with staff on the Plat, DIA – utility, road improvement, temporary sidewalk.

Application Presentation

Atkinson was present at the meeting on behalf of adagio properties. Had been working with the POA and submitted first application in 2018, and had also helped with the CAMP. Wanted to help incorporate the community. Site plan complied with the camp, county, CB South Metro, CBFDP; with no variances needed. Wanted to make sure that the development would be cohesive with the neighborhood. Planned to create great streetscapes and social interactions; and help created the main street, donating half of the 35 ft need right of way (another half was still needed from Pioneer Plaza)

Reviewed the site plan for block six. The dental office on Lot 1 was pointed out, it was previously subdivided, on the condition that they wouldn't subdivide block 6 any further without a master plan. Had an agreement for the Library district to purchase lot 10 .

Overall, a 6-acre parcel with a lot planned through the camp master plan. POA approval from February, and conditional approvals from metro, fire protection district, public works, conditions were technical

but not needing a public hearing. All proposed buildings would be reviewed administratively for compliance with those

Glacier road was planned to be a public access road

Harwell and Sandstrom were present from CB South (association manager and POA president)

Sandstrom added that the POA's main concerns were who was maintain the roadways, access and connectivity w/ temporary trails until lots were developed. This was all addressed and memorialized in agreement with Atkinson.

Adagio was planning to take on the maintenance for block 6 and have a maintenance agreement for an entity agreement as opposed to having another HOA within the POA.

The applicant applied for a major impact assessment, which was previously reduced to a minor impact. After review of the CAMP and discussion with the CAO, it was determined that the planning commission could determine if the project could be further reduced to an admin review, per the CAMP. Atkinson noted that there was a lot of public review leading up to this point from within CB South, and had POA approval.

Niederer made a motion to reduce the impact classification from a minor impact to an admin review. Seconded by McBreen. The motion passed unanimously in support.

BREAK

Work Session: LUC-24-00022 | Minor Impact | Lalani

Applicant Presentation

Primary residence that exceeded the size limit. Believed that project met all design standards noting that while the home was over the maximum sf of 5000, that it was under the 7000-sf aggregate. The applicant stated that they were seeking an impact classification reduction to an administrative review.

The existing topography was flat until the parcel dropped off at the river. All buildings would be within the designated building envelope. Minimize visibility by screening – color pallet to blend in, non-reflective services; WUI, limited on providing screening through vegetation to retain defensible space and align with the well permit.

Not obtrusively visible, already within an establish subdivision, already had HOA approval, which included architectural design review.

Also had in an application for a lot cluster, as the owner owned the adjacent lot as well.

Staff Presentation

Pope noted that the max building size was 5k sf, including attached project. If the garage was detached, the aggregate sf would be below the 7k max. Pope reviewed the LUR definition of obtrusively visible structure for the planning commission.

Questions from the Board

Mason – requirement to tap into waste treatment plant. HOA approval indicated that the neighbors were aware of the project.

Discussed the attached vs. detached garage, for the applicant. This was to be a family home, wanted to be able to age with the home, and it would be preferred that the garage be attached.

Size of adjacent homes in comparison was considered, noting that it was proposed to be significantly larger than surrounding homes, but comparable in size.

Noted that they were decreasing the impact by clustering the lots. Understanding for the reasoning for wanting to attach the garage. Noted that it was helpful that the project was overall was below the maximum allowed for the aggregate.

No need for additional work session, or site visit. but wanted to move to a public hearing and directed staff to draft a decision document to review for the public hearing.

Staff asked if the Planning Commission would like to have a draft of a decision document ready to be reviewed at the public hearing. The planning commission directed staff to have a draft decision document.

Work session ended at 10:48

Mason adjourned the meeting at 10:49 am.