

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, February 19, 2026**

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting in the Planning Commission Meeting Room in the Blackstock Government Center, 221 N. Wisconsin, Gunnison, Co. and on Zoom **Present:**

Chairperson – Eric Phillips Vice Chair – Sean Patrick Commissioner – Brett Adkins Commissioner – Anna Fenerty	Director of Planning – Hillary Seminick Planner II – Rachael Blondy Planner I – Caroline Danielson Others present as listed in text
--	--

Absent: Karen Stock, Julie Baca, Beverly Troxtell
Recused:
Zoom:

With a quorum present Chairperson Phillips opened the February 19, 2026 regular meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:46 am. Phillips seated Alternate Commissioner Fenerty as a voting member.

Moved by Patrick, seconded by Adkins to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes, dated February 5, 2026. The motion passed unanimously in support. Fenerty abstained from voting due to not being an appointed Commissioner at the February 5, 2026 meeting.

Staff announcements/ miscellaneous:
Seminick noted that Anna Fenerty and Beverly Troxtell were appointed as alternate Planning Commission Members. She also noted upcoming shifts to the March and April schedules.

Work Session: LUC-25-00038 | Dos Rios Village | Minor Impact

Simco Ventures LLC submitted an application to build six buildings containing four townhomes each for a total of 24 townhomes at 37764 W. Highway 50, Gunnison CO. Twelve of the townhomes would be 2-bedroom, 1.5 bath at 1,009 square feet each. Twelve of the units would be 3-bedroom, 1.5-bath at 1,246 square feet each.

Seminick explained that the application was located in the South Urban Transition Area of the Gunnison Area Plan (GAP), but that the application was submitted prior to the adoption of the GAP. She also explained that the application had previously been approved but that entitlements expired.

Applicant Presentation

Kendall Burgemeister, representing Simco Ventures LLC, reiterated that a virtually identical application was approved in 2024. He explained that the previous approval expired due to the timing of another project and supply chain issues post-COVID.

Burgemeister provided an overview of the proposed project, explaining the location to be adjacent to existing multi-family developments. He noted that changes from the previously approved application do not reflect changes to the impacted area on the parcel and rather reflect a reconfiguration within the units. He noted that each unit would have 2 covered parking spaces and overflow parking for guests. He also noted that the applicant is considering adding storage units and a fenced in dog park area.

Burgemeister reviewed the previous approvals (LUC-05-00084 and LUC-20-00015) and requested that the application be reclassified as a Minor Impact Land Use Change Application, explaining that there would be low marginal demand for public services and a minor impact on the surrounding area.

Burgemeister reviewed the residential density standards, noting that the application is for a density of 11 units/acre and that existing surrounding multi-family condos range from 5-23 units/acre. He also explained that existing cottonwoods would provide screening.

He explained that the application was consistent with the Three Mile Plan that was in effect at the time of application submittal.

Group discussed access; previous CDOT permit still sufficient, no concerns from CDOT. GFPD and PW would control internal access, no major concerns with regards to access from staff or referral agency perspective.

Planning Commission Questions

The group discussed access to the parcel, noting that the CDOT permit was still sufficient. Seminick noted that Gunnison Fire Protection District and Gunnison County Public Works would review internal access, but that no major concerns were noted from staff or referral agencies.

Seminick explained that the Planning Commission would need to determine the impact classification of the project. She noted that the project was an infill project and that impacts were anticipated to be minimal. She explained that while the project did not need to comply with the GAP due to timing of submittal, that the project nearly complied in terms of density. She noted that if the impact classification were reduced, there would still be a Joint Public Hearing with BOCC and that BOCC would make the ultimate decision.

Planning Commission agreed that the application meets standards outlined in LUR Section 3-111 to reduce the impact classification to a Minor Impact.

Phillips inquired about connection of the development to the golf course. The applicant noted that there was no current plan to provide direct connection to the golf course.

Planning Commission discussed residential density, noting that the proposed density was consistent with surrounding density.

Adkins inquired about how the application comports with the GAP Special Area Regulations. Seminick noted that the application meets GAP density standards, but may not meet all design standards or essential housing requirements.

Planning Commission expressed they did not feel the need for a site visit.

Phillips inquired about impacts to the community without the inclusion of essential housing. Group discussed standards in LUR Section 10-103, noting density to be substantially similar to the surrounding area.

Seminick explained that if the project meets density standards, then there would be no requirement for inclusionary zoning.

Burgemeister noted that the inclusion of deed restricted units could be used as an incentive for increased density, height, and reduced setbacks, but that these are not sought after under this application. He noted that this development was expected to serve the missing middle.

