

GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

PRELIMINARY AGENDA: January 8, 2026

200 E. Virginia, 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 December 18, 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.

Continued Joint Public Hearing: 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, December 18, 2025**

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting in the Board of County Commissioners Boardroom at 200 E Virginia Ave., Gunnison, Co. and on Zoom **Present:**

Chairperson - Roland Mason Vice-Chairperson - Eric Phillips Commissioner - Julie Baca Commissioner – Brett Adkins 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 Others present as listed in text
---	--

Absent: Stock

Recused: Patrick (LUC-25-00004)

Zoom:

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the December 18, 2025 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:48 am.

Moved by Baca, seconded by Partrick to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated December 4, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous:

Mason: introduced new Planning Commissioner Adkins.

Mason: Commissioner Patrick seated as a voting member.

Pagano: reminded commissioners of upcoming meeting dates, January 8th and January 22nd.

Joint Public Hearing: 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 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.

Confirmation of Adequate Public Notice

Pagano: confirmed adequate public notice.

Commissioners: confirmed no ex parte communication.

Applicant Presentation

Applicant: noted the presentation of the third revised sketch plan. Addressed public concerns from previous public hearings including commercial use, wildlife impacts, and density. Noted the presentation addresses many of those concerns. Stated commercial use has been removed, density issues have been addressed with reduction in density, and the inclusion of more deed-restricted units. Noted setback revisions from Hwy 135, explained emphasis on viewsheds, noise, and buffering were central. Explained traffic flow, noting access to Hwy135, additional parking for transit, and improving entrance and exit points. Noted the inclusion of a multiuse athletic field. Shared recent housing statistics from nearby neighborhoods and communities, explaining the need by local families for housing options.

Applicant: noted the October 2, 2025 site visit.

Applicant: explained density reduction of 17% from 129 lots/units to 107 lots/units. Noted high-density units being reduced from 44 to 24 units, the square footage range. Noted only 25 ADUs will be permitted. Addressed the square footage ranges for single family homes, noting various sizes throughout the proposed development. Noted the nonresidential lot for the CB South Metro District building. Explained commercial lots/units have been removed. Addressed short-term rental, with a maximum of 90 nights per year as rentals only for single family units. Noted amenities and setbacks, explaining closes setback from Hwy 135 is 218 feet. Explained the relocation of driveways for neighboring properties for ease of access and safety.

Applicant: noted safety of residents both in the proposed development and neighboring residents is of greater importance than wildlife crossings.

Applicant: presented Google Earth imagery

Applicant: explained design for the road won't cause a disturbance.

Applicant: explained the proposed new driveway for a neighboring parcel would create an easier access but noted the proposed driveway doesn't have to happen.

Applicant: explained there are other potential location for the proposed driveway to address the concerns expressed by the CPW comments. Stated the inclusion of intersections simply to show potential final design.

Staff Comments

Pagano: noted the submission date of the original application and the previous joint public hearings in 2024 and early 2025. The current joint public hearing is to address the revised sketch plan.

Pagano: noted CPW comments, explaining concerns such as high traffic volumes and motor vehicle lights and noise may impact potential wildlife movement.

Planning Commission Questions

Mason: noted the October 2, 2025 site visit.

Puckett Daniels: asked to see the sketch plan chart and the site plan.

Smith: asked applicant about CPW concerns about wildlife migration patterns crossing the property.

Puckett Daniels: asked for clarity concerning site plan.

Smith: asked about proposed driveway, noting its location in the middle of an open space.

Baca: noted concern over headlight disturbances across the open space property.

Puckett Daniels: asked applicant to explain their choices concerning the proposed driveway.

Houck: noted CDOT requirements for spacing between intersections.

Baca: asked about the use experience for various proposed intersection and access points. Noting the present gravel road to a neighboring property would likely have more use if chosen as the access location.

Puckett Daniels: asked about the process including the proposed roundabout and the approval of the proposed project. Asked about sequencing.

Pagano: noted the roundabout must be installed by either 2029 or 2030 as per the grant received by the Federal Government. Explained a Development Improvement Agreement may be involved.

Applicant: noted the placement of the roundabout was to improve potential accesses and reduce traffic volume at the various access points.

Puckett Daniels: noted the athletic field will be the same size as Rainbow Park in Crested Butte. Asked about berms, and the potential danger of located an athletic field near Hwy 135. Asked about short term rental limits and who would enforce that limit.

Applicant: noted the neighborhood HOA would be the enforcer of the short term rental limit.

Smith: asked about licensing for short term rentals, noting the potential for County limits.

Applicant: noted the limits would be included in the development covenants.

Puckett Daniels: asked if the developer intends to carry out vertical construction. Asked why there is a minimum square footage requirement.

Pagano: clarified that the property is currently for sale. Noted the maximum limit for square footage is a requirement of the Land Use Resolution.

Applicant: noted the requirement is to keep the subdivision uniform.

Phillips: asked about the property being for sale and what happens to the proposed development if the property is sold.

Applicant: stated the property is for sale for give the current owners options.

Adkins: asked about garages and their inclusion in the square footage.

Applicant: noted garages are included to keep the neighborhood aesthetic.

Patrick: asked about what the high-density portion of the development would look like.

Applicant: explained they would look more like townhomes with common ownership for open spaces. Noting the high density units would be for sale and deed restricted.

Puckett Daniels: asked about the unit/acre ratio for the deed-restricted area.

Smith: asked about housing market, noting it is a buyers' market without buyers.

Applicant: noted there is a shortage of inventory in the North Valley. Noted the average house price in the North Valley was 1.6 million dollars over the last year.

Puckett Daniels: asked about proposed pricing for the planned development.

Applicant: explained that they would like to sell future units at a similar price to neighboring areas.

Baca: stated the missing middle is deed restricted units.

Smith: asked how the applicants intend to meet the need for high density development and to address those who wish to have low density development, asked about pricing and the need of many people for lower priced housing options.

Patrick: asked applicant about pricing for high density units. Asked about HOA fees,

Applicant: cost of building will determine pricing for units. Noted the deed restricted area would have a townhome/condominium HOA to determine fees. Noted the greater HOA would supersede the townhome/condominium HOA.

Patrick: asked if the applicant can add more deed restricted units.

Applicant: noted the challenge of meeting needs for buyers and meeting development requirements. Noted the sale of the deed restricted units would have price caps. Explained balancing deed restricted units and profit with non-deed restricted units and profit will be challenging.

Mason: asked about the viewshed, noted the applicants have done work to address concerns over the viewshed and wildlife migration. Noted the stepped topography of the property adds to the reduction in overall visibility from Hwy 135.

Public Comments

Sue Wallace: CB South resident. Asked about approvals if the Starview property sells. Asked whether the approval is carried to future owners of the property. Asked if the sale of the land puts into jeopardy the CB South Metro District's water obligations to CB South. Asked about 90-day short term rental limit, if it applies to the entire property or if it applies both to the primary residence and a potential ADU. Asked if the applicants have met the requirements of the County for development.

Len Rubenstein: noted the need for affordable housing in the Gunnison Valley. Noted having asked the applicant to preserve the viewshed from his family's cabin. Asked the applicant for

adjustments to the proposed development to preserve viewsheds through height restrictions. Asked commission to work towards viewshed preservation measures.

Galen Niccoli: noted concern over ditches which cross the property under proposed development. Asked about what will happen to irrigation what, what the plan for infrastructure is for containing ditch water.

Tracy Wentz: Hidden River Ranch resident. Asked about modelling of the site topography to visualize the height of units compared to the topography. Noted a proposed development of this scope has not been approved so close to Hwy 135.

Brian Downs: expressed concerns over essential services for Gunnison County. Noted services per capita are limited throughout the County, and future limitation on services given funding cuts. Asked about the influx of residents compared to the limitation of essential services provided.

Jason Hogan: asked Commissioners where the Corridor Plan stands in relation to current and proposed developments throughout the Gunnison Valley.

Bob Goettge: asked about the proposal for a roundabout at Cement Road. Asked about concerns over multiple access points allowing for the avoiding of the proposed roundabout.

Jim Williamson: expressed concern over increasing carbon emissions due to developments in the Gunnison Valley. Explained alternatives to the use of carbon.

Gail Mancuso: expressed concerns over limited essential services, asked for a pause on various proposed projects until the Corridor Plan is finalized. Expressed concerns over the lack of a comprehensive traffic study.

