

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, January 8, 2026**

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting in the Planning Commission Meeting Room in the Board of County Commissioners Boardroom at 220 N. Virginia, Gunnison, Co. and on Zoom **Present:**

Chairperson – Roland Mason Vice-Chairperson – Eric Phillips Commissioner – Julie Baca Commissioner – Brett Adkins Commissioner – Karen Stock 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 County Attorney – Matt Hoyt Planner I – Caroline Danielson Planning Technician – Aidan McComas Others present as listed in text
---	---

Absent:

Recused:

Zoom: Baca

With a quorum present Chairperson Mason opened the January 8, 2025 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:46 am.

Mason seated Patrick as a Voting Member.

Moved by Phillips, seconded by Adkins to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated December 18, 2025. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous:

Pagano: noted the next scheduled meeting is on January 22nd, reminded the Planning Commission that the Public hearing scheduled for January 22nd was cancelled.

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.

Staff Comments

Pagano: clarified the standards of a moratorium on Major Impact project, under Colorado State Statute, the County is only permitted to hold a moratorium for six months. Noted Starview was applied for in 2022, stated the County cannot pause an application to adopt new rules. Stated the County is obligated to review an application when it is submitted under regulations in place at the time of submission. Noted the release of the RFP for the Corridor Plan.

Hoyt: clarified that a moratorium cannot be placed on an active application, unless amendments to the Land Use Resolution are being considered. Stated the Corridor Plan wasn't pending at the time of Starview submitting an application.

Hoyt: clarified the differences in actions a Home Rule County versus a regular county can take in relation to a moratorium. Stated Gunnison County is subject to the statutes and constitution of the State of Colorado.

Pagano: noted the Corridor Plan will likely be kicked off in the Spring with many opportunities for public input.

Planning Commission Questions

Mason: asked to view the Draft Recommendation Document created by staff.

Mason: addressed public written comments, noted few were in support of the current application. Noted the submission of a petition of disapproval for the application with approximately 313 signatures.

Puckett Daniels: noted the Board of County Commissioners is diligent in reading and considering all public comments.

Pagano: clarified standards for approval to be considered by the Commission. Started with "Compatibility with Community Character", Section 7-102: B.

Mason: addressed Section 7-102: B being central to most received public comments. Noted the blending of the proposed development with neighboring development, asked if this meet the standard of Community Compatibility.

Pagano: asked Commissioners to consider affordable housing as an offset to the overall development.

Mason: noted asking for the proposed wildlife corridor to meet the request found in the CPW comments. Noted the applicant stated the conditions for relocating the southern access to the proposed development.

Mason: asked for both Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioner input.

Puckett Daniels: expressed deep concern for wildlife migration being disrupted by this proposed development and is current design. Noted wildlife migration fluctuates in movement patterns, movement density, etc. Expressed concern over the tiered level of housing, despite the potential for removal of the upper three lots in the proposal. Asked for the cumulative impacts to be

considered fully in relation to the proposed development. Cited Purposes found in the Land Use Resolution.

Adkins: asked Puckett Daniels where the corridor is mapped, if it is centrally located across the proposed development.

Puckett Daniels: noted CPW stated the southern portion of the proposed development as an important place for elk permeability.

Smith: asked whether a denser proposal in the middle of the parcel would address some wildlife crossing concerns and reduce the cost of construction and therefore the cost of housing in the proposed development. Noted the project is not for the Commissioners to design. Stated a more compact design could address many concerns over density and magnitude.

Pagano: asked Planning Commissioner to make their determination of the application that was submitted.

Hoyt: noted new information not previously included in the public hearing should not be considered.

Applicant: noted the information Puckett Daniels has introduced was not included in the public hearing materials.

Puckett Daniels: stated her reference to maps created by CPW and which have been presented by Pagano.

Adkins: noted elk migration more or less happens on the opposite side of the East River from the proposed development.

Baca: confirmed the CPW mapping tool was shared prior to this meeting.

