

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, December 4, 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 E. Virginia, Gunnison, Co. and on Zoom **Present:**

Chairperson – Roland Mason Vice-Chairperson – Eric Phillips Commissioner – Julie Baca Alt. Commissioner – Sean Patrick	Director of Community and Economic Development – Cathie Pagano Director of Planning – Hillary Seminick Planning Technician – Aidan McComas Others present as listed in text
---	--

**Absent:** McBreen

**Recused:** Patrick (LUC-25-00004)

**Zoom:** Patrick and Baca

\*\*\*\*

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the December 4, 2025 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:49 am.

\*\*\*\*

**Moved by** Baca, seconded by Phillips to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated November 20, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

\*\*\*

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous:

\*\*\*

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

The applicant proposed subdivision of 450 acres into 311 residential lots ranging in size from 1/8 acre to 3 acres. The parcel is legally described as 450 acres in Sections 7, 8, 17, and 18, Township 14 South, Range 85 West, 6<sup>th</sup> p.m.

**Applicant Presentation**

Jessica Garrow: presented project goals and site conditions. Noted size, location, and adjacent land used. Stated unit number increased to 344, noted deed restricted units, mixed use development, conservation of open space, existing irrigation ditches with designed large vegetative buffer as well as an augmentation pond. Addressed vehicular circulation and pedestrian circulation, noted the addition of 40 parking spaces for a potential transit stop. Noted a 150ft to 300ft setback from the parcel boundary, publicly accessible ball fields, neighborhood clubhouse, open space, and a working hay meadow along Hwy 135 acting as a buffer.

Baca: noted density dissimilarity between a neighboring development and the proposed development. Asked about density near the proposed transit stop.

Garrow: noted density could be adjusted in future plans to be near to transit stops allowing for greater connectivity. Noted additional deed restricted housing from 15 percent (45 units) of development to 26 percent (90 units).

Garrow: spoke to the applicants' original submission, explaining additions to the current plan including additional deed restricted housing and multifamily units. Noted updates concerning amenities near the deed restricted and multifamily units.

Garrow: presented matrix showing updates to the project compared to original submission and neighboring developments. Noted less density compared to neighboring subdivisions, more proposed open space, and the inclusion of additional multifamily units.

### Staff Comments

Pagano: noted first work session was a site visit. Clarified what can happen during the current work session. Noted the Planning Commission term limits, cited concern over Public Hearings and Commission turnover with new Commissioners being seated by February 2026. Asked Commissioners to consider timing. Shared updates on applications for Planning Commission.

### Planning Commission Questions

Baca: noted concerns about the number of acres and location of deed restricted units. Asked applicant to consider relocating the units near the proposed transit stop.

Marcus Locke: stated the applicants' proposal as being updated in response to the Planning Commissions' comments. Noted the placement of the hay meadow, spoke the importance of a buffer from Hwy 135.

Phillips: asked about the exclusion of ADUs.

Garrow: noted the previous work session, and the Commissioners appeared to not want them included. Stated if the Commission requests the inclusion of ADUs, the applicants' will consider their addition.

Dan Dow: clarified that workforce housing was included over ADUs due to its importance.

Phillips: asked the Commissioners about ADUs and their potential inclusion.

Mason: noted ADUs were in place of the deed restricted units. Stated ADUs and deed restricted units could both be included in the future plan. Spoke to the inclusion of ADUs in Crested Butte South as an example of how rentals can be (recording 9:31).

Dow: stated the applicants' willingness to include ADUs across the proposed development. Questioned local restrictions on ADUs.

Pagano: clarified that ADUs can be included but not synonymous with workforce housing.

Mason: clarified that restricted ADUs deter people from building them on their property.

Phillips: asked to have a conversation on how size restrictions can make ADUs livable.

Pagano: noted short term rentals, and whether ADUs have the potential to be used as short term rentals.

Dow: stated the proposed development is an inappropriate location for short-term rentals. Noted a counterargument that short term rentals can offset some costs for homeowners in the North

Valley. Asked about the location of high-density housing being located nearest to Hwy 135, noted the applicants' intention to balance needs of future residents and the requirements of the County.

Baca: expressed support for ADUs, but limiting short-term rentals in the proposed development.