Beth Appleton: representative of a neighboring property indicated that the existing driveway serving the neighboring property should remain; however, they expressed enthusiasm about the possibility of gaining an additional access point to the property.

Pat Wallace: asked about the Corridor Plan and for updates on the plan. Expressed concerns that approval of this project would set the standard for the Corridor Plan.

Ann Johnston: expressed thanks to the community for efforts to preserving land across the North Valley area through investments from small and large donors. Asked Commissioners to consider the massive investments in effort to preserve open space when deciding on this proposed development. Asked Commissioners to consider capacity of the valley, asking for a pause on the project.

Mark Schwiesow: neighboring resident. Expressed concerns over the capacity of the river in dealing with treated wastewater from additional developments. Asked Commissioners to investigate what effects large developments would have on the future health of the river.

Stewart Hunter: asked about the disruption to wildlife such a development would have. Noted even small disruptions can disproportionately harm wildlife. Expressed concern over the health of the river neighboring the proposed development.

Derek Harwel: Asked about short-term rental issues associated with the proposed development, namely the 90-day limit policy. Asked about the athletic field, noted a source of funding is lacking unless the developer intends to fund and build it themselves.

Gary Fentiman: expressed concern over the preservation of the viewshed for neighboring residents. Asked for adjacent residential units to be built at only one story.

Mason closed the public comment period at 10:52 am.

Applicant Response

Applicant: noted the short-term rental limit would apply to the entire property.

Applicant: noted the existing ditches would remain as they are, including buffers. Noted the applicant has water rights to use toward building a pond. Noted proposed development has no river access.

Applicant: noted view easements exist and buffers between existing and proposed lots exist so as not to disrupt viewsheds.

Applicant: noted plans to speak with neighbors about the proposed relocated driveway.

Staff Response

Pagano: noted the approval of a project transfer with property ownership.

Pagano: stated there is a map of topography of the property. Noted there aren't 3D renderings currently.

Pagano: noted an all-electric development is possible.

Pagano: noted the release for proposals for the Corridor Plan was released on December 16th. Explained the delay in the release for proposal, noting the due date for proposals is in February 2026.

Pagano: noted a moratorium cannot be put in place to pause a current project. Noting statutory limits on the duration of a moratorium, therefore placing a pause on this proposed project cannot last more than 6 months. Explained details and community involvement with the Corridor Plan.

Puckett Daniels: clarified that a requested moratorium on projects would not have the impact the community was requesting.

Houck: noted the differences between home rule municipalities versus those that aren't.

Pagano: noted a traffic study is only required at the preliminary plan and not accepted as part of the sketch plan.

Pagano: noted wastewater treatment is regulated by the State and must meet State requirements, to be reviewed at the preliminary plan phase.

Applicant: noted the water rights associated with the property would be transferred with a transfer of ownership.

Houck: noted water rights will be reviewed in more detail during the preliminary plan phase.

Applicant: noted the intention for the included pond is for fire protection and for the irrigation of lawns.

Puckett Daniels: asked whether the ditch water is currently being used to irrigate the property.

Applicant: noted being unclear on use of the ditch water.

Houck: stated damage to others' water rights is not permitted.

Phillips: asked for clarity on funding the athletic field.

Applicant: noted there currently is not a plan to build the field.

Houck: asked about the connectivity path.

Applicant: stated the path is to be funded and built by the applicant.

Baca: noted the roundabout and traffic study will be closely examined later in the process.

Pagano: noted if essential services are at capacity, the Commission may find the proposed development to not be compatible with the community character.

Puckett Daniels: noted cumulative impacts.

Puckett Daniels: asked about viewshed preservation, and whether single story buildings would be considered.

Applicant: noted considerations have been made to address concerns over loss of viewsheds.

Mason: asked if more modifications can be made to preserve neighbors' viewsheds.

Applicant: various modifications have been made including moving proposed development further away from existing residences.

Pagano: noted requirements of developments to be compatible with community character. Stated additional considerations such as demand for public services can be reviewed by the County for classifying the impact of a project.

Baca: asked about cumulative impacts, asking if the Commissioners can consider multiple projects together.

Pagano: clarified that cumulative impacts from multiple developments can be considered together.

Pagano: noted the standard to ensure compatibility with adjoining lands.

Pagano: clarified that a second access is required of subdivisions to ensure access for emergency services. Noted CDOT will review traffic movements.

Houck: asked if construction of the roundabout would happen before the approval of this development.

Pagano: noted the roundabout will be completed before building permits are issued for a development.

Smith: asked about essential services.

Pagano: noted compatibility could include the impact on essential services. Noted essential services are and can be in the future part of the referral agencies contacted for comments on projects.

Commissioner Deliberation

Phillips: stated that this proposed development could be trying to tick boxes and requirements rather than serving the needs of the community. Asked about the net negative and net positive impacts this proposed development could have on the community. Noted needs of the community including potential home prices are unlikely to positively serve the community.

Smith: noted the need for more attainability in the proposed development not only in the deed restricted units. Expressed concern with the lack of integration of the townhome/condo units with the rest of the community. Noted the desire to see more duplexes and triplexes throughout the community to address community concerns and meet the missing middle expressed by the Commission and the community.

Puckett Daniels: noted the applicants' willingness to face the challenges between addressing public comments, community needs, agency comments, and County requirements. Noted the contradiction between placing homes along the highway and considering wildlife corridors. Noted the density for this proposed development is quite low, verging on sprawl. Stated that concessions have been made concerning wildlife migration, however, high density development would likely open up more space for wildlife. Noted the potential to condense the number of units into a smaller area while preserving the open space on the rest of the parcel.

Baca: expressed concerns over the cumulative impact of many larger developments currently. Noted the availability of essential services to this parcel if developed. Stated that workforce housing is needed across the Valley. Expressed concern over the placement and concentration of workforce housing.

Smith: noted the site map for the proposed development is deceptive in that it looks very developed, yet there is so much sprawl.

Phillips: asked if the parcel was suitable for development, noted yes. Asked if the current plan is going to address more needs than the impact it causes.

Houck: noted the need to provide workforce and affordable housing for the residents of the Gunnison Valley. Compared the difference in quality between old homes and new builds, but the similarity in price. Noted building costs create a need to make a profit by selling more costly homes.

Adkins: stated support for meeting a price point which is attainable for residents. There needs to be a middle ground for the Valley and the developers, but that will be a challenge to meet. Noted the poor integration of the deed restricted housing versus the rest of the community.

Patrick: noted deed restriction can be dispersed throughout a neighborhood. Asked about the timeline for vertical building of the development. Asked how this development can help the community. Noted a gap between building cost and sale price.

Applicant: noted the present availability of lots throughout the North Valley. Noting project design guidelines and changes to the Land Use Resolution also contribute to rising building costs. Noted buying and construction in the Gunnison Valley is challenging, and placing deed restrictions on vacant land is challenging.

Phillips: asked if single family homes are the solution to the affordability issue in the Valley.

Smith: noted the conversation needs to center on problem solving, not on redesigning the proposed development. Explained various factors that would contribute to a more successful design and more impactful on the community.

Phillips: noted the Corridor Plan could assist in meeting the needs of the community.

Mason: expressed concern the mix of positive impact and negative impacts the current proposal. Stated this proposal looks like a scale of affordability, coming up being unaffordable.

Puckett Daniels: emphasized community compatibility. Expressed concern over incompatibility.

Phillips: agreed with incompatibility statement made by Puckett Daniels. Stated affordable housing does not always look like deed restriction.

Mason: asked for a Draft Recommendation Document of Conditions for Approval to be drafted.

Phillips: asked for a Draft Recommendation Document of Denial to be drafted.

Mason: expressed a condition of approval to move the south access point to align with Aries Avenue. And removing lots 64, 65, and 66. Asked for the athletic field to be built by the applicant at a set date with public restrooms to be included. Asked for greater density in the deed restricted units area, bringing the deed restricted units up to between 30 to 35. Asked for the inclusion of duplexes and triplexes, and no building over two stories in height.

Adkins: noted the relocated driveway wouldn't do much, so eliminating the relocated driveway in order to keep the open space free. Asked for the second access point to be relocated to align with Aries Avenue.

Phillips: asked for the including of buffering between uses to increase wildlife permeability.

Houck: asked Commissioners to take time to consider the conditions for approval rather than provided them at this meeting.

Pagano: shared potential conditions for approval.

