

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, November 6, 2025**

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting in the Planning Commission Meeting Room in the Board of County Commissioners’ Meeting Room, 200 N. Virginia, Gunnison, CO. and on Zoom **Present:**

Chairperson – Roland Mason Vice-Chairperson – Eric Phillips Commissioner – Julie Baca Alt. Commissioner – Catherine McBreen Alt. Commissioner – Sean Patrick	Director of Community and Economic Development – Cathie Pagano Director of Planning – Hillary Seminick Planning Technician – Aidan McComas County Attorney – Matt Hoyt City of Gunnison – Anton Sinkewich Others present as listed in text
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Absent: Niederer

Recused:

Zoom: Baca

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the November 6, 2025 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:46 am. Mason seated Alternate Members Patrick and McBreen as Voting Commissioners.

Moved by Phillips, seconded by McBreen to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated October 23, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous:

Pagano: noted agendas will be full into the near future.

Work Session: SG-25-00001 | Gunnison Area Plan Special Area Regulations

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

Staff Comments

Pagano: noted the public hearing was closed at the previous meeting, with public comment open until November 5 at 5:00 p.m.

Pagano: summarized the process leading to the GAP SAR, referencing the Board’s Strategic Plan and describing the SAR as a long-term guide for growth and workforce housing, with feasibility driven by the private market.

Pagano: reviewed State Demographer data and Colorado’s housing shortfall, noting Proposition 123 established the State Affordable Housing Fund and requires local governments to implement a 90-day fast-track approval process for affordable housing eligibility.

Pagano: presented local housing statistics, linking the housing gap to impacts on the economy and essential services.

Pagano: stated the GAP's goal is to modernize development rules, expand housing options, and maintain neighborhood compatibility. Recommended revisions include larger single-family and duplex lot sizes, reduced density, and requiring Minor Impact permits for projects over 17 units. Explained that net density would exclude waterbodies, easements, rights-of-way, and trail areas.

Pagano: referenced other developments such as Gunnison Rising and West Thorn, noting market conditions will determine feasibility, and summarized statistics for the Urban Growth Boundary and the North and South Urban Transition Areas.

Pagano: Pagano explained the current LUR excludes workforce housing, parks and trails requirements, and connectivity standards for sidewalks, bike paths, and streets. Noted the LUR applies countywide. Cautioned that without SAR adoption, development on the Dunbar parcel would likely follow a suburban pattern with larger lots, lower density, and increased parking requirements. Stated that the public review component of the SAR adds time and cost, which may delay or discourage housing development.

Pagano: clarified next steps for the GAP SAR and reviewed standards of approval.

Baca: requested clarification on approval criteria.

Phillips: requested clarification on approval criteria.

Mason: asked about developer requirements for infrastructure connectivity and scope of improvements.

Pagano: stated a traffic study will address those requirements, noting that access improvements vary by project and must meet Public Works and/or CDOT standards.

McBreen: asked if developers are responsible for long-term infrastructure maintenance.

Pagano: stated roads will be privately maintained but dedicated to the public, and if the North Urban Transition Area is annexed, maintenance would be transferred to the City of Gunnison.

Phillips: asked how net versus gross density affects units per acre; Pagano responded that it depends on parcel conditions.

Sinkewich: noted developers can design to maximize each parcel's potential.

Pagano: reiterated the importance of the standards of approval and their relationship to County development.

Planning Commission Questions

Mason: noted public comments, and asked for clarification on the public comments.

Pagano: noted the public may receive notifications from the County concerning Boards and Commissions.

Mason: stated many comments noted agricultural lands. Asked for clarification on agriculture and urban development in the County.

Pagano: stated the County has worked hard to preserve working ranches, water rights, viewsheds, etc. Noted the GAP SAR is meant to focus development near to existing developments and urban areas.

Mason: asked if resort communities were being targeted by the State as locations for increased workforce housing.

Pagano: noted the State is focusing on housing efforts throughout Colorado.

