

# **GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**PRELIMINARY AGENDA: November 6, 2025**

**221 N. Wisconsin, Suite D Gunnison CO, 81230**

**In person or on Zoom**

*Disclaimer: agenda discussion item times are approximate. Public hearings may start on or after the posted notice time. Work sessions may start earlier or later than the posted time.*

**8:45 a.m.**

- Call to order; determine quorum.
- Approval of Minutes from the October 23, 2025, Planning Commission meeting.
- Unscheduled Citizens: A brief period in which the public is invited to make general comments or has questions of the Commission or Staff about items which are not scheduled on the day's agenda.
- Miscellaneous/Staff Reminders/Announcements.

**9: 00 a.m.**

**Work Session: SG-25-00001 | Gunnison Area Plan**

Work Session on the proposed Gunnison Area Plan and draft Special Area Regulations.

**11:30 a.m.**

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

The applicant proposes subdivision of a 96-acre parcel into 107 residential lots (83 single-family residence lots and 24 deed restricted units); and a building for the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District. The subject parcel is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Highway 135 and Cement Creek Rd.

**Adjourn**

**Packet Materials are available online: [Planning Commission Meeting Packets](#)**

Or by visiting <https://gunnisoncounty.org/197/Planning-Commission> and selecting "View Most Recent Meeting Packet"

**Use this link to join the Webinar on Zoom: <https://gunnisoncounty-org.zoom.us/j/86337231015>**

**Phone one-tap:**

**+17193594580,,86337231015# US**

**+14086380968,,86337231015# US (San Jose)**

NOTE: Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are conducted in the Blackstock Government Center Meeting Room 221 N. Wisconsin St. in Gunnison, across the street from the Post Office. This is a preliminary agenda; agenda times may be changed up to 24 hours before the meeting date. If you are interested in a specific agenda item, you may want to call the Planning Department (641-0360) ahead of time to confirm its scheduled time. Anyone needing special accommodations may contact the Planning Department before the meeting.

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, October 23, 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 – Fred Niederer Commissioner – Julie Baca Alt. Commissioner – Catherine McBreen Alt. Commissioner – Sean Patrick  BOCC – Jonathan Houck BOCC – Liz Smith BOCC – Laura Puckett Daniels	Director of Community and Economic Development – Cathie Pagano Director of Planning – Hillary Seminick Planning Technician – Aidan McComas Matt Hoyt – County Attorney Anton Sinkewich – City of Gunnison Others present as listed in text
---	---

**Absent:** Barvitski

**Recused:**

**Zoom:** McBreen, Phillips, Neiderer, Baca

\*\*\*\*

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the October 23, 2025 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:49am. Mason seated Alternate Member Patrick as a Voting Commissioner

\*\*\*\*

**Moved by** Patrick, seconded by Phillips to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated Sept 4, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

**Moved by** McBreen, seconded by Phillips to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated September 17, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

**Moved by** Patrick, seconded by McBreen to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated September 18, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

**Moved by** McBreen, seconded by Phillips to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated October 2, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

\*\*\*

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous:

Staff noted the next meetings are November 6, 2025 and November 20, 2025.

\*\*\*

**Cont. Joint Public Hearing: SG-25-00001 | Gunnison Area Plan Special Area Regulations**

Public hearing on the proposed Gunnison Area Plan and Special Area Regulations with Gunnison County Planning Commission and Gunnison County Board of Commissioners.

## Staff Presentation

Pagano: Staff reviewed the SAR/GAP and proposed increasing lot sizes—single-family from 9,000 to 11,000 sq. ft., and duplex lots accordingly. Density requirements increased; any project over 17 units per acre triggers a Minor Impact Review.

Pagano: New language addresses character and scale relative to neighboring development. Larger developments will be located near highways, with smaller housing types set back to ensure visual transitions.

Seminick: Presented density scenarios. Scenario A: 7 units/acre, lowest density, mix of home types.