Phillips: states the site is suitable for development, noted the negative tradeoffs are greater than the positive tradeoffs.

Patrick: expressed agreement with conditions put forth by Commissioners Mason and Adkins.

Pagano: reiterated the conditions proposed by Commissioners.

Moved by Mason, seconded by Patrick to have staff draft a letter of Recommendation for Approval with conditions. The motion passed with four votes in the affirmative, one against.

Next Steps

Staff will work with Applicants to schedule the continued joint public hearing to January 8th at 9:00am.

Pagano: noted public written comment will be accepted until January 7th at 12:00pm

Work Session: WUI Code Amendments

Updates to the wildfire code to be no less stringent than the State Wildfire Resiliency Code as required by Senate Bill 23-166.

Presentation

Crystal Lambert: stated the State of Colorado's Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code is required to be adopted, or a code no less stringent, by April 1st, 2026. Noted some adjustments to the County's current code may be needed to make them no less stringent than the State code.

Lambert: noted having organized a stakeholder group to discuss the proposed updates to the County wildfire code including contractors, builders, local material suppliers, firefighters, and fire professionals.

Hugo Ferchau: noted the proposal is more straight forward and understandable compared to the alternatives. Noted if the adopted code is hard to understand or implement, people simply won't comply. Noted the exclusion of various requirements from the past code, but while still meeting the Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code.

Phillips: asked about defensible space.

Ferchau: noted if a building is indefensible when fire is approaching, the fire protection district personnel will move on. However, if buildings are maintained and their defensible space is, then preparing them for incoming fire is easier.

West Region Wildfire: noted their job is to prepare and guide the maintenance of defensible space.

Phillips: asked about flower boxes

West Region: noted that if something is flammable and within 5ft from a building, it may need to be removed.

Phillips: asked if people were doing wildfire mitigation or simply using cistern water.

Adkins: noted supporting augmentation ponds for fire mitigation and suppression.

Mason: asked about ventilation requirements, compared to CWRC versus WUI.

Lambert: clarified that the vent openings will be reduced from 1/4in to 1/8in. Presented a matrix showing the stringency of the two codes.

Ferchau: noted the inclusion of fire hydrants and suppression systems may assist for insurance purposes.

Lambert: noted the Colorado FAIR Act which provides insurance to residents who cannot obtain insurance due to fire risks. Noted the FAIR Act insurance has very strict qualifications.

Lambert: noted a wildfire resilient and ready community will help with insurance availability and affordability.

Lambert: explained the State Minimum Requirements for plantings near buildings.

Adkins: noted controlling plantings is complex, rather not allowing plantings in the hardened zone is more approachable. Noted nothing can be in the harden 5ft zone.

Lambert: explained the requirements from compliance when certain remodels which have additions of a certain size.

Ferchau: noted insurance policies, and the challenge of retroactive compliance.

Lambert: stated requirements for accessory structures less than 120 square feet. Noted they are exempt in the current code if they are at least 50 feet from a habitable building, in the State code, they are exempt if they are at least 10 feet from a habitable building.

Lambert: touched on the application of the code. Stated the current code applies to all parcels in the mapped area of the wildland urban interface. The State code applies to all parcels in the mapped areas of the wildland urban interface, except 35 acre or greater parcels with only one dwelling when abutting a residential or commercial area.

Lambert: spoke about the deck construction requirements. The current code requires deck construction to meet the level of ignition-resistant construction. The State code only applies to the deck walking surface.

Lambert: spoke about requirements of the State code that are more stringent than the County's current code including exterior wall embellishments and trim, fencing within 8ft of a structure needs to be constructed with noncombustible or ignition resistant materials, retaining walls, detached accessory structures where exterior walls shall comply with material requirements when located less than 50ft from a building containing habitable space, ventilation openings, and additions and alterations that increase the footprint by 500 sf or more or replacement of exterior walls or roof coverings where 25% or more are replaced.

Phillips: asked how map designation (moderate, high) changes requirements.

Adkins: explained for moderate and high have no difference.

Lambert: shared the wildfire categorization map. Explained the designation criteria.

Lambert: spoke about ground truthing, stating that the State code allows for a fire professional to visit a site to potentially lower a designation.

Phillips: asked if an augmentation pond could help reduce the designation.

West Region: noted vegetation management and defensible space can assist in reducing the designation.

Lambert: noted the recommendation is to adopt the State code, use the State map, without exempting 35 acre parcels and prohibiting vegetation in the 0-5ft hardened zone. Noted the need for amendments to the Land Use Resolution.

Planning Commission Questions

Moved by Phillips, seconded by Patrick to recommend adoption of the Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code with amendments including that 35 acre parcels shall comply with the requirements, and that structure ignition zone 1, 0 to 5ft, contains only non-combustible hard surface materials without exception for ignition-resistant plantings. Proposed amendments to the Gunnison County Land Use Resolution shall align with the Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code and state map adoption. The motion passed unanimously in support.

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

The applicant proposed subdivision of 450 acres into 309 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, 6th p.m.

Applicant Presentation

Applicant: presented general overview of the proposed project. Noted goals of the proposed development. Shared site context including size, frontage on Hwy 135, and near equal distance between Crested Butte and CB South. Noted benefits of the project include conserved open space, ecological rehabilitation, and preservation of viewsheds and neighboring aesthetics. Explained the use of the site's topography to determine vehicular circulation to reduce land moving efforts. Noted the inclusion of multimodal trails. Noted the increase in workforce housing shifted closer to transit and community center.

Locke: noted having met previous requests of the Planning Commission. Stated the proposed development is located near to a wastewater treatment facility for ease of sewer connection.

Staff Comments

Pagano: reiterated the applicants' possible intention to donate the deed restricted areas to the County but noted the cost of building that out would be a significant challenge.

Pagano: noted various conditions for approval. (Recording, 1:58) Reminded Commissioners of the Joint Public Hearing scheduled for January 22. Stated the Commission could hold another Work Session on January 8.

Planning Commission Questions

Baca: asked about the inclusion of workforce housing compared to the overall size of the proposed development.

Phillips: clarified that the vacant lots would be sold with deed restrictions.

Locke: noted the flexibility of donated deed restricted land to the County. Noted the preservation of open space was an important aspect of conceptualizing the project.

Phillips: noted 3% of the proposed property will be dedicated to being deed restricted.

Mason: asked about the irrigation plan for the active hay meadow.

William Lacy: noted the ditches will remain intact as they were designed to irrigate using the topography of the site.

Locke: noted being willing to work with the Buckhorn development to work out an easement agreement.

Dow: expressed wanting to see people own homes, asked if the County could find a way to make the down payment for first time homeowners.

Pagano: questioned the idea of down payment assistance, noted that down payment assistance could be very problematic. Noted the impacts for the development are being placed on others to be addressed.

Mason: noted the purpose of the Whetstone development was to address the rental shortage. Expressed concerns over affordability of new homes.

Locke: stated if the sketch proposal is approved, the development team is very willing to make sure needs are met.

Phillips: asked for the net positive impact on the community to be clearly enumerated.

Phillips: expressed concerns over sprawl. Asked applicants to explain how their proposed development isn't sprawl.

Locke: noted the placement near the East River Sanitation District and the placement of a transit stop at the entrance of the proposed development fight against sprawl.

Phillips: noted RTA and Mountain Express expressed unwillingness to provide service to the parcel proposed for development. Noted the negative impacts on the community aren't going to be offset by the benefits.

Mason: expressed concerns over developing bare land and the expense of doing so. Noted the need for available units, not potential units.

Phillips: asked if the deed restricted units offset the negative impacts of excess single-family units.

Dow: asked about the County's desire to conserve open space. Asked what the County wants to see. Stated there is a tough balance between wanting open space versus dense housing.

Phillips: stated density helps fight sprawl. Expressed concern over demand for services. Reminded applicants that the Public Hearing process will be tough to face without answers to questions. Noted the proposed development is centered on privately owned vehicles rather than multimodal connectivity.

Mason: noted the Commission asked the applicants to include parking for transit along the highway which they did. Asked whether density should be focused along the highway or if single family homes should be located nearer the highway.

Baca: asked how the County can get more workforce housing whether it is buildings or land.

Locke: noted the balance is between open space and density.

Phillips: stated increased density creates more open space.

Pagano: stated the proposed development is spread out through the parcel, whereas increased density could look like concentrating the development while leaving more space as open space.