Pagano: shared Commissioner Niederer's comments. Niederer's concerns over changes that may inhibit local development, regulations could attract out of town developers rather than local developers. Niederer noted expressed concerns that ADUs and secondary residences won't adequately address the housing issue because cost would limit building of them. Niederer suggested reducing the density of development from 4 units/acre gross, and 5 units/acre net. Niederer suggested a sliding scale of density.

Pagano: professional developers don't have much presence in the County. Most development in the County is small scale. Stated that the marketplace will determine how feasible development is for various developers both within and outside the County. Address how difficult code language would be to create a sliding scale of density, and confusion it may cause for neighborhoods and developers.

Seminick: noted Staff shared what feathered density would look like through a presentation slide previously.

Mason: asked what Next Steps will look like.

Hoyt: noted what the Planning Commission must address in their recommendation of the SAR to the Board of County Commissioners.

Pagano: shared the standards of approval and recommendation in detail. Stated planning ahead allows for approval process to be more streamlined.

Mason: addressed "Development Activity". Stated that the structure of the GAP SAR is needed for the future to address applications through a single lens. No changes to this section.

Phillips: stated there has been a major increase in the number of Major Impact Land Use Change Applications.

Mason: addressed "Rationale and Need for Designation". Reducing the permitting timeline is necessary for larger projects, streamlining in specific areas. No changes to this section.

Mason: addressed "Boundaries". Stated focusing future development near Gunnison meets connectivity, access, etc. needs. Chosen boundaries for the transition areas are appropriate given proximity to Gunnison.

Phillips: noted lesser impact to wildlife through the proposed GAP SAR boundaries.

Patrick: noted concerns of Fairway Lane residents, stated clarification today was shown.

Mason: maintaining the concentration of development near Gunnison prevents threatening the preservation of ranchland, wildlife areas, etc. Noted that development outside the GAP SAR areas will be very difficult if adopted. No changes to this section.

Mason: noted "Community Plan or Technical Study". No changes, besides the Housing Needs Assessment and the Gunnison Area Plan.

Pagano: stated that an addition of Land Use Resolution amendments would be applicable to the entire county, added to "Alternatives" section of the approval standards. Noted collaboration with the City is an important function of the GAP SAR.

Phillips: addressed "Adverse Impacts and Expected Benefits".

Mason: noted pre-annexation agreements as necessary for future development.

Pagano: noted agriculture will be added to "Adverse Impacts and Expected Benefits".

Hoyt: stated pre-annexation could be added to "Adverse Impacts and Expected Benefits".

McBreen: asked about adverse impacts on development and developers.

Pagano: noted the current permitting process and review process is onerous to development. Stated the lack of certainty is an obstacle to gaining housing in the County. Noted limiting the public process cuts back on costs for potential developers.

McBreen: asked why the cost currently is so high.

Seminick: stated a public/private relationship is being encouraged.

Patrick: asked what the amendment process is for the GAP SAR.

Pagano: stated the Land Use Resolution contains the provision for amendments. Noted the first version of the GAP SAR won't be perfect, so amendments are expected.

McBreen: asked whether comment has been received from builders and/or contractors concerning the GAP SAR.

Sinkewich: the process started with stakeholder groups including builders and contractors.

Pagano: The streamlined review process is meant to address major concerns over the lengthy projects.

Phillips: noted lack of public input is an Adverse Impact.

Seminick: stated a loss of funding from Proposition 123 by not implementing GAP SAR is a major adverse impact.

Mason: the streamlined review of an Administrative Review, while limiting public comment is a benefit.

Pagano: asked Commissioners to address potential revisions.

Mason: stated being comfortable with increasing lot sizes. Comfortable with the minimum of 7 units/acre. Comfortable with using net density over gross density.

Phillips: Stated reducing below 7units/acre would limit the number of housing units for citizens who need it most.

Mason: noted local developers were looking for smaller scale development, similar to sprawl. Smaller developers may face challenges when developing under the GAP SAR.