Puckett Daniels: Confirmed 7 units/acre is the minimum in the current draft.

Seminick: Clarified visuals are conceptual, intended only to illustrate density.

Seminick: Scenario B: 12 units/acre; includes required green space. Some units may need to be smaller to accommodate density.

Seminick: Scenario C: 17 units/acre; includes more duplexes and townhomes, fewer single-family units.

Niederer: Requested review of Scenario A and clarification on unit-per-acre calculations.

Seminick: Explained differences due to total acreage versus developable acreage.

Smith: Asked about density at Van Tuyl Townhomes and the overall neighborhood.

Pagano: Estimated 20–23 units/acre overall, with 25 units/acre in the townhome section.

Seminick: Explained 10-ft setbacks and reiterated that visuals are abstract and not site-specific.

Pagano: Emphasized importance of construction type and green space requirements.

Puckett Daniels: Noted visuals cannot reflect real-world topography or site constraints.

Smith: Asked how density requirements are affected by physical constraints.

Seminick: Confirmed density would be affected by developable area limitations.

Pagano: Noted most parcels avoid hazardous areas by design; variance options could be considered in future updates.

Puckett Daniels: Asked whether density minimums apply to total parcel acreage or developable area.

Pagano: Confirmed they currently apply to total acreage.

Mason: Asked whether a variance could be offered for projects unable to meet the 7 units/acre minimum, suggesting flexibility to encourage development.

Puckett Daniels: Stated the intent is to maximize developable land near urban areas.

Smith: Asked if a variance process could be added for parcels with limited development potential.

Pagano: Suggested exploring that option but cautioned against writing regulations for exceptions.

Niederer: Asked about the process to amend the SAR/GAP if issues arise in the future.

Pagano: Explained amendments would be submitted to Community Development and reviewed by the BOCC.

Puckett Daniels: Noted amendment requests will likely occur regularly. Commented on Land Use Resolution amendments and noted the inclusion of public hearings for such amendments.

Hoyt: Clarified that SAR amendments do not require a public hearing or notice; only property interest holders may propose them. Clarified the Board may receive written or oral public comments for SAR amendments.

Niederer: Confirmed that public hearings are not required for SAR amendments.

Hoyt: Affirmed; noted participation depends on proximity and property interest. Commented that proximity and property interests concerning SAR amendments applies to those within or adjacent to the Special Area boundaries.

Smith: Observed amendments could occur without public hearings.

Pagano: Stated the amendment process remains at the Board's discretion.

Puckett Daniels: Noted the Board generally encourages public comment regardless.

Seminick: Added that typical city lots in Gunnison have roughly nine units per acre, often including ADUs.

Pagano: Requested direction from the Board on next steps concerning revisions.

Smith: Highlighted that public concern centers on infrastructure limitations and asked how the process addresses those.

Pagano: Explained developments creating 100+ trips/day must submit traffic studies; Public Works may require studies.

Mason: Asked how infrastructure issues are handled if areas cannot support increased density.

Pagano: Noted developers must meet SAR standards; site constraints may limit feasibility.

Puckett Daniels: Stated it is the developer's responsibility to address site constraints.

Mason: Expressed concern high density and infrastructure costs could deter development.

Pagano: Noted developers often find workable solutions.

Smith: Asked whether infrastructure costs could be distributed among multiple developers rather than placed on one.

Pagano: Explained the Board declined road impact fees; infrastructure follows, not precedes, development.

Smith: Reiterated community concerns about infrastructure and asked if future needs can be anticipated.

Puckett Daniels: Acknowledged utility and connectivity challenges; discussed funding options to reduce developer burdens.

Smith: Emphasized the need for continued public input on these topics.

Houck: Stated the SAR/GAP applies area-wide, not parcel-by-parcel, and cautioned against overanalyzing details at this stage.

Puckett Daniels: Noted that specific development impacts can only be assessed once proposals are submitted.