Locke: asked for clarity concerning what the County wants.

Pagano: noted the desire is to have clustered dense development.

Phillips: stated the Corridor Plan is upcoming. Noted the Corridor Plan would offer valuable guidance as to how development should happen throughout the county. Explained the challenge is looking at developments individually without some guidance from a high-level plan.

Pagano: noted the Corridor Plan is intended to identify what the desired vision of the community is, improve development guidance, community connectivity.

Dow: stated reliance on the Corridor Plan shouldn't be relied on as the sole guide for development.

Phillips: explained the Corridor Plan will provide tools to help guide development in a meaningful way.

Mason: stated the recent GAP SAR decision is meant to determine the level of density and allow developers to cut some red tape allowing them to move forward quicker. Stated timelines prevent all developments currently being considered prevent them from being looked at through a cumulative impact lens.

Phillips: brought up the requirement to meet community compatibility or enhance it.

Mason: acknowledged that a lot is being asked for. Noted the developer bears the responsibility to meet the requirements of the County and the needs of the community.

Adkins: asked if the ditches on the property could be moved to improve the design. Asked if the development was designed around the ditches.

Applicant: noted there is more room for density on the parcel.

Phillips: emphasized that density and open space go together. Noted deed restricted lots and vertically build deed restricted units aren't the same thing. Expressed that deed restriction is not the only solution to housing affordability.

Locke: noted the incentives for including workforce housing into a development aren't worth doing so. Expressed that development in the North Valley is running into the challenge of not having enough land for development.

Phillips: stated there is a balance to the issues at hand, however, it is on the developer to strike the balance. Spoke to the housing needs of the Gunnison Valley.

Dow: noted the potential to tap taxes to assist in development and housing needs.

Phillips: asked the applicant to provide the positive tradeoffs versus the negative impacts of this proposed development. Asked if the current Sketch Plan is the plan that will be brought to the Public Hearing.

Locke: stated the applicants would like to hear what the public has to say.

Lacy: noted there may be many people who want this proposal to work.

Mason: clarified the Commission does not want all density to be located along Hwy 135.

Mason: noted discussion at the Public Hearing will be in depth.

Next Steps

Staff has scheduled a Joint Public Hearing for January 22nd, 2026 at 9:00am.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:05 pm.

TO: Planning Commission

SUBJECT: DRAFT Planning Commission Sketch Plan Recommendation
Starview Subdivision
LUC-22-00028

DATE: January 8, 2026

PREPARED BY: Cathie Pagano, Assistant County Manager for Community and Economic Development

APPLICANT: HGC Holding LLC, represented by Attorney Michael Dawson and Gary Huresky

LUC-22-00028 is governed by the following standards set forth in the Gunnison County *Land Use Resolution* (LUR) Section 7-103(B), as follows:

SKETCH PLAN IS EXPLORATORY. *Sketch Plan review provides an opportunity for the County, the applicant, and the public to engage in an exploratory discussion of a proposed land use change, to examine alternative approaches to development of the property, to participate in a process of joint planning and negotiation between the County and the applicant to promote development and land use change which is consistent with the intent and purposes of this Resolution.*

SKETCH PLAN EXPECTED TO EVOLVE. *Requirements of Sketch Plan direct the applicant to review specific sections of this Resolution and submit a plan that has addressed issues important to the County. It is expected that the proposal will evolve during Sketch Plan review.*

ENGINEERED DESIGNS AND DETAILED PLANS NOT REQUIRED NOR ACCEPTED AT SKETCH PLAN. *To encourage the consideration of alternatives and to allow the Sketch Plan to evolve, detailed engineering plans and other overly detailed information shall not be required nor accepted by the County.*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes to subdivide a 96-acre parcel to include 83 single family residential lots and 24 essential housing units. Up to 25 accessory dwelling units (secondary residences) are allowed in the subdivision with a minimum size of 600 square feet. The maximum building size on Lots 1-10 is 5,000 square feet and 2,800 square feet on lots 11-83. The minimum lot size for single family residences is 1,000 square feet. The multifamily residences have a maximum size of 1,200 square feet and minimum size of 800 square feet.

The applicant proposes that the 25 multifamily units will be restricted as workforce housing.

One lot is proposed to be dedicated to the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District. Lot sizes range from 0.12-1.25 acres. Short-term rentals are allowed on the single-family lots and shall be limited to 90 days per year.

The applicant proposes that 51% of the parcel is open space and proposes the following recreation amenities:

- Trail
- Ponds
- Bridge across East River for peds/bikes
- Recreation field space (w/ 20 parking spaces)
- Pavilion and play area

The applicant has made multiple revisions to the original Sketch Plan application. Final revisions include the following:

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

The subject parcel is located at 48 County Road 740. The parcel is legally described as a tract of land in Sections 27, 28, and 34, Township 14 South, Range 85 West, 6th pm. The parcel is at the southeast corner of the intersection of Highway 135 and Cement Creek Road (County Road 740).

PLANS/REPORTS/SUBMITTALS:

Plans, reports, letters and other submittal documents informing this decision include, but are not limited to:

- Starview Sketch Plan Application Revisions dated November 12, 2025
- Site Reference Map, Starview, Gunnison County, Colorado prepared by NCW Associates, Inc. dated September 25, 2025

IMPACT CLASSIFICATION:

The project is a Major Impact pursuant to Section 7-101:A. *More Than Four Units.*

MEETING DATES:

The Planning Commission held work sessions and public hearings to discuss the Whetstone Community Housing application on the following dates:

- February 15, 2024 Work Session
- March 21, 2024 Work Session and Site Visit

- July 11, 2024 Work Session
- September 19, 2024 Work Session
- December 19, 2024 Joint Public Hearing
- February 6, 2025 Joint Public Hearing
- September 4, 2025 Work Session
- October 2, 2025 Site Visit
- November 6, 2025 Work Session
- December 18, 2025 Joint Public Hearing
- January 8, 2026 Joint Public Hearing

SITE VISIT:

The Planning Commission conducted a site visit on March 21, 2024 and October 2, 2025. The Commission noted the topography, adjacent uses, possible location of the highway roundabout, traffic noise, wildlife corridors, and natural features of the parcel.

PUBLIC HEARING:

The Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners conducted joint public hearings on December 18, 2024, February 6, 2025, December 18, 2025, and January 8, 2026; Comments included the following, but are not limited to:

1. Scale, Density, and Community Character

- Widespread concern that the project represents suburban-style sprawl inconsistent with the rural character of the corridor and CB South.
- Many commenters felt the density, layout, and mass were out of scale with adjacent parcels and surrounding conserved lands.
- Strong desire to preserve viewsheds, open space, and the sense of entry into CB South rather than create a “gateway subdivision.”

2. Housing Type, Affordability, and “Missing Middle”

- Repeated calls for housing that truly serves local workers and families, not high-end or second-home buyers.
- Concern that affordability levels proposed do not address workforce needs.
- Many commenters supported greater density only if it results in more deed-restricted, attainable units, smaller unit sizes, duplexes/triplexes, and integration of affordable units throughout the site.
- Skepticism that market-rate homes would “filter down” to affordability without stronger deed restrictions.

3. Commercial Uses and Gas Station

- Broad opposition to commercial uses, particularly a gas station.
- Commenters argued that commercial demand is already met in CB South and that new commercial would:
 - Increase traffic,
 - Undermine the existing commercial core,
 - Be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
- Some suggested that if any commercial were allowed, it should be small-scale, community-serving, or maker/shop space, driven by demonstrated need.

4. Traffic, Transportation, and Infrastructure

- Strong concerns about traffic safety and congestion
- Emergency access and evacuation routes were frequently raised.
- Questions about who would bear responsibility for roads, maintenance, and long-term costs.

5. Wildlife, Open Space, and Environmental Impacts
 - Many commenters emphasized the project’s location amid protected open space and wildlife corridors, with concerns about habitat fragmentation, permeability, light pollution, and noise.
 - Requests for stronger conservation measures, clustering development, larger contiguous open space, and limiting river access.
6. Water, Wastewater, and Carrying Capacity
 - Concerns about water supply, wastewater treatment capacity, river health, and cumulative impacts.
 - Commenters questioned whether the valley has reached or is nearing its carrying capacity, citing impacts to quality of life, wildlife, and public services.
 - Specific concerns were raised about irrigation ditches, wetlands, and treated effluent entering the river.
7. Public Services and Community Facilities
 - Commenters cited strain on schools, healthcare, emergency services, parks, recreation facilities, childcare, and transit.
 - Skepticism that proposed parks or athletic fields would be funded, built, or maintained.
 - Concerns that population growth is outpacing the community’s ability to provide services.
8. Process, Timing, and Corridor Planning
 - Many commenters urged the County to pause or delay the project until the Corridor Plan is completed.
 - Concern that approving this project would set precedent and effectively determine the corridor’s future without a comprehensive plan.

