

**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<br>Vice-Chairperson - Eric Phillips<br>Commissioner - Julie Baca<br>Commissioner – Brett Adkins<br>Alt. Commissioner - Sean Patrick<br><br>BOCC - Jonathan Houck<br>BOCC - Liz Smith<br>BOCC - Laura Puckett Daniels | Director of Community and Economic Development - Cathie Pagano<br>Director of Planning - Hillary Seminick<br>Planning Technician – Aidan McComas<br>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 8<sup>th</sup> and January 22<sup>nd</sup>.

\*\*\*

**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 16<sup>th</sup>. 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 8<sup>th</sup> at 9:00am.

Pagano: noted public written comment will be accepted until January 7<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup>, 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, 6<sup>th</sup> 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 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2026 at 9:00am.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:05 pm.