Applicant: noted having never seen elk migrating in the location being referred to by the Commission. Stated deer do migrate across the parcel for proposed development.

Mason: clarified the information introduce about elk migration has been withdraw.

Pagano: noted the Wildlife Planning Tool has been used previously as well as the Housing Needs Assessment.

Mason: noted the neighboring Land Trust parcel as a potential migration corridor. Noted agreement with the previous comment by Puckett Daniels concerning the removal of lots for migration corridors. Asked the Planning Commission if moving the southern access point will make enough space for the migration corridor.

Phillips: noted the proposed development is not clustered enough to reduce potential impact on wildlife.

Adkins: noted the migration through the site appears to be limited, therefore the relocation of the southern access will allow for the migration of wildlife.

Patrick: stated the CPW migration map appears to show a small pinch point for migration across the parcel proposed for development.

Smith: noted CPW concerns go beyond elk herd migration and address more wildlife.

Pagano: explained the inclusion of "Cluster or cluster development" in the Draft Recommendation Document.

Phillips: noted the deed restricted area is clustered, but the remainder of the proposal does not feel clustered. Noted more clustering could happen to offset the magnitude of the development.

Puckett Daniels: noted the Purposes found in the Land Use Resolution. Expanded on the Clustering Purpose. Noted (minutes 9:45). Section 1-103. Stated sprawling development across a large parcel does not reflex standards found in the Land Use Resolution.

Mason: noted deed restricting houses is only a step to meeting the overall housing needs of Gunnison County. Stated deed restriction does provide an entry into home ownership. Stated the missing middle among the housing needs is not single family residences. Noted the price differential, based on current prices, will be out of reach for many individuals in the community.

Phillips: stated the proposal is missing the missing middle among the housing needs. Asked why diverse housing options weren't included in the proposal.

Mason: noted Crested Butte South, a neighboring development, contains multi-family units.

Patrick: stated the current application does not meet the goal of adding affordability to the housing market in the Valley.

Houck: noted housing costs in the Valley are impacted by availability, the inventory is not enough to meet current needs. Stated the current application with clustered deed restricted housing meets standards, but other aspects of the proposed development don't. Noted concern over the utilization of this parcel and it not offsetting the development.

Pagano: noted Section 10-102: Locational Standards. One standard being adjacent to existing population centers.

Patrick: noted the importance of the view corridor and concern over how the proposed development might disrupt it.

Phillips: noted the parcel itself is suitable for development, but noted the current application has not demonstrated having no adverse impacts on the adjacent community.

Adkins: agreed with Patrick, asked whether the proposed development will disrupt the view corridor from Hwy 135.

Patrick: stated the development will likely disrupt the view corridor.

Mason: noted any development close to Hwy 135 will have an adverse impact on the view corridor. Noted the current application placed open space on the southern end of the parcel to allow for less disruption to the view corridor. Noted the disruption to the viewshed was mitigated as much as possible given the current design.

Adkins: asked if clustered development will further disrupt the viewshed.

Phillips: noted there are tradeoffs, including providing for the community and the preservation of the landscape.

Mason: noted CPW asked for future development to be concentrated close the existing roads.

Pagano: asked Commission to decide whether the application meet the standard of having no net adverse impact.

Pagano: noted Section 10-103: Residential Density. Noted lot size and lot density shall be substantially similar to neighboring parcels unless other standards are met. Asked Commissioners to address whether the standard is met, or if the exception standards have been met.

Mason: noted is the decision of the Planning Commission to decide the neighborhood of a proposed development.

Patrick: noted the proximity to CB South, stated could be a neighborhood of CB South.

Adkins: agreed with Patrick.

Phillips: noted the density of the proposed development is like CB South, but the sprawl of the proposed development is not.

Mason: stated being comfortable with including the proposed development as a neighborhood with CB South.

Phillips: noted Cement Creek Road acts as a major road when considering the definition of neighborhood in the Land Use Resolution.

Pagano: presented the Starview parcel in relation to nearby developments such as CB South and Allen Homesites. Asked if large and small parcels are including the neighborhood, requested input from the Planning Commission. Cited Section 10-103 when considering meeting standards.