Locke: asked for clarity surrounding ADUs and their location within the proposed development. Noted some proposed lot sizes don't allow for the inclusion of ADUs.

Mason: noted a ½ acre lot is large enough for an ADU.

Phillips: stated ADUs should be an open option for all lots.

Dow: asked for clarification on parking requirements for lots that contain both primary housing units and ADUs.

Mason: noted the developer can decide where parking can be in relation to primary housing and ADUs.

Baca: stated the developer can decide how and where an ADU can be located among the free market parcels in the proposed development.

Mason: noted income restriction is not being considered for ADUs.

Mason: noted concern over the location of deed restricted units in relation to open space and parking for transit stops. Asked applicants to consider relocated deed restricted units to be moved closer to parking for transit stops to improve accessibility and transportation.

Dow: stated willingness to consider relocating deed restricted units closer to parking for the transit stop.

Mason: noted the need for a transit stop to be located near to people who will use it. Locating deed restricted units near transit stops could increase ridership. Noted the relocation of deed restricted units near to the proposed ball fields. Noted concern over viewsheds and the location of taller units near Hwy 135.

Phillips: noted high density development being located near to public transit could reduce individual car use.

Mason: asked applicants to look at relocation of deed restricted units.

Phillips: noted concerns over two access points into the proposed development, as well as concerns over transit access to the proposed development.

Garrow: noted expecting to move towards a single access point to the proposed development.

Mason: asked about the potential for a legal easement from the north of the parcel.

Pagano: asked for clarity about the easement.

Locke: noted the only legal access to the parcel is from Hwy 135. Stated cooperation between the subdivisions would need to take place to establish legal easement access. Noted the existence of an easement but clarified it could not be used by the proposed development.

Pagano: clarified the access easements to the highway, noted two access points are (recording 10:00) for emergency services.

Pagano: asked Commissioners to consider lot sizes and density and if the requirements are being met by the applicant. Asked Commissioners to consider compatibility with nearby neighborhoods. Spoke to nearby parcel sizes.

Mason: spoke about a previous request to subdivide a neighboring parcel. Noted an adjacent neighborhood, speaking to the increased density in that residential development compared to the proposed development. Stated the increased density in the updated proposed development plan is what the Commission is looking for.

Phillips: noted concern over the number of deed restricted units and if they will offset the price burden of neighboring parcels.

Mason: stated higher prices are affordable for some, however, for most workers in the North Valley could not afford high price housing.

Pagano: asked Commissioners if the proposed development is substantially similar to neighboring parcels. Or if increased density is offset by other considerations.

Locke: stated the goal of the updated plan was balance, stated the inclusion of preserving open space, inclusion of essential residences, inclusion of deed restricted units, and including public transportation.

Phillips: noted concerns over sprawl. Asked for the applicants to consider the costs to the community compared to the benefits to the community. Expressed concern over how public transit can access the proposed development considering capacity issues.

Garrow: noted the applicants' willingness to dedicate the trail system that crossed the property to preserve connectivity.

Pagano: asked Commissioners to consider a condition of approval in which the applicants will contribute financially to building a public easement trail.

Locke: spoke to how the proposed plan is conceptual, and how the applicants are willing to make changes to meet needs.

Phillips: asked the Commission if the proposed deed restrictions are enough to offset the non-deed restricted luxury homes being proposed.

Baca: expressed support for Phillips' questions to the Commission.

Mason: noted the public concern during a future public hearing. Noted the applicants' effort to blend lot sizes across the property to conform with all nearby neighboring parcels. Noted

concerns over the potential loss of legacy ranch lands due to the pressures of development and housing needs.

Pagano: asked applicant if they planned to carry out vertical construction after approval.

Dow: stated vertical construction will be done by others.

Locke: noted the applicants' willingness to consider selling versus donation of the deed restricted unit portion of the land.

Dow: expressed intention to find a cost-effective solution to building workforce housing.

Phillips: expressed concern over the deed restricted unit area compared to the overall size of the parcel. Questioned the impact of the proposed number of deed restricted compared to the cost of developing the parcel.

Pagano: asked Commissioners what they want the next steps to look like.

Locke: asked Commissioners to consider a public comment given the term limits of multiple Commissioners.

Baca: asked for updated plan to be sent along with the public hearing notice.