Phillips inquired about an estimate of pricing for the units, Burgemeister noted that the best data point is current comparable units.

Next Steps

Planning Commission directed staff to schedule a Joint Public Hearing with BOCC. Seminick noted that this would be tentatively scheduled for April 2, 2026.

Work Session: LUC-25-00043 | Barkman Subdivision | Minor Impact

The proposed Barkman Subdivision, Filing No. 2 would divide 18.81 acres adjacent to the City of Gunnison into five lots, including the applicant's existing developed lot where they currently reside.

Seminick disclosed her relationship to one of the applicant's representatives, explaining that she rented from him. She noted that she did not believe this would impact her ability to remain impartial to the application.

Applicant Presentation

Jesus Lopez introduced himself, noting that Rachel Sabbato and Andy Socick were representing him in the application.

Sabbato summarized the application, explaining that the subdivision would create four new lots plus the lot that Lopez presently resided. She explained that sewer and electric easements were included in the draft plat. She explained that the application proposed for each lot to be reliant on individual wells permitted through the state, but that they would like direction from the Planning Commission on the matter. She noted that the draft covenants allowed for one ADU on each lot and that the covenants allowed for small animals. She also noted the request for an impact classification reduction to Minor Impact.

Staff Comments

Blondy explained that the application was submitted prior to the adoption of the GAP SAR. If submitted after GAP SAR adoption, provisions of the Urban Growth Boundary would apply, which would include connecting to City water and entering into a pre-annexation agreement with

the City. She noted that the application was referred to the City and no substantial comments were provided.

Planning Commission Questions

Patrick noted comfort with reducing the application to a Minor Impact. He inquired about water augmentation, Blondy noted that the applicant was directed to not purchase augmentation until direction from Planning Commission provided.

Sabbato explained that connection to water in the future would be possible by the property owners but they would like to give the owners the option to construct individual wells pending water treatment plant expansion timeline.

Phillips discussed density standards in LUR Section 10-103.

Sabbato noted that two wells were already existing and that they could do a 3rd test well.

Phillips inquired about the possibility of connection to public water.

Seminick noted that the application before the Planning Commission was a 5-lot subdivision served by well and central sewer. Adkins noted the cost barrier in connecting to water.

Phillips clarified that connection to the sewer line from the road would be up to individual property owners.

Adkins inquired about the allowance of horses on the wells, Sabbato noted this would be up to each property owner and Division of Water Resources. Adkins requested more information on the wells including data from well tests.

Blondy noted that the Planning Commission needed to determine if they would like to see more density in this area. She explained that within the BOCC Strategic Plan, sprawl was discouraged.

Planning Commission discussed the definition of sprawl and the proposed subdivision in comparison to surrounding density.

Sabbato argued that the proposed subdivision would provide a good transition from the density of the City to agricultural parcels.

Blondy explained concerns brought by Gunnison County Public Works regarding multiple accesses from County Rd 13, Chris Hill from Public Works shared that sharing one access from County Rd 13 would be preferred.

Hill expressed concerns with the length of the accesses, explaining that each lot would be required to include emergency services turnarounds. He explained that the irrigation ditch would require crossing as currently proposed. He explained that creating a single access to serve all 4 lots would reduce traffic concerns.

Sabbato explained that one access would not be preferred, but that they could work with Public Works to determine another access plan. She explained that the driveways would not be constructed by the applicant.

Phillips noted that the group needed to provide direction on locational standards, water, and access. Overall, the group expressed comfort with reducing the impact to Minor Impact. Adkins noted that water and access were big sticking points.

Planning Commission directed the applicant to work with Public Works on an access plan and obtain more information on the wells from well testing.

Patrick expressed comfort with the proposed density given the buffer it could provide from dense development to agricultural parcels. Phillips noted the desire for more dense development in this area, but that the GAP was not to be applied to this application due to submittal date.

Next Steps

Planning Commission directed staff to schedule a site visit and an additional work session.

Work Session: LUC-26-00004 | Petrus Solid Fuel Burning Device LUR Amendment | Minor Impact

The Applicant, Petrus Holdings, Inc., represented by Smith Law Firm PC, submitted a request to amend the Gunnison County Land Use Resolution (LUR) Section LUR 13-107: Installation of Solid Fuel Burning Devices pursuant to LUR Section 11-113: Amending this Land Use Resolution, et. seq.

Seminick explained that the amendment proposal was to increase the allowed solid fuel burning devices.