Phillips: noted lot sizes are dissimilar. Stated overall lot densities are similar, however lot sizes are dissimilar.

Patrick: agreed the boundaries of Cement Creek, East River, and Hwy 135 separate the proposed development from neighboring developments.

Mason: reiterated the definition of neighborhood found in the Land Use Resolution. Asked Planning Commission to fully consider the standards for defining a neighborhood in terms of residential density.

Puckett Daniels: noted the difference in coming to define a neighborhood including by the provided definition, through lived experiences, through actions, etc.

Mason: asked whether the Allen Homesites are part of CB South when looking at distance, current boundaries of road and natural features, etc. Determined Allen Homesites to be adjacent to CB South but not a neighborhood of CB South. Applied that to Starview.

Phillips: agreed with Mason.

Patrick: agreed with Mason, the Starview development is not part of the CB South neighborhood.

Adkins: agreed with Mason.

Phillips: noted lot density is similar, but lot sizes are not when comparing them to CB South. Stated the standard was not met.

Mason: stated the surrounding area has larger lot sizes.

Pagano: covered conditions to be considered.

Mason and Phillips: stated the application does not meet the Clustering standards.

Smith: noted the development is uniquely located in relation to Hwy 135, Cement Creek Road, and the East River. Stated clustering, in relation to other concerns, is important and hasn't been met with the current application.

Mason: clarified clustering has not been met to satisfy the standards of Section 10-103: C.

Pagano: stated the application is required to meet all applicable standards found within the Land Use Resolution.

Puckett Daniels: noted there were previously addressed standards that the Planning Commission had not determined if they were met.

Phillips: stated the proposed development does not meet the standard of Section 7-102: B. Compatibility with Community Character.

Mason: agreed with Phillips' statement, noted there is no net positive impact when considering Compatibility with Community Character.

Puckett Daniels: clarified the definition of population center.

Mason: stated the net adverse impact have not been mitigated.

Phillips: agreed with Mason, noted the applicant has tried to mitigate the net adverse impacts however the net adverse impacts remain.

Patrick agreed

Adkins: agreed

Baca: agreed

Pagano: clarified the application does not meet many standards of the Land Use Resolution. Addressed the possible directions the Planning Commission could go in terms of voting.

Mason: asked for input from Attorney Hoyt.

Hoyt: stated the Draft Recommendation Document is at the discretion of the Planning Commission.

Applicant: asked for time to review the Draft Recommendation Document of Denial to allow for response.

Hoyt: clarified the decision is at the discretion of the Planning Commission.

Mason: asked for a motion for a Draft Recommendation Document for Denial.

Hoyt: clarified the public hearing can be closed, however the Planning Commission cannot receive input from the applicant or the public. Noted a continued Public Hearing allows the Planning Commission to receive input from the applicant and public.

Mason: stated no further input from the applicant is needed.

Moved by Baca, seconded by Phillips to close the public hearing. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Patrick: asked to see the Draft Recommendation Document of Denial today.

Hoyt: clarified the process when viewing a Draft Recommendation Document.

Mason: reminded the room the Public Hearing has been closed and there will be no input from the public or the applicant.

Pagano: presented the Draft Recommendation Document of Denial, explained the various standards not met by the applicant as determined by the Planning Commission. Noted references to a Preliminary Plan were not included in the Draft Document. Addressed Planning Commission findings including insufficient workforce housing, trail construction and public access, recreation field construction and bathrooms, wildlife and open space, Highway 135 roundabout, view sheds from neighboring properties and highway, adequate snow storage, maintenance of irrigation ditches, traffic impacts, the impact of the proposed southern access on wildlife, and overall design and layout of the development.

Phillips: noted the Draft Recommendation Document for Denial was appropriate.

Moved by Patrick, seconded by Baca to approve the Recommendation Document for Denial. The motion passed unanimously in support.

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

Meeting Adjourned at 11:48 am