The entirety of the public record is included within the Land Use Change permit file.

ADJACENT AND NEARBY USES:

Surrounding land uses include residential, conserved land, and agricultural uses.

REVIEW AGENCY REFERRAL COMMENTS:

County staff sent the second (March 31, 2025) revised Sketch Plan application to referral agencies on April 9, 2025. The third revision of the Sketch Plan application has not been sent to referral agencies.

- Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife
- Colorado Department of Transportation
- Gunnison County Public Works
- Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)
- RE1-J School District
- Crested Butte Fire Protection District
- Crested Butte South Property Owners Association
- Colorado Division of Water Resources
- CB South Metropolitan District

Comments received include, but are not limited to, the following:

Gunnison Valley Rural Transportation Authority, Scott Truex, Executive Director, dated May 9, 2025 comments included:

- 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.
- They requested to be kept informed on the application’s progress.

Colorado Department of Transportation, Brian Killian, Region 3 Access Program Manager, dated April 22, 2025, comments noted that:

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

Colorado Parks and Wildlife, dated April 30, 2025, from Codi Prior, District Wildlife Manager, comments included:

- Raised concerns about the impact on wildlife, particularly the E-43 elk herd migration corridor near Highway 135 and Cement Creek.
- 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.
- 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.

Crested Butte Fire Protection District, dated April 14, 2025, from Ric Ems, Fire Marshal, comments included:

- The plan includes two points of ingress/egress, meeting requirements.
- The proposed roundabout improves alignment and safety at the intersection.
- 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.
- Existing or proposed bike/pedestrian paths on CR-740 must be considered for life safety.

Gunnison County Public Works, Martin Schmidt, Assistant County Manager for Public Works, dated May 17, 2024, comments included:

- Road design and connectivity: Two proposed roads (Road AL and Road B) exceed County standards for cul-de-sac length and would require waivers unless reconfigured. Staff expressed a preference for improved connectivity, including a potential connection between Road AL and Road C and a southern emergency access from Road B rather than a mid-point access.
- Emergency access clarity: Staff raised concerns about how emergency access is described in the sketch plan, noting that emergency-only access should be clearly distinguished from general traffic relief to avoid confusion or unintended use.

- Right-of-way and ownership: There is insufficient information regarding right-of-way location, ownership, and control along Road AL where it follows the ditch and overlaps platted parcels, requiring clarification.
- Snow storage and operations: Portions of the site—particularly the commercial and higher-density areas—do not clearly identify adequate snow storage areas accessible to snow removal equipment.
- Trails and public access: The sketch plan should clearly identify trails as common areas intended for public use.
- Intersection and traffic impacts: Increased traffic at the County Road 740 and Highway 135 intersection may necessitate improvements, and staff requested continued coordination on intersection design and right-of-way needs, including potential roundabout alignments.

Crested Butte South Property Owners Association, dated April 7, 2025 from POA Board of Directors, comments included:

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

Colorado Division of Water Resources, dated May 1, 2025, from Ailis Thyne, P.E. Water Resource Engineer, comments included:

- Deferred an opinion pursuant to Section 30-28-136(1)(h)(1), C.R.S., as to whether the proposed water supply plan will cause material injury to existing water rights until Preliminary Plan is submitted
- Offered general comments.
- Recommendation that applicant clarify if UGRWCD contract will be used for augmentation or obtain an augmentation plan.
- Clarify if the proposed augmentation plan is to offset both the operation of the wells and out-of-priority depletions caused to Bocker Ditch

COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF THE *GUNNISON COUNTY LAND USE RESOLUTION*:

7-102: A. Compliance with All Applicable Standards.

Applicable, the applicant has submitted evidence in compliance with the applicable standards. The analysis in each of the following LUR sections identifies if and how the application complies with the applicable standards.

7-102: B. Compatibility with Community Character

Applicable, the applicant has demonstrated that the Sketch Plan is compatible with community character, or an enhancement of the character of existing land uses in the development area, and does not adversely impact the future development of the development area. (Planning Commission to provide direction).

The *Land Use Resolution* (LUR) defines compatible as “means consistent with, harmonious with, similar and complementary to, the use and/or function of natural systems and/or existing land uses in an area.

The LUR defines development area as, “those geographic areas within the county that will be developed or altered directly by the construction or operation of a proposed project.”

The application states:

The proposed land use change and density is compatible with the character of the existing land uses in the development area as it is putting development next to development with Crested Butte South on the other side of Cement Creek Road and avoiding leapfrog development. The larger lots are located next to existing 1-2 acre lots and the open space on the north side provides a buffer from the larger agricultural parcel to the northeast. The proposed development will comply with all applicable requirements of the Gunnison County Land Use Resolution. There are not any phases within the proposed development. There are no proposed lots which no uses have been identified.

Section 7-103: C. Phases Required to “Stand Alone” in Providing Services.

Not applicable, the applicant has not proposed phasing of the development. A Development Improvements Agreement shall be required to be executed upon any final approval of the development. The applicant proposes one phase for development of the proposed subdivision.

Section 9-100: Uses Secondary to a Primary Residence.

Applicable, the applicant proposes the allowance of secondary residences (accessory dwelling units) on twenty-five of the single-family lots.

Section 9-200: Special Residential Uses.

Not applicable, no special residential uses are proposed as part of this application.

Section 9-300: Commercial and Industrial Uses.

Applicable, the applicant proposes one lot for the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District to be used for a shop space and employee housing. No additional commercial or industrial uses are proposed in the revised Sketch Plan application.

Section 9-400: Exploration, Extraction and Processing of Minerals and Construction Materials.

Not applicable. No exploration, extraction or processing of materials is proposed.

Section 9-500: Miscellaneous Uses and Activities.

Not applicable. No miscellaneous uses or activities are proposed.

Section 9-600: Essential Housing.

Not applicable, although the applicant proposes the inclusion of 24 workforce housing units, the quantity does not meet the standards of this section (40% of total units) to be eligible for the incentives.

Section 10-102: Locational Standards for Residential Development.

Applicable, the standards of this Section require that an application for a new residential development shall initially be reviewed for its location relative to existing development and shall be located adjacent to existing population centers, within a municipal three-mile plan area or

adjacent “to a subdivision that is served by a central wastewater treatment system that was platted and approved...”

Per Section 10-102: B.3.

When the applicant has demonstrated that a proposed residential cannot satisfy the locational standard, the location may be approved if the Board finds that in addition to meeting all of the applicable requirements of this Resolution, the cumulative impacts of the proposed development and existing development will result in no significant net adverse impact to neighborhood lands or land uses, wildlife, visual quality, air or water quality, including impacts caused by a proliferation of On-site wastewater treatment systems and/or individual wells.

Planning Commission to provide direction on how application complies with this standard. The Commission may find that the provision of twenty-four workforce residences, inclusion of area for a highway roundabout, connection to central water and sewer mitigates impacts to neighborhood lands or land uses, wildlife, and visual quality.

The LUR defines “significant net adverse impact” as:

An impact of an action, after mitigation, which is a considerable or substantial, and unfavorable or harmful; includes social, economic, physical, health, aesthetic and historical impacts, and biological impacts including but not limited to, effects on natural resources or the structure or function of affected ecosystems.

Section 10-103: Residential Density.

Applicable, the standards of this Section apply. The proposed development is not within a municipal three-mile plan area and therefore the application shall comply with the standards of Section 10-103: C.3. which requires that “lot size and lot density shall be substantially similar to neighborhood parcels unless the standards of (a) or (b) are met.”

The Planning Commission shall determine the “neighborhood” for this development. Article 2: *Definitions* defines “neighborhood” as “an area or locality characterized by similar or compatible land uses, that may be identified by a place name and/or has boundaries composed of major streets, distinct changes in land use and/or land formations, topography or water bodies.”