Smith: Asked whether developers can pay into infrastructure funds, so no single developer is faced with excessive costs associated with development and improvement. Asked whether, with high density development encouraged, if it is reasonable to predict some level of infrastructure improvement.

Mason: Raised concerns about how SAR minimums and maximums may affect northern vs. southern areas, potentially limiting future options.

Puckett Daniels: Noted constraints exist everywhere; variance processes could help maintain flexibility and community character.

Smith: Said lowering minimum density further is unnecessary; suggested reviewing impact fees for future infrastructure funding.

Seminick: Explained infrastructure (e.g., roads) is typically built concurrent with development; CDOT access points change post-development.

Puckett Daniels: Concluded with emphasis on maintaining robust public engagement and addressing ongoing concerns.

### Gunnison Area Plan

Pagano: Explained the GAP is a high-level policy document outlining future vision, while the SAR is a regulatory document that operationalizes the GAP. Noted the GAP would stand-in for the Three-Mile Plan document. Stated the plan will be used both by the City and the County.

Sinkewich: Stated the plan focuses development into specific areas.

Pagano: Noted adoption protocols and relationship between the two documents.

Niederer: Asked how the SAR relates to the IGA, noting the Planning Commission has not reviewed the IGA, which complicates approving the SAR without that context.

Hoyt: Clarified that under Colorado law, intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) are executed by the Board of County Commissioners, which shares authority and jurisdiction between governments.

Pagano: Confirmed the IGA belongs to the Board.

Puckett Daniels: Stated authority for SAR adoption rests with the Board and that processes exist to ensure consistency between the SAR and IGA.

Pagano: Added that implementation details can be reviewed further if needed.

Hoyt: Noted the IGA and SAR are intended to be read together. Noted if there is a conflict, the IGA is to default to the SAR.

Puckett Daniels: Mentioned ongoing coordination with the City and requested a City update.

Sinkewich: Reported staff received direction to complete the document, with adoption expected before year-end.

Phillips: Asked about the wildlife planning tool and whether it can be shown alongside the GAP.

Pagano: Stated the wildlife tool will be used in daily application reviews; acknowledged challenges in integrating wildlife data.

Pagano: Outlined next steps for GAP completion.

Puckett Daniels: Noted the GAP reflects three years of collaboration, multiple drafts, and coordination with the City.

Mason: Called for a motion to recommend Gunnison Area Plan to the Board of County Commissioners.

**Moved by** Phillips, seconded by Patrick to recommend the Gunnison Area Plan to the Board of County Commissioners. The motion passed unanimously in support.

### Special Area Regulations

Niederer: Raised concern over interpretive language. Asked if Planning and Zoning classifications affect property taxes.

Hoyt: Clarified taxation is determined by the Assessor based on actual use, not zoning or planning actions.

Niederer: Recommended using net developable area instead of gross, noting gross calculations restrict flexibility.

Seminick: Said regulations were written for typical conditions, not exceptions. Areas were selected for minimal hazards, supporting the gross developable approach. Staff will define what qualifies as developable.

Mason: Asked if switching to net developable area would limit density and whether developer flexibility should be prioritized.

Seminick: Said fewer regulations align with the goal of streamlining the process.

Niederer: Expressed concern over losing land to non-developable areas.

Seminick: Explained the intent is to let developers determine density for their parcels within a zoning framework.

Niederer: Questioned the need for strict minimum and maximum density if the goal is to encourage development.

Puckett Daniels: Asked whether calculating net versus gross area would significantly affect outcomes.

Niederer: Said absolute limits impose unnecessary constraints under the SAR.

Puckett Daniels: Noted all planning to date is based on gross area; changing now would alter density requirements.

Seminick: Clarified roads and rights-of-way are excluded when calculating density.

Pagano: Said height revisions are intended to help meet density goals.

Mason: Asked if removing roads and sidewalks reduces achievable density.

Puckett Daniels: Warned reducing density could weaken regulations that support the GAP policy.