Pagano: stated developers have voiced needing more units to make a development profitable. Noted constraints on development.

Phillips: stated being comfortable with the revisions recommended by the Commission.

Patrick: stated being comfortable with the revisions recommended by the Commission.

Baca: noted being comfortable with the revisions recommended by the Commission.

Pagano: stated constraints of the parcel will dictate number of units.

Mason: noted Staff and City of Gunnison spent much time identifying parcels that make sense for development.

Pagano: stated staff identified appropriate parcels for development. Noted the inclusion of net density.

Mason: asked about concern over uranium in the South Urban Transition Area. Asked what development would have to do to ensure it is safe?

Pagano: stated the area has been determined to be safe by the Department of Energy. Developers don't have to test further to prove the safety of the South Urban Transition Area.

Staff Response

Next Steps

Moved by Baca, seconded by Patrick to forward a draft recommendation of the Special Area Regulations to the Board of County Commissioners. The motion passed, with one abstention.

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

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

Applicant Presentation

Applicant: applicant presented the revised sketch plan grid.

Staff Comments

Pagano: applicant made changes to plan, noted concerns from CPW over current designs.

Planning Commission Questions

Mason: asked for the maximum and minimum lot sizes and whether Lots 1–10 will be gated. Asked Commissioners for observations from the October 2 site visit. Noted improved understanding of the wildlife corridor and neighboring driveway easements; stated CPW is concerned about overlap between the corridor and driveways. Said viewing road easements, highway setback, and the natural slope was helpful.

Phillips: said viewing the proposed sports field, highway setback, deed-restricted housing, site grading, and road noise was useful; also viewed the southern access point and relocated driveways.

Patrick: said seeing the site helped understand view preservation from Hwy 135.

Mason: said seeing the proposed roundabout location helped visualize potential traffic flow.

Applicant: explained the roundabout design is preliminary and subject to change.

Applicant: said the neighboring driveway has been relocated, reopening the wildlife corridor.

Pagano: noted CDOT and County approval of the roundabout will be required.

Phillips: requested to see the CPW wildlife map overlaid on the applicant's site plan.

Mason: noted the proposed density of 1.2 units per acre is reasonable and applicants have addressed prior Commission requests.

Phillips: asked whether developers will build out the project themselves.

Applicants: confirmed they plan to construct the development.

Mason: said future buildout could be by one or multiple developers.

Patrick: noted similar areas in the north valley are largely built out and asked about plans for street lighting.

Applicant: said lighting plans are undecided but will be minimal; CDOT may require lights at intersections and public spaces.

Pagano: presented the CPW wildlife map showing the southern parcel area as a migration corridor of concern.

Mason: asked how the trail network and water lines will connect to Crested Butte South.

Applicant: said trails and utilities are planned to connect with the development.

Phillips: asked how access points may impact wildlife and whether the secondary access could be relocated to address CPW concerns.

Applicant: said coordination with CDOT will determine the final location of the secondary access.

Phillips: asked about anticipated traffic patterns and resident use of access points.

Applicant: said southern residents would likely use the southern access, and northern residents the northern access.

Public Comments

Applicant Response

Staff Response

Pagano: stated the Commission may hold a public hearing, based on their discretion.

Hoyt: stated the public hearing would be a continuation.

Pagano: after the public hearing, it may be decided to continue or close, adding notes about the process. Stated the notice requirements for a public hearing.

Mason: stated being in favor of a public hearing.

Patrick: stated agreement with having a public hearing.

Phillips: asked whether the application is ready to be moved to a public hearing.

Mason: asked if the commission had questions during this work session.

Pagano: stated another work session could be held after a future public hearing.

Motioned by Baca, seconded by Patrick. Motion passed unanimously in support to reopen the public hearing.

Next Steps

Staff will work with applicants to schedule a date for the public hearing.

Moved by Mason, seconded by McBreen to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:41am