CB South Subdivision is across the East River from the proposed development and on the north side of Cement Creek Road. The proposed development may be considered to be part of a neighborhood composed of Staples East River Estates Subdivision (lots are 1 acre or larger) and five other lots (not part of a subdivision) that are adjacent to the subject parcel and on the west side of the East River which are 1 to 1.5 acres in size. The bounds of the neighborhood may be considered Highway 135, Cement Creek Road, and the East River. The lots in the “neighborhood are all 1.05 to 1.5 acres. The proposed lot sizes in Starview range from 0.12-1.25 acres with an average density of 1.1 units per acre (107 lots/96 acres). The density of the adjacent parcels in East River Staples Subdivision and the metes and bounds parcels is 0.97 units/acre.

The application states:

The proposed development is substantially similar to neighborhood parcels in Crested Butte South, and Allen homesites and with the proposed landscaping and berming, and location of open space in the north side, will create buffers from the larger parcels to the

northeast and across Highway 135. To the extent the lot density is greater than neighborhood parcels, the conditions in 10-103(C)(3) are met in that the project will be served by the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District, a public water and wastewater district, protective covenants and design guidelines are proposed to ensure continued compatibility with neighborhood uses and densities, the lots have been sited and landscaping has been proposed to minimize visual impact. With the consideration of the 67% (revised to 51%) of open space, the clustering of the residences, and lack of impacts on wildlife habitats, the impact of any increased density has been reasonably mitigated in the proposed development.

a. CONDITIONS ARE APPROPRIATE FOR SMALLER LOTS OR GREATER DENSITY. *The project shall be considered for smaller lots or greater density when all of the following four requirements are met:*

1. DEVELOPMENT SERVED BY PUBLIC WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM. *The development is or will be served by a public wastewater treatment system, by approval of the subject application pursuant to Section 12-106: Sewage Disposal/Wastewater Treatment.*

Applicable, the applicant proposes connection to the Crested Butte South Metro District wastewater treatment system.

2. DEVELOPMENT SERVED BY OTHER SERVICES AND FACILITIES. *To the maximum extent feasible, the development is or will be served by a public water supply, public transportation and other public services and facilities by approval of the subject application.*

Applicable, the applicant proposes connection to the Crested Butte South Metro District water supply. There are no other proposed connections to public transportation or other public services described in the application.

3. COMPATIBLE WITH NEIGHBORHOOD. *The development is compatible with the neighborhood existing when the Land Use Change Permit application is submitted. Methods of ensuring compatibility may include, but are not limited to:*

a. PERMANENT COVENANTS TO ENSURE CONTINUED COMPATIBILITY WITH NEIGHBORHOOD USES AND DENSITIES. *The proposed development includes permanent protective covenants that, at a minimum, address the following, to ensure that, if approved, it remains compatible with the neighborhood uses and densities that exist as of the date of approval of the Land Use Change Permit:*

1. DESIGN STANDARDS. *Building exterior design standards.*

Applicable, the applicant proposes design standards as part of the application.

2. LANDSCAPING. *Landscaping requirements.*

Applicable, the applicant proposes landscaping requirements as part of the application.

3. OUTSIDE PARKING AND STORAGE. *Standards and limitations on outside parking and storage.*

Applicable, the applicant proposes limitations on outside parking and storage and requires the construction of garages.

4. COMPATIBILITY OF USES. *Conditions pursuant to Section 13-119: Standards to Ensure Compatible Uses.*

Applicable, the applicant has described compliance with this standard which includes: limitations on height and size of structures; construction limitations; landscaping and berms to protect viewsheds; internal trails; compliance with County exterior lighting standards; main roads will be paved or treated with dust control measures.

5. BUILDING SIZE. *Building size.*

b. SITE LAYOUT AND DESIGN. *The proposed development shall locate buildings and lots to minimize to minimize visual impact.*

Applicable, the applicant proposes building size restrictions:

- Lots 1-10: 1,000 sq. ft. minimum, 5,000 sq. ft. maximum. Two-car garage required.
- Lots 11-83: 1,000 sq. ft. minimum, 2,800 sq. ft. maximum. Two-car garage required.
- Workforce units: 800 square ft. minimum, 1,200 sq. ft. maximum. One-car garage required.
- Secondary residences (accessory dwelling units): 600 sq. ft. minimum

4. IMPACT OF INCREASED DENSITY IS MITIGATED. *The decision-making body finds that impacts of the increased density have been reasonably mitigated; methods of mitigation may include, but are not limited to:*

a. ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE. *The amount of open space included in the proposed development exceeds the amount required by Section 13-108: Open Space and Recreation Areas by at least ten percent of the total land designated for residential uses within the development.*

Applicable, a major impact residential project is required to provide 30% open space. The applicant proposes 51% open space, which exceeds the requirement.

b. PROVISION OF ESSENTIAL RESIDENCES. *Provision of Essential Residences that equal at least ten percent of the total number of residences, in addition to any other applicable requirements of this Resolution.*

Applicable, the applicant proposes the inclusion of 24 (22% of total units) essential residences. The Planning Commission has indicated that at least 30-35 (28%-33% of total units) essential residences shall be required.

c. CLUSTERING OF RESIDENCES. *Residences are clustered to minimize visual impact and impacts on wildlife habitats as depicted on Wildlife Habitat Maps.*

Planning Commission to provide direction on this standard. The application indicates that residences are clustered.

“Cluster or cluster development” is defined as:

The concentration of development, including buildings, driveways, and water supply and wastewater treatment facilities, on one or more areas of a development parcel, preserving the remainder as productive agricultural land or undeveloped open space, and avoiding impacting areas of identified value for wildlife habitat, scenic features of a rural landscape, historical agricultural uses, and significant environmental features including wetlands, bodies of water, geologic hazard, or significant vegetation. Clustering allows flexibility in layout and protection of identified valuable characteristics of a development parcel.

The area at the southern end of the parcel has been revised to eliminate residential lots and there is an area of open space that is adjacent to the river that does not include proposed residences, however that area could not be developed in accordance with County and State standards for floodplain and wetlands.

d. PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM. *As applicable, provision of a bus stop or similar facility for use with an existing public transportation system.*

No participation in a public transit system is identified as part of the application. The applicant has indicated an area for parking for transit riders in the development.

Section 10-104: Locational Standards for Commercial, Industrial, and other Non-Residential Uses.

Applicable, the application proposes the inclusion of a lot for the Crested Butte South Metropolitan Recreation District for shop space and employee housing. This is a necessary location because the current CB South Metro District site is constrained by water bodies and Cement Creek Road. No additional commercial or industrial uses are proposed in the revised Sketch Plan application.

Section 11-103: Development in Areas Subject to Flood Hazards.

Applicable, a portion of the parcel is within the 100-year floodplain. The applicant is not proposing any development within the 100-year floodplain.

Section 11-104: Development in Areas Subject to Geologic Hazards.

Not applicable, the subject parcel is not in an area of mapped geologic hazards.

Section 11-105: Development In Areas Subject to Wildfire Hazards.

Applicable, the parcel is in a high wildfire hazard area. A copy of the application has been referred to the Crested Butte Fire Protection District and Colorado State Forest Service for review and comment. No comments were received from the Colorado State Forest Service. The proposed development shall comply with the standards of this Section, and the Preliminary Plan design shall be guided by these standards and the adopted wildfire code at the time of construction and development.

Section 11-106: Protection of Wildlife Habitat Areas.

Applicable, the application was referred to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for review and comment. In a letter from Codi Prior, District Wildlife Manager, dated April 30, 2025 raised concerns about the impact on wildlife, particularly the E-43 elk herd migration corridor near Highway 135 and

Cement Creek. Prior 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. Prior also questioned the necessity of a new driveway and proposed alternatives to minimize disruption. Broader concerns were expressed about the cumulative impact of development on wildlife habitats, public lands, and natural resource sustainability. Prior 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.

The applicant has not relocated the access at the southern portion of the parcel although it was discussed at the December 18, 2025 public hearing. The applicant removed several lots from the southern portion of the parcel.

The southern access road for the subdivision shall be relocated to align with Aries Avenue and reduce impacts to wildlife. Additionally, the Planning Commission has indicated that lots 64, 65, and 66 shall be removed from the development plan and maintained as open space to reduce impacts to wildlife.

Section 11-107: *Protection of Water Quality.*

Applicable, the subject parcel includes water bodies within 125 feet and shall comply with the standards of this Section. No development is proposed within the inner restrictive buffer of a water body. If development within 125 feet of the water body is proposed, a water quality protection plan shall be required at Preliminary Plan.