Mason: Noted staff reduced minimum and maximum standards and requested Board feedback.

Baca: Expressed support for staff's reduction and use of gross developable area.

Phillips: Expressed support for staff's reduction and use of gross developable area.

Patrick: Expressed support for staff's reduction and use of gross developable area.

McBreen: Expressed support for staff's reduction and use of gross developable area; noted concern about overregulation.

Smith: Expressed support for staff's reduction and use of gross developable area.

Puckett Daniels: Noted new language was added to promote transitions between neighborhoods and soften development edges.

### Public Comment

Mark Hatcher: Dos Rios 3 homeowner and HOA President. Asked how high- and low-density developments are being addressed. Emphasized the importance of wetlands, whether manmade or natural, and noted changes include the Dunbar Family Tract, the only area within the South Urban Transition Zone.

Rus Halpern: Fairway Lane resident. Questioned whether the Gunnison Rising project is being revived and if its 1,900 planned units already meet local housing needs. Urged that the Dunbar Tract be left undeveloped, stating demand does not justify the proposed additional units.

Steve Jenkins: Asked whether a response was provided to the submitted petition. Opposed inclusion of the Dunbar Ranch in the SAR and expressed concern that public comment will not be allowed in future SAR matters. Cited inadequate public notice and environmental concerns related to wetlands near Dos Rios.

Jeff Wilkinson: Fairway Lane resident and developer. Supported efforts to modernize regulations but said Fairway Lane cannot accommodate additional traffic. Urged adherence to all regulatory processes and stated proposed density near Fairway Lane is incompatible with the neighborhood. Noted Antelope Hills could be more suitable and less impactful to wildlife.

John Schaffer: Tomichi Trail resident. Raised concerns over traffic impacts from future development and asked when density thresholds would trigger infrastructure upgrades. Encouraged preserving non-developable areas as public or green spaces.

Wendy Naugle: Thanked staff for reducing density. Asked for clarification on whether high-density development would trigger a minor impact review.

Lauren Koelliker: Valley Housing Fund representative. Spoke in support of the GAP and SAR, noting they modernize outdated regulations and promote diverse, well-planned development.

Pamela Hatcher: Tomichi Trail resident. Questioned why the Dunbar Tract is the only southern area identified for development and why the County is not utilizing land it already owns.

#### Response to Public Comments

Pagano: Explained that County regulations and the Army Corps of Engineers only regulate naturally occurring wetlands. Uncertain about the status of the Gunnison Rising project. Stated Antelope Hills poses accessibility and topographic challenges and would have greater wildlife impacts than the Dunbar Tract. Noted that infrastructure, utilities, and overall improvements must be addressed in planning for large-scale developments. Clarified that the Dunbar Tract is not the only site identified for potential development under the GAP; several parcels south of the City are also included.

Houck: Requested clarification on uranium contamination.

Pagano: Explained the County industrial park was formerly the site of a uranium mill. Contaminated soils were removed in coordination with the Department of Energy (DOE). The DOE confirmed the Dos Rios area was not contaminated, though the County retains ownership of previously affected land.

Houck: Added that the DOE established buffer zones and removed contaminated soil from developed areas.

Seminick: Addressed residential building height standards.

Puckett Daniels: Clarified there is no current development application for the Dunbar Tract.

Pagano: Stated the applicant only requested a pre-application conference to review concepts and was advised they could either wait for SAR adoption or proceed independently.

Hoyt: Noted that a future application would become quasi-judicial, and receiving information about a future application is unfair to the applicant and others affected. Cautioned against receiving information about a future application.

Deliberations:

Hoyt: Reviewed Standards of Approval, including Development Activity, Rationale and Need for Designation, Boundaries, Community Plan or Technical Study, Alternatives, Adverse Impacts, and Expected Benefits.

Niederer: Expressed concern with Section 1-110(C)(6), stating the North and South Urban Transition Zones differ and should be considered separately. Opposed removal of public comment opportunities, especially for affected property owners. Supported the North Zone but not the South.