Applicant Presentation

Nate Smith (attorney representing applicant), Andrew Schulman (employee of applicant), and Sean Pope (consultant for applicant), were all present.

Smith explained that the amendment request was tailored narrowly to apply to the applicant and any other likely situated applicant, but that the application to another applicant was highly unlikely to occur.

Schulman provided context for the application, explaining that the request is based upon a kind of building pursued. Smith explained that Petrus Holdings was a non-profit that supports groups of roman catholic monks, developing monasteries in various locations around the country.

Schulman explained that the structure type was intended to establish a similar way of life to historic monks. He noted that the structures contain private cells, a library, chapel, dining room, and kitchen. Each cell would have its own wood burning stove, and the building would have no utilities. He explained that many of the properties that these structures reside contain biomass-salvageable fuel. He explained that the stoves would be clean-burning, EPA certified stoves.

Smith explained that part of the inspiration behind the amendment would be to reduce wildfire concerns, using deadfall to heat the structure rather than having to burn it in piles outdoors.

Pope noted that the LUR does not allow for exceptions to two stove maximum, and that the amendment would benefit properties in Gunnison County that are beyond plowed access and far from utilities.

Seminick explained that LUR amendments can be initiated by a property owner or resident, and that the Planning Commission is tasked to review the proposal and provide a recommendation to the BOCC to approve, approve with modifications, or to deny.

Seminick reviewed the LUR Standards that would need to be met, as outlined in LUR Section 1-113.

Seminick expressed concerns with how the project comported with the Gunnison County strategic plan, noting concerns with aggregate emissions in a given structure, effect on the natural environment, and the longevity of a clean-burning EPA certified stove.

Seminick expressed concerns with the applicant sharing a site plan for a separate application, noting ex-parte communication. She noted that the amendment proposal should stand on its own.

Seminick expressed concerns with how the definition of communal household would be applied in an equitable manner. She noted the equal protection clause of the constitution.

Seminick summarized her staff memo. She explained that the LUR was amended to reduce the number of wood burning stoves to 1 device per household to address pollution within the three mile plan of Crested Butte and Mt Crested Butte. She noted that wood stove technology had evolved, but that there was no carve out for an exemption to the standard.

Fenerty inquired about the application of this standard if the cells were separate buildings. Seminick clarified that the limitations to the numbers of stoves in multi-family residences would apply regardless of if the units were attached or not.

Smith explained that if the parcel were subdivided, more solid fuel burning devices would be allowed. He also noted that heating the building with electricity or propane was not rational given the remote location. He expressed that the reference to an administrative fee could be removed, and that they could include the requirement for a Minor Impact review. He also noted they would be comfortable including that the amendment would not apply to parcels within three miles of Crested Butte.

Seminick noted that staff and the attorney's office was struggling to understand the government purpose and rational basis for the amendment under the equal protection clause. She noted that the LUR should be applied broadly across the County.

Phillips noted that the LUR was intended to provide standards for the entire County, not to make exceptions for certain projects or parcels.

Fenerty requested more information on the anticipated stove emissions.

Phillips noted LUR Section 1-113 C. 1. Consistency with Any Comprehensive Plan Adopted by Gunnison County. Fenerty noted that the applicant could show that this standards was met if more data was provided.

Smith expressed the desire to amend the proposed amendment.

Phillips reiterated concerns with the standard not applying to the whole County. Smith expressed that this standard could be applied to other applicants.

Seminick noted that the applicant could revise the amendment to include for performance based criteria which could be applied more broadly across all applicants.

Planning Commission continued discussion around LUR Section 1-113 standards. They noted that they were not aware of any changed conditions that would necessitate a modification to the number of solid fuel burning devices.

Group discussed the effect on the natural environment, noting that this was linked to 1. Consistency With Any Comprehensive Plan Adopted by Gunnison County.

Group discussed community needs, noting that there was not need for this amendment.

Group discussed development pattern, noting that this amendment was not and ask coming from other developers. Fenerty expressed concerns with potential loopholes created for future developers.

Group discussed that there was no changes to applicable law that was prompting the amendment request.

Group discussed public health, safety, and welfare, noting that they appreciate the willingness to engage in wildfire mitigation but that they do not see wood burning stoves as a justified approach to wildfire mitigation.

Group did not have anything to add in regards to compliance with applicable IGA adopted by Gunnison County.

Next Steps

Planning Commission provided the opportunity for the applicant to amend the request. Planning Commission directed staff to schedule an additional work session after new materials received.

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

Meeting Adjourned at 12:31pm.