Section 11-108: *Standards for Development on Ridgelines.*

Not applicable. The site is not located on a ridgeline.

Section 11-109: *Development That Affects Agricultural Lands.*

Applicable, the subject parcel is adjacent to agricultural lands. The standards of this Section shall apply.

Section 11-110: *Development of Land Beyond Snowplowed Access.*

Not applicable, the site is not located beyond snowplowed access.

Section 11-111: *Development On Inholdings In The National Wilderness.*

Not applicable, the site is not located on a National Wilderness inholding.

Section 11-112: *Development On Property Above Timberline.*

Not applicable, the site is not located above timberline.

Section 12-103: *Road System.*

Applicable, a copy of the application was referred to Gunnison County Public Works and CDOT. The applicant has identified the general locations of roads and access in compliance with Sketch Plan requirements. Engineered road plans and traffic studies are not required or accepted at Sketch Plan.

CDOT comments noted that if the proposed development causes an increase of 20% or more in traffic that a traffic study shall be required. Gunnison County standards require that a traffic study be submitted at Preliminary Plan for any development that includes more than 100 trips per day.

Gunnison County Public Works comments are noted above and indicate concerns that adequate snow storage is not provided, trails shall be open to the public, and that there be continued coordination on the Cement Creek Road and Highway 135 intersection design.

The Preliminary Plan shall include road plans that are stamped by a Colorado-licensed engineer in compliance with the standards of this Section and the Gunnison County Road and Bridge Standards.

Section 12-104: *Public Trails.*

Applicable, trails are proposed as part of this application. Gunnison County recently completed a high-level design for a Crested Butte to Crested Butte South multimodal access trail. The applicant has identified a trail alongside Highway 135 which would be a likely connection point to the proposed Crested Butte to Crested Butte South trail and would support the multimodal connectivity to and from the development. Staff recommends that the proposed trail along the highway be dedicated to the public at large.

Per Section 12-104: E. there is a rational connection between the impacts to traffic and recreation caused by the proposed subdivision and the applicant shall mitigate the proportionate share of the impact caused by the development. The development of additional residential units will create added vehicular traffic and recreation demand.

A trail connecting the development and Crested Butte South to Crested Butte is in the public interest and has been expressed as a community desire during the design process and in the Gunnison County Metropolitan Recreation District Recreation Master Plan. The proposed trail shall be guided by the design standards described in the County's design prepared by Design Workshop. The applicant shall also refer to any designs that are proposed by the Gunnison County Metropolitan Recreation District for the fully engineered trail plans.

The costs of trail maintenance, construction and signage within the subdivision shall be described in a future development improvement agreement. The proposed trail design and alignment shall be shown on the site plan and preliminary plat in the Preliminary Plan application.

Section 12-105: *Water Supply.*

Applicable, according to the application, "the development is proposed to have a dual water supply. One will be for domestic water, in house use, and fire flow and the other will be for irrigation and on domestic uses." The water supply plan is described on page 5 of the "Revised Sketch Plan Narrative."

The applicant proposes central wells for the domestic water supply for the subdivision. The applicant proposes to drill additional wells which will be connected to the CB South Metro District and which will support adequate fire flows for the subdivision and provide additional water supply to the CB South Metro District.

The application was forwarded to the Colorado Division of Water Resources for review and comment. Colorado Division of Water Resources provided a response on May 1, 2025, from Ailis Thyne, P.E. Water Resource Engineer. Thyne deferred an opinion pursuant to Section 30-28-136(1)(h)(1), C.R.S., as to whether the proposed water supply plan will cause material injury to existing water rights until Preliminary Plan is submitted and instead offered general comments. She recommended that the applicant clarify if UGRWCD contract will be used for augmentation or obtain an augmentation plan. Thyne requested that the applicant clarify if the proposed

augmentation plan is to offset both the operation of the wells and out-of-priority depletions caused to Bocker Ditch.

The applicant shall be required to submit a complete water supply plan in compliance with the standards of this section at Preliminary Plan.

Section 12-106: Sewage Disposal/Wastewater Treatment.

Applicable, the applicant proposes connection to the Crested Butte Metro District wastewater treatment. In a letter dated October 28, 2021 from the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District, District Manager Ronnie Benson states:

The Crested Butte South Metropolitan District (the "District") is capable of supplying the Avalon the East River Development...with potable water. The District is also capable of treating the wastewater produced by the Development. The terms and conditions pursuant to which the District is willing to provide water and sewer service to Avalon will be the subject of a forthcoming inclusion agreement between the parties that is negotiated and executed pursuant to a future formal inclusion process.

Staff followed up with Mr. Benson in August 2023 and he confirmed the above is still the position of the District. A fully executed agreement for service shall be required for Preliminary Plan submittal.

Section 12-107: Fire Protection.

Applicable, the subject parcel is within the Crested Butte Fire Protection District (CBFPD) and a copy of the application has been referred to CBFPD and Colorado State Forest Service (CSFS) for review and comment. No comments were received from CSFS. Comments from CBFPD are noted above. The applicant shall be required to submit road and water system plans in compliance with the standards of this section at the time of Preliminary Plan.

Section 13-102: Location with a Municipal Three Mile Plan

Not applicable, the subject parcel is not within a municipal three-mile plan.

Section 13-103: General Site Plan Standards and Lot Measurements.

Applicable, the site plan generally complies with the standards of this section as shown on the site plan titled, "Site Reference Map, Starview, Gunnison County, Colorado" dated September 25, 2025 and prepared by NCW & Associates, Inc.

Section 13-104: Setbacks from Property Lines and Road Rights-of-Way.

Applicable, road setbacks and property line setbacks are required to comply with the standards of this Section.

A detailed site plan shall be submitted at Preliminary Plan.

Section 13-105: Residential Building Sizes and Lot Coverages.

Applicable, the applicant has proposed maximum residential building size standards that comply with the standards of this Section. The Preliminary Plan application shall comply with the standards of this Section.

Section 13-107: Installation of Solid Fuel-Burning Devices

This section applies and any solid fuel-burning devices proposed shall comply with this section.

Section 13-108: *Open Space and Recreation Areas*

Applicable, a major impact residential project is required to provide 30% open space. The applicant has proposed 51% open space including a recreation field, trails, park space, and a pavilion. The inclusion of recreation area and developed amenities shall be included in the Preliminary Plan application and shall also be included in a future development improvement agreement.

Section 13-109: *Signs.*

Applicable, any proposed sign(s) shall meet the requirements of this Section. The applicant may submit designs for any proposed signs at the Preliminary Plan stage.

Section 13-110: *Off-Road Parking and Loading.*

Applicable, parking in compliance with this Section shall be required. Specific detail and location shall be demonstrated at Preliminary Plan.

Section 13-111: *Landscaping And Buffering.*

Applicable, this Section requires that a Major Impact application “shall integrate the elements of the site plan and design, so that the land use change preserves and enhances the unique identity of the site. Landscaping may include plant materials including trees, shrubs, ground covers, perennials and annuals, and other materials including rocks, walls, fences, planters and paving materials.”

The applicant has described landscaping which includes revegetation with native seed, installation of trees and shrubs, installation of berms along the highway

Section 13-112: *Snow storage.*

Applicable, the applicant has identified areas of snow storage on the site plan and additional detail shall be provided at Preliminary Plan. Gunnison County Public Works has expressed concern that the areas identified for snow storage are insufficient. The applicant shall include sufficient areas for snow storage within the Preliminary Plan application and in compliance with the standards of this Section.

Section 13-113: *Fencing*

Applicable, this section applies and any fencing proposed shall comply with this section.

Section 13-114: *Exterior Lighting.*

Applicable, the standards of this Section shall be applied at the time of building permit application.

All lighting proposed on the parcel shall comply with this Section and Section 9-301: D.6. *Exterior Lighting* for commercial and nonresidential development.

Section 13-115: *Reclamation And Noxious Weed Control.*

Applicable, the applicant has acknowledged that a reclamation plan, prepared in compliance with this Section, shall be required at Preliminary Plan. A reclamation permit is required for road cutting and/or construction, homesite clearing and berm construction.

Section 13-116: *Grading And Erosion Control.*

Applicable, the design of the sketch plan has been guided by the standards of this Section.

The Preliminary Plan is the step of this overall review in which engineered details are required to be indicated and assure compliance with this Section. Details of grading and erosion control are

appropriately required at Preliminary Plan level of review as elements of detailed engineered plans.