Mason: Asked if the South Zone should be revisited and requested specifics from Niederer. Noted both zones would be affected by approval.

Phillips: Concerned there has not been sufficient deliberation to approve the SAR.

Smith: Sought clarification on public comment. Noted comment opportunities would remain for developments triggering a minor impact review, though not for administrative reviews.

McBreen: Also concerned about limiting public comment but comfortable moving forward if comment opportunities remain.

Baca: Had no additional questions. Opposed removing sections as suggested by Niederer and preferred keeping the document intact.

Patrick: Acknowledged public concerns and supported further discussion of the South Urban Transition Area.

Mason: Emphasized the importance of public comment. Comfortable moving forward but asked if the North and South could be regulated separately.

Pagano: Said separate regulations have not been considered. Differing standards would complicate future reviews and create inefficiencies for developers and staff. Noted it is difficult to plan for future developments without applications in hand. Asked whether the Commission needs additional information.

Hoyt: Clarified the Commission's action is a recommendation, not an approval. The Board may accept, modify, or deny it.

Mason: Asked if recommending the SAR ends the public hearing process.

Hoyt: Explained no additional public hearing is required under the Land Use Resolution. The joint public hearing serves as the formal public process.

Puckett Daniels: Requested more time to consider the GAP/SAR and address public requests to remove the Dunbar Tract from the South Zone.

Pagano: Noted the option to continue the public hearing or close it and continue deliberations.

Puckett Daniels: Requested acceptance of additional written public comment.

Pagano: Asked what further information the Commission would need before the next meeting.

McBreen: Requested staff responses to questions raised during public comment.

Mason: Requested examples of current City and County developments with unit counts for context.

Smith: Requested additional discussion on infrastructure requirements.

### Next Steps

**Moved by:** Baca, seconded by Phillips to close the public hearing, leaving the public comment period open through November 5<sup>th</sup>. The motion passed unanimously in support.

November 6<sup>th</sup> will be a regular Planning Commission meeting.

### **Work Session: LUC-24-00008 | Treasure Mountain Ranch – Minor Impact**

Treasure Mountain Ranch, Inc. applied for a Minor Impact Land Use Change at 3881 Forest Service Road 314 to consolidate 16 parcels into 9, complete three boundary line adjustments, and cluster new development, including four new residential structures (5,089 sq. ft.) and one maintenance barn (4,900 sq. ft.) within a 1.9-acre building envelope in the historic Crystal townsite.

### Staff Comments

Seminick: Noted the summary from the September 17<sup>th</sup> site visit in the Staff Memo. Stated staff's recommendation is for Planning Commission to comment on the site visit notes. Noted Planning Commission can either schedule an additional work session or to schedule a public hearing, further Planning Commission can direct staff to draft a nonbinding decision document for consideration at a public hearing.

### Applicant Response

Stuart Gillespie: Asked for clarification on some minutes.

### Next Steps

Staff will work with the applicant to schedule the public hearing.

**Moved by:** Mason, seconded by Baca to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously with approval.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:28 pm



Cathie Pagano, Assistant County Manager  
Gunnison County Community & Economic Development Department

Phone: (970) 641-0360  
Email: [planning@gunnisoncounty.org](mailto:planning@gunnisoncounty.org)  
Website: [www.GunnisonCounty.org](http://www.GunnisonCounty.org)

---

From: Cathie Pagano, Assistant County Manager for Community and Economic Development  
To: Planning Commission  
Date: October 30, 2025  
Re: Starview Subdivision LUC-22-00028

---

### **Third Amended Sketch Plan dated September 4, 2025**

The third revised sketch plan includes 107 residential lots (83 single-family residence lots and 24 deed restricted units); and a building for the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District. The applicant proposes the following additional changes to the application:

