

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, September 4, 2025**

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 - Eric Phillips Commissioner - Julie Baca Commissioner - Fred Niederer Commissioner - Bill Barvitski Alt. Commissioner - Catherine McBreen Alt. Commissioner - Sean Patrick	Director of Community and Economic Development - Cathie Pagano Planner I – Caroline Danielson County Attorney – Matthew Hoyt Others present as listed in text
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Absent:

Recused: Patrick (LUC-25-00004 only)

Zoom: Baca

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the September 4, 2025 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:45 am.

Moved by Phillips, seconded by Barvitski to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated August 21, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous:

Pagano reviewed the upcoming Planning Commission schedule.

Work Session: LUC-22-00028 | Starview Subdivision - Major Impact

The applicant proposed subdivision of a 96-acre parcel into 129 residential lots. The parcel included a “high density” area that will include 44 units, 22 of which will have some type of deed restriction for local workforce. The remaining 22 units would not be restricted but are 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.

Staff Comments

Pagano provided an overview of the application status, summarizing previous meetings, referral comments, and the staff memo. She noted that the meeting was a work session for the revised application.

Applicant Presentation

Huresky summarized the revised plan, highlighting improved access accommodating recreation and wildlife, deed restricted housing, water rights, and increased open space. Since the March 31, 2025 submittal, there had been changes to the plat which reduced density and increased the percentage of deed restricted lots. He noted the increased setbacks from the highway, bringing the minimum setback to 218 feet. He noted that there would be 83 open market single-family residence lots. He summarized square footage maximums, ranging from 2800-5,000. He explained that there would be a 90 day short term rental limit. He noted the inclusion of an area for a soccer field and RTA parking. He urged the group to schedule a site visit before the snow falls.

Staff Comments

Pagano noted the submittal of "Starview Sketch Plan Fact Sheet," which did not contain the same details as the application which was submitted on March 31, 2025.

Huresky explained that there had been some revisions in response to agency comments. Pagano requested a written description of what was being proposed.

Planning Commission Questions

Mason suggested the applicant provide an overview of what had changed.

Huresky explained the change in open space, showing that the lots on the north property line of the development had been increased to match neighboring parcels but that the maximum building size would be 2800 sq ft.

Phillips inquired about the total number of lots. Huresky confirmed 108.

McBreen inquired about commercial lots, Huresky confirmed the commercial aspect had been removed.

Mason inquired about the viewshed from Hwy 135, Huresky noted that there would be deed restrictions limiting some homes to 1-story, and that the units closest to the highway would be 8 feet below the highway.

Mason inquired about the berms, the applicant noted that the berms would provide sound buffer for the development.

Patrick inquired about their water plan. The applicant noted that they had purchased 60 water shares which would be sufficient.

Phillips inquired about the deed restrictions, noting that a recent housing study showed the need for 75% of deed restricted housing in new developments. Huresky noted that he had seen a need for open market residences, and that meeting higher percentage goals is not feasible. Phillips inquired about the target market for the lots. Huresky noted the target market to be professionals, whether they were locals, part time residents, or moving from out of the valley. He noted the deed restricted lots target market to be locals.

Patrick inquired about minimum square footages. Huresky explained the minimum square footages would be 1,000 sq ft, excluding garages or ADU's.

Phillips asked if the southern open area would be open to the public, Huresky confirmed it would be.

Mason inquired about the build out of the development, Huresky confirmed the intent to build, though nothing could be guaranteed.

Next Steps

Group directed staff to schedule a site visit.

The applicant was directed to clean up the fact sheet, including a comparison with revisions from the March 31st submittal.

Work session ended at 10:08 a.m.

Work Session: LUC-25-00004 | Lower Verzuh Ranch Subdivision - Major Impact

The applicant proposed subdivision of 450 acres into 301 residential lots clustered into neighborhoods centered around a common amenity area. Lot sizes ranged from 1/8 acre to 3 acres. Secondary residences would be allowed on most lots. The proposed development included approximately 60% open space, including 45% undeveloped open space, with 5.7 miles of trails. Additionally, up to 10 acres of parks and playgrounds, 10 acres of ponds, and a 50-acre hay meadow were proposed, representing 15% of the total site acreage. The applicant proposed central wells and connection to the East River Regional Sanitation District for wastewater treatment.