Section 13-117: Drainage, Construction And Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff.

Applicable, the Sketch Plan shall be guided by the requirements of this Section, however specific details are not required at Sketch Plan.

This is a Major Impact subdivision and may involve 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area created by road and driveway improvements. A plan pursuant to this Section is required to be submitted in the Preliminary Plan, certified by a qualified professional engineer licensed in the State of Colorado, indicating that this project meets the standards of this Section including methods to ensure that drainage will not injure adjacent lands. Documentation of whether a Stormwater Discharge Permit is required for this project by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment is also required to be submitted as part of Preliminary Plan.

Subject to State standards, storm water runoff is required to be managed onsite, to direct runoff to stable, vegetated areas capable of maintaining sheet flow for infiltration, or to discharge to a storm water conveyance structure, designed to accommodate the projected additional flows from the proposed project.

Section 13-118: Water Impoundments.

Not applicable, no water impoundments, as defined in this Section, are proposed as part of this application.

Section 13-119: Standards to Ensure Compatible Uses.

Applicable, this Section notes that, "Proposed land use changes shall be designed, constructed, and maintained in a manner that will not adversely affect the character and tranquility of nearby residential or public use areas, as well as the following:

- 1. Hazards or Nuisances. Land use changes shall not subject other uses to undue noise, dust, fumes, odor, explosion, aircraft flight patterns, or other hazards or nuisances, whether the result of design, location, basic character, or of planned or reasonably expected growth.*
- 2. Adverse Impacts to Adjoining Land. Land use changes shall eliminate or minimize or mitigate conflicts between adjoining land uses and to the maximum extent feasible, avoid changes that will result in significant net adverse impact to adjoining land.*

The applicant has described compliance with this standard which includes: limitations on height and size of structures; construction limitations; landscaping and berms to protect viewsheds; internal trails; compliance with County exterior lighting standards; and main roads will be paved or treated with dust control measures.

Article 15: Right-to-Ranch Policy.

Applicable, the subject parcel is adjacent to any agricultural operations, as defined in the LUR, and shall comply with the standards of this Section. A Preliminary Plan application shall detail how the application complies with the standards of this Section including how irrigation ditches will be maintained on the property.

FINDINGS:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission finds, for purposes of approval of the Sketch Plan phase of the Major Impact project application, that:

1. This application is classified as a Major Impact per Section 7-101: *More Than Four Units*.
2. Pursuant to Section 7-102: *Standards of Approval for Major Impact Projects*, the Commission hereby finds and concludes:
 - a. This Sketch Plan application is generally consistent with the standards and requirements of the *Resolution*, pursuant to Section 7-103, *i.e.*, compliance of the proposed land use change with the standards of the *Resolution* are required to be determined broadly and conceptually during Sketch Plan review. This application has addressed, and the Commission has evaluated this submittal for its integration of the standards of the *Resolution* within its conceptual presentation of the proposed development pursuant to the foregoing standard.
 - b. The applicant has submitted sufficient evidence at this stage of the process to demonstrate that the project concept is compatible with the community character. A final determination of whether or not the proposed land use change would result in a significant adverse net effect to adjacent land uses can occur only after the applicant has submitted the Preliminary Plan application.
 - c. No phasing has been proposed by the applicant within this Sketch Plan submittal.
 - d. All uses have been identified on lots within this proposed development.
3. The following have been identified as potential issues related to this application during the Sketch Plan review process:
 - a. Insufficient workforce housing
 - b. Trail construction and public access
 - c. Recreation field construction and bathrooms
 - d. Wildlife and open space
 - e. Highway 135 roundabout
 - f. View sheds from neighboring properties and highway
 - g. Adequate snow storage
 - h. Maintenance of irrigation ditches
 - i. Traffic impacts
 - j. The impact of the proposed southern access on wildlife
2. The subject parcel is adjacent to agricultural operations.
3. The applicant proposes the allowance of short-term rentals on the single family lots for no more than 90 days.
4. A nonresidential use (CB South Metro District building) is proposed at the site. The Commission finds that these proposed uses meet the sketch plan standards of the LUR.
5. The applicant has requested service from the Crested Butte South Metropolitan District for water supply and wastewater treatment.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission, having considered the submitted plan, site observations and public testimony, has reached the above findings and recommends that LUC-

22-00028 be classified as a Major Impact Sketch Plan, and that the Sketch Plan be approved with the following conditions:

1. Pursuant to Section 7-103: C., in the submittal of Preliminary Plan, the applicant shall formulate detailed, designed/engineered solutions to the issues and concerns identified during this Sketch Plan review, and shall address, in a site-specific manner, all other issues that are relevant to the Preliminary Plan.
2. The Preliminary Plan application shall address how the application and proposed development will address the following issues identified during the Sketch Plan review process:
 - a. Insufficient workforce housing
 - b. Trail construction and public access
 - c. Recreation field construction and bathrooms
 - d. Wildlife and open space
 - e. Highway 135 roundabout
 - f. View sheds from neighboring properties and highway
 - g. Adequate snow storage
 - h. Maintenance of irrigation ditches
 - i. Traffic impacts
 - j. The impact of the proposed southern access on wildlife
3. The southern access road for the subdivision shall be relocated to align with Aries Avenue and reduce impacts to wildlife.
4. Lots 64, 65, and 66 shall be removed from the development proposal and maintained as open space.
5. The proposed recreation field shall be required to be constructed and include public bathrooms.
6. The workforce housing area shall be better utilized and include at least 30-35 workforce units and be made up of duplexes and triplexes.
7. The applicant shall continue to coordinate with Gunnison County Public Works on the Highway 135 and Cement Creek Road intersection. Gunnison County will be contracting with a firm to design the roundabout.
8. The applicant shall provide 3-D renderings of the proposed development and how it impacts the viewsheds from adjacent properties and Highway 135.
9. The applicant shall detail how the irrigation ditches onsite will be maintained so as not to interfere with agricultural operators.
10. A traffic study prepared by a Colorado-licensed engineer shall be submitted at Preliminary Plan.
11. The applicant shall provide a water supply plan and respond to the comments from the Division of Water Resources at Preliminary Plan.

12. The applicant shall provide an agreement with the Crested Butte South Metropolitan Recreation District for water supply and wastewater treatment at Preliminary Plan.
13. Per LUR Section 7-202(O), approval of this Sketch Plan application constitutes a final decision of approval for the general development concept only, but shall not constitute approval of any detailed design or engineering submittals or proposed solutions to specific problems revealed during the Sketch Plan review or later in the review process. Sketch Plan approval by the Board shall not constitute approval of the Major Impact project, or permission to proceed with construction of any aspect of the proposed land use change. Approval at this stage only authorizes the applicant to submit a Preliminary Plan application. If, during the Preliminary and Final Plan reviews, the applicants are unable to fulfill all of the requirements of this Resolution or any requirements imposed as part of the Preliminary or Final Plan review, then the application shall be denied at the Preliminary or Final Plan review stage.
14. The applicant shall be required to submit and actively pursue the completion of the Preliminary Plan application within twelve (12) months after the date of approval of the Sketch Plan. Per Section 7-202: Q. *Extension of Submittal Deadline*, the Board may extend the deadline to submit a Preliminary Plan application for no more than 12 months beyond the date of the 12-month expiration, and only one extension may be granted. Failure to submit a complete Preliminary Plan application within this time period shall render the Sketch Plan approval null and void, and require the applicant to begin the Sketch Plan review process again.
15. This approval is founded on each individual requirement. Should the applicant successfully challenge, in a judicial proceeding, any such finding or requirement, this approval is null and void.
16. This Sketch Plan approval may be revoked or suspended if Gunnison County determines that any material fact set forth herein or represented by the applicant was false or misleading, or that the applicant failed to disclose facts necessary to make any such fact not misleading.
17. The removal or material alteration of any physical feature of the property (geological, topographical or vegetative) relied on herein to mitigate a possible conflict shall require a new or amended land use change application.
18. Approval of this use is based upon the facts presented and implies no approval of similar use in the same or different location and/or with different impacts on the environment and community. Any such future application shall be reviewed and evaluated, subject to its compliance with current regulations, and its impact to the County.
19. This review and decision incorporates, but is not limited to, all the documentation submitted to the County and included within the Planning Office file relative to this application; including all exhibits, references and documents as included therein.