1. Highway 135 Setbacks Increased – To improve views and minimize site grading and vegetation disruption.
2. Southern Parcel Opened Up – Enhances wildlife movement, visual buffer, and protects key views.
3. Commercial Development Removed – Project now entirely residential/recreational.
4. Recreation Field Added – Multi-use grass field located at the north end with 20 parking spaces.
5. Parking for RTA Bus Riders – Added near the north end for Starview residents.
6. Recreation Path Straightened – Improved alignment along Highway 135.
7. Reduced Berm Size – Height and density along Highway 135 decreased.
8. Roundabout Added – Proposed at the north end to improve traffic at Cement Creek Rd/Highway 135.
9. Secondary Access Added – At the south end to improve traffic flow and emergency access.
10. Larger Lots by Stables at East River – Better density transition to adjacent neighborhood.
11. Lot Sizes and Open Space Adjusted – Open space reduced from 70% to 51%.
12. Pedestrian/Bike Bridge Retained – Over East River near Cement Creek Road remains in plan.

### Changes in the Sketch Plan Application

	Original Sketch Plan Application	Sketch Plan Revision #1	Sketch Plan Revision #2 (March 31, 2025)	Sketch Plan Revision #3 (Sept. 4, 2025)
Single-family lots/units	76	129	125	107
Essential housing units	0	22	20	24
Accessory dwelling units allowed	Yes	Yes	Yes, only 25 total allowed in subdivision and can be short term rented	Yes, only 25 total allowed in subdivision and can be short term rented up to 90 days
Maximum residential size	5,000 sq ft	5,000 sq ft	5,000 sq ft	Lots 1-10: 5,000 sq ft  Lots 11-83: 2,800 sq ft
Minimum residential size	1,400 sq ft + 2-car garage for single family	1,200 sq ft	1,000 sq ft for SFR 800 sq ft for ADU	1,000 sq ft 600 sq ft for ADU
Multifamily size			Min 800 sq ft and 1-car garage Max 1,600 sq ft	Min 800 sq ft Max. 1200 sq ft
Non-residential (CB South Metro lot)	1	1	1	1
Commercial	0	12	0	0
Lot size range	0.13-0.68 acres	0.06-0.91 acres	0.16-1.04 acres	0.12-1.25 acres
Average Density	0.79 units/acre	1.43 units/acre	1.31 units/acre	1.11 units/acre
Short-term rental limitations	No	Yes	Yes, except multifamily units.	Yes
Open Space	67%	55%	71%	51%
Recreation Amenities	Trail, Ponds, bridge across East River for peds/bikes	Trail, Ponds, bridge across East River for peds/bikes, pavilion, play area	Trail, Ponds, bridge across East River for peds/bikes; recreation field space (w/ 20	

			parking spaces), pavilion, play area	
--	--	--	---	--

**Staff Comments**

The Sketch Plan Revision #3 addresses some of the concerns raised at the public hearing in February. The applicant has eliminated commercial uses, included an area for a recreation field, moved the development further from the highway, and eliminated some development on the southern portion of the parcel for wildlife movement.

The revision increases the proposed essential housing units from 20 to 24. Staff continues to have concerns about the limited amount of essential housing proposed in comparison to the total free market units. 83 free market units will create additional demand for local workforce. The 2024 Housing Needs Assessment found that, "To address the current housing shortfall and keep up with projected job growth, at least 75% of the estimated 1,300 to 1,550 homes needed to support local residents and employees by 2029 in the Valley will need to be priced below market." Staff does not find that the applicant addressed the concerns of the Planning Commission and BOCC expressed during the February public hearing including skepticism that the number of deed-restricted units justifies the scale of the proposed development and if the free market homes will be attainable for the local workforce and "missing middle." There was agreement that more affordable housing—targeted to full-time residents and the local workforce—is needed, and concern that free-market housing would only be available at a luxury price point.