### Next Steps

Staff will work with Applicants to schedule a work session for December 18<sup>th</sup> and a public hearing on January 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Mason closed the work session at 10:37am.

### **Public Hearing: LUC-24-00008 | Treasure Mountain Ranch | Minor Impact**

Treasure Mountain Ranch, Inc. applied for a Minor Impact Land Use Change to consolidate 16 parcels into 9, complete three boundary line adjustments, and cluster new development with a 1.9-acre building envelope in the Crystal townsite. Treasure Mountain Ranch, who owns 700 acres over the 16 parcels, proposed to retire four structures, construct a 4,900 sq. ft. maintenance ban, and build four new cabins totaling approximately 5,000 sq. ft. to replace four decommissioned cabins in the townsite. The proposal included wayfinding and interpretive signage for the historic Crystal Mill site and the intention of pursuing landmark designation for six structures.

### Staff Comments

Mason: confirmed no ex parte communication.

Seminick: noted staff received two public comments after the written public comment period was closed at 12:00pm on December 3<sup>rd</sup>. Noted the use of an AI summary to distill all public comments received.

Mason: noted no public comment will be received during the Public Hearing.

Seminick: clarified the minor comments including: number of parcels to be consolidated, references to acreage, residential density and context,

Seminick: presented the primary considerations within the Draft Decision Document.

Seminick: noted various considerations for the Commissioners when considering an impact classification and required findings for coverage exceeding standards. Standards include minimizing visibility by siting and screening and the location of utilities underground. Asked applicants to present proposed vegetation concerning defensible space requirements.

### Applicant Presentation

Locke: noted having the opportunity to review the Draft Decision document, noted minor edits given to Hillary Seminick.

Gillespie: presented a proposal for screening and siting. Noted the aspen grove in which the proposed cabins will be located won't be removed meeting defensible space requirements. Noted the addition of evergreen trees to provide additional screening between proposed development and neighboring structures.

Phillip Supino: asked Commissioners to provide a minimum number of trees for screening and siting.

Seminick: noted landscape requirements. Recommended a condition of approval which requires a screening buffer and meets the landscaping buffer requirements.

Chris Cox: the intention is to have the proposed development be essentially unnoticed by residents and visitors using evergreens for year-round screening and siting.

### Planning Commission Questions

Mason: asked applicant to further detail screening to minimize visibility. Asked for screening and sitting to be included in the Draft Decision Document.

Seminick: noted a previous discussion on screening and siting, however the need to include screening and sitting in the Draft Decision Document. Asked applicants to propose language to be included in the Draft Decision Document for screening and siting.

Locke: proposed discretionary language.

Phillips: noted the proposed screening and siting is sufficient.

Patrick: asked for the number of additional trees to be added.

Mason: stated the proposed screening and sitting is sufficient.

Seminick: noted the impact classification reduction. Stated the applicant intends to house staff working on new cabins in historic cabins.

Mason: asked for clarity concerning Cert of Occupancy.

Locke: stated the proposal for Cert of Occupancy requirements meets the applicants' needs.

Seminick: addressed a condition of approval which includes language asking the applicant to provide documentation to Gunnison County (No. 7) Submit applications for historic designation for the following structures to Gunnison County Historic Preservation Office within 60 days from approval of LUC-24-00008.

Seminick: stated the subject property does not fall within a fire protection district. Noted conditions which include annexation, a service agreement, installation of a sprinkler system, or the submission of a waiver of liability.

Locke: noted applicants expressed support for a waiver of liability.

Seminick: explained a condition of approval concerning archaeological findings upon earth disturbing activity.

Locke: noted the applicants are satisfied with condition 11.

Baca: asked about public comments concerning potential future expansion.

Seminick: noted conditions which include language limiting approval of this application to only what is included in the present application application. (reread)

Patrick: asked about the loss of access for Crystal residents to their properties is this application is approved.

Seminick: noted condition 9 which requires applicant to provide an access easement for a neighboring parcel.

**Moved by** Phillips, seconded by Baca for approval for the Draft Decision document as amended. The motion passed unanimously in support.

**Moved by** Mason, seconded by Patrick to close the Public Hearing at 11:28 a.m. The motion passed unanimously in support.

#### Next Steps

**Moved by** Mason, seconded by Phillips to adjourn the meeting at 11:28 a.m. The motion passed unanimously in support.