Staff Overview

Sean Patrick recused himself from the agenda item due to potential conflict of interest due to his position as the President of Buckhorn Ranch HOA.

Pagano provided an overview of the Major Impact Land Use Change application process.

Applicant Presentation

Jessica Garrow from Design Workshop, representing the applicant, summarized the project proposal. She noted that the proposal was guided by the context of the area and the desire to create a neighborhood that met community needs. She noted the parcel to be 450 acres, and that the proposal set out to preserve agricultural uses and open space while addressing housing needs. She noted the open space, buffers from the ditches, water rights, pedestrian trails, and the potential for an RTA bus stop. She explained that they would maintain a minimum 300 foot buffer of open space around the entire project.

She explained the mix of lot typologies and the 15% deed restricted lots. She noted that the application was a starting point, and that they wished to work with the Planning Commission.

She noted the residential density of nearby subdivisions (Whetstone and Buckhorn) and explained that the density of the proposal is less than or consistent with these developments.

She explained that the water was sufficient to meet needs of the proposal, and that East River Sanitation District had provided a “will serve” letter for the proposal.

Planning Commission Questions

Phillips inquired about the target market of the development. Lacy explained that they were not sure, but that 75% of a previous development (Verzuh Ranch) were locals.

Phillips inquired about the historic barn on the parcel. Lacy noted they had not decided what would happen with the barn.

Phillips noted the demand for deed restricted homes per a recent housing study. Garrow noted that the LUR did not have specific requirements of percentage of deed restrictions. She also noted that 75% deed restricted would not be financially feasible.

Phillips inquired about the possibility of connecting to Buckhorn Ranch to combine RTA stops. The applicant noted that this was not possible without approval by Buckhorn Ranch.

Phillips inquired about transit and walk-ability. The applicant noted the potential of a CB to CB South trail, which would reduce traffic.

McBreen inquired about phases of the project. The applicant noted that they were flexible, but that they were not building out the development.

Group discussed ADU's, the applicant noted that they were not sure if ADU's would be included and that the available water could support it.

Group discussed the possibility of locals owning homes in the development, Mason noted he would like to see a higher percentage of deed restricted lots. Phillips echoed this. Group discussed limitations of deed restrictions.

Barvitski explained that he would like to see tiers of square footages, noting that reduced square footage minimums would make homes more affordable.

Baca inquired about lot clusters and relations with Buckhorn. The applicant noted that there could be limitations on lot clusters outlined in the covenants, and that they had plans to talk with Buckhorn.

Pagano noted that lot clusters are reviewed by the County, and that the BOCC has the ability to deny them. She also noted that CDOT had expressed the need for parallel connectivity along Hwy 135.

Barvitski inquired about including duplexes or triplexes on certain lots. Applicant noted that this could potentially be integrated.

Niederer asked about applying deed restrictions to undeveloped lots and potential sale price limits. Pagano said these are possible but may pose construction financing challenges.

Niederer asked about deed restriction impact through construction and North Valley benefits, and whether the applicant consulted GVRHA. The applicant said not yet but is open to consulting.

Phillips inquired about how the proposal addressed wildlife needs. The applicant noted that the large setbacks and open space addressed these needs.

Mason noted the need for affordable housing.

Barvitski noted that the 40% deed restriction goal was difficult to meet as a developer. Mason noted they could increase the deed restricted lots while also reducing the maximum square footage allowances, explaining that cutting the lot and home sizes reduced the cost of homes.

Group discussed similar deed restricted lots in the community.

McBreen inquired about the housing needs assessment, asking if the need was lowering with recent projects. Pagano noted that each housing study had showed the need for more housing.

Mason inquired about parking at the potential bus stop location; this did not exist in the current plan.

Next Steps

The group directed staff to schedule a site visit. Phillips urged the applicant to look at numbers to determine the amount of affordable housing that would be feasible. Mason suggested including space for a park and ride. Group discussed affordable housing, expressing that increased density would be tolerated if it meant an increase in affordable housing.

Moved by Baca, seconded by Phillips to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously in support. Meeting Adjourned at 12:00 pm.