While the overall project density is relatively low, the proposed layout represents a sprawling development pattern that does not address the key concerns raised by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners at the February hearing. Those concerns emphasized the importance of compact, clustered development that limits land disturbance, preserves open space, and supports efficient infrastructure and transit. Although the revised plan reduces the number of lots and removes development from the southern portion of the site, it still lacks the design elements necessary to achieve a cohesive, clustered form consistent with County standards and community goals.

The applicant has identified a location for a recreation field and shown twenty parking spaces. There was a broad need expressed at the public hearing for recreation space that met community needs and field space has been identified as a community need.

CPW has concerns about the secondary southern access point and its impact on wildlife, the applicant has not indicated that they will modify this location in response to CPW.

**Referral Agency Comments on Sketch Plan Revision #2**

County staff sent the second (March 31, 2025) revised Sketch Plan application to the following referral agencies on April 9, 2025: CDOT, CB South POA, Gunnison County Public Works, Colorado Parks and Wildlife, CB Fire Protection District, Gunnison RE1-J School District, Colorado Division of Water Resources, RTA, and CB South Metro District. The third revision of the Sketch Plan application has NOT been sent to referral agencies.

**Crested Butte South POA**

1. Urged that five key concerns—traffic safety, road maintenance, viewshed impact, athletic field viability, and infrastructure contributions—be carefully addressed in the planning process.
2. They emphasized a desire for continued collaboration and transparent communication as the Starview proposal advances.

#### **Applicant Response to CB South POA**

1. A roundabout is anticipated at the Cement Creek Road/Highway 135 intersection, with its location shown on the plan.
2. Starview will handle road maintenance and snow removal through its HOA.
3. Multifamily units closest to the highway will be restricted to one story, with no structures exceeding two stories elsewhere. Density may be reduced from 41 to 24 units, all deed-restricted as Essential Housing.
4. Space for a multi-use athletic field has been set aside, similar in size to Rainbow Park’s soccer field.
5. Contributions include inclusion in the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District, dedication of property for public uses, and conveyance of high-capacity wells to the District.

#### **RTA**

1. Acknowledged the proposal’s potential impacts on transit operations and emphasized the importance of proactive infrastructure planning—particularly transit parking and bus pullouts—to ensure future service viability.
2. They requested to be kept informed on the application’s progress.

#### **Applicant Response to RTA**

1. Additional parking will be open to all users, not just Starview residents.
2. The Applicant will coordinate with RTA on bus pull-out locations and designs if space allows.

#### **Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW)**

1. Raised concerns about the impact on wildlife, particularly the E-43 elk herd migration corridor near Highway 135 and Cement Creek.
2. They recommend leaving the southern portion of the parcel undeveloped to preserve wildlife movement and suggest relocating the second subdivision access point further north to reduce habitat fragmentation. CPW also questioned the necessity of a new driveway and proposed alternatives to minimize disruption.
3. Expressed broader concerns about the cumulative impact of development on wildlife habitats, public lands, and natural resource sustainability. They emphasized the need for increased collaboration among local, county, and federal agencies to address these issues, including planning for wildlife crossings and infrastructure along Highway 135.

#### **Applicant Response to CPW**

1. The south end of the development has been opened up to address wildlife concerns.

2. A safer driveway access to Harrison and Rick's properties is proposed, with the Applicant willing to relocate the existing easement at its cost.
3. A new southern access provides secondary entry to Starview, alleviating traffic at the Cement Creek Road/Highway 135 intersection.

#### **CDOT**

1. If the proposed development will cause an increase of 20% or more in traffic that a traffic study shall be required.

#### **Applicant Response to CDOT**

1. A traffic study will be conducted at the Preliminary Plan stage, with initial calculations showing less than a 20% traffic increase at the Cement Creek Road/Highway 135 intersection.

#### **CBFPD**

1. The plan includes two points of ingress/egress, meeting requirements.
2. The proposed roundabout improves alignment and safety at the intersection.
3. Access roads requiring fire hydrants are 26 feet wide, and the cul-de-sac at Orion Way has a 45-foot radius, both meeting standards.
4. Existing or proposed bike/pedestrian paths on CR-740 must be considered for life safety.

#### **Applicant Response to CBFPD**

1. Safety considerations for connecting a path to Crested Butte South will be addressed during the Preliminary Plan stage.
2. The Applicant will work with CBFPD to secure an affordable housing unit for employees.
3. Water supply and utilities will be detailed further in the Preliminary Plan.

#### **CO Division of Water Resources**

1. Well Permits and Augmentation: Existing wells, including Well Number 2, must obtain new permits and operate under an approved augmentation plan to supply the subdivision. The applicant may use the Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District (UGRWCD) contract or seek approval for an individual augmentation plan from the Division 4 Water Court.
2. Non-Domestic Water Supply: Irrigation water will be managed by the applicant and a future property owners association. Changes to the historical use of Bocker Ditch water rights require approval from the Division 4 Water Court to prevent injury to senior water rights.
3. Recommendations: The applicant should clarify the augmentation plan, provide a copy of the UGRWCD contract and worksheet (if applicable), or seek approval for an individual augmentation plan.
4. The DWR emphasizes the need for a finalized water supply plan to ensure compliance with legal requirements and prevent injury to existing water rights.

#### **Applicant Response to Colorado Division of Water Resources**

1. Domestic water uses will be included in the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District's existing water augmentation plan, supported by 60 shares in Long Lake purchased by the Applicant.
2. Non-domestic water uses (irrigation and pond filling) will utilize water rights from the Applicant's 6.0 cfs in the Bocker Ditch, with dry-up credits for depletions.

Please feel free to reach out to me in advance with any questions or concerns. Thank you.

**STARVIEW PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT  
CHANGES IN THE SKETCH PLAN APPLICATION**

	Revision #2 (3/31/25)	Revision #3 (9/4/25)	Notes
Single-family lots/units	125	83	Reduced density
Deed-restricted units	20	24	22% of the project is deed-restricted housing
Accessory dwelling units	Yes, only 25 total ADU's permitted for open-market single-family homes, lot selection TBD. Minimum 800 sq ft.	Yes, only 25 total ADU's permitted for open-market single-family homes, lot selection TBD. Minimum 600 sq ft.	Reduced ADU minimum sq footage
Single-family min/max square footage	1,000 sq ft minimum, 5,000 sq ft maximum	Lots 11-83 (not including lot 78 - metro lot): 1,000 sq ft minimum, 2,800 sq ft maximum. Lots 1-10: 1,000 sq ft minimum, 5,000 sq ft maximum	Lots 1-10 square footage updated to match the character of surrounding homes
Deed-restricted min/max square footage	800-1,600 sq ft + one-car garage	800-1,200 sq ft + one-car garage	Reduced maximum square footage for greater affordability
Non-residential (CB South Metro Lot)	1	1	No change
Commercial	0	0	No change
Lot size range	0.16 - 1.04 acres	0.16 - 1.37 acres	Lot size increased on particular lots due to plat layout
Average density	1.31 units/acre	1.2 units/acre	Reduced overall density
Short-term rentals	Single-family units only	Single-family units only, 90 rental nights per year maximum	Added 90-day restriction

Open space percentage	71%	51.5%	Lots 79-84 were increased in size to mirror neighboring lots in the Stables East River Estates in response to public comment
Recreation amenities	Trail, ponds, bridge across East River for peds/bikes, recreation field space with 20 parking spaces, pavilion, play area	Trail, ponds, bridge across East River for peds/bikes, recreation field space with 20 parking spaces, pavilion, play area	East River pedestrian bridge details TBD based on ongoing planning with CB South Metropolitan District
Highway 135 setbacks	Between 261-290-foot setback from Highway 135 for single-family structures  165-foot setback from Highway 135 for deed-restricted structures	Between 261-290-foot setback from Highway 135 for single-family structures  218-foot setback from Highway 135 for deed-restricted structures	Increased structure setbacks from Highway 135 to address viewshed preservation concerns