

GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PRELIMINARY AGENDA: FRIDAY, July 9, 2021
Blackstocks Government Center 221 N. Wisconsin Suite D.
You may also participate with ZOOM

8:45 a.m. Call to order; determine quorum

Approval of Minutes

Unscheduled citizens: A brief period in which the public is invited to make general comments or ask questions of the Commission or Planning Staff about items which are not scheduled on the day's agenda.

9:00 a.m. Planning Commission; Joint Work Session. Discussion *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*, Section 13-105: Residential Building Sizes and Lot Coverages.

Adjourn

Join Zoom meeting.

Topic: Planning Commission Meeting 7-9-21

Time: Jul 9, 2021 08:30 AM Mountain Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/98718770499?pwd=RHFLODNjVXRpZ0Ywd2F4ZEIHSjY1Zz09>

Meeting ID: 987 1877 0499

Passcode: 671633

One tap mobile

+12532158782,,98718770499#,,, *671633# US (Tacoma)

+13462487799,,98718770499#,,, *671633# US (Houston)

Dial by your location

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 987 1877 0499

Passcode: 671633

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/adPEVM4Ark>

GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Friday, July 9, 2021

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. **Present:**

Chairperson- Laura Puckett-Daniels Vice-Chairperson- Andy Sovick Commissioner-Vince Rogalski Commissioner-Scott Cox Alt. Commissioner- Beth Appleton Alt. Commissioner- Julie Baca	Director of Community and Economic Development-Cathie Pagano Senior Planner – Rachel Sabbato Senior Planner- Hillary Seminick Administrative Assistant III- Rebecca Ricord Others present as listed in text
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ZOOM: Scott Cox, Julie Baca
Absent: Melanie Miller

With a quorum present Chairperson Puckett-Daniels opened the July 9, 2021 regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Moved by Baca seconded by Sovick to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes of, June 18, 2021 as proposed, the motion passed unanimously.

Planning Commission; Joint Work Session. The Gunnison County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners conducted a joint discussion of Gunnison *County Land Use Resolution*, Section 13-105: Residential Building Sizes and Lot Coverages.

Puckett-Daniels requested that the unscheduled citizens introduce themselves, tell them where they live and make any comments. Introductions made by members of the audience.

With a quorum present Chairperson Puckett-Daniels opened the joint work session.

Pagano went over the staff memo sent out to the members that the committee asked for with the updates.

- Overview of water quality protection standards. They regulate any development within 125 feet of a waterbody, wetlands are included in the definition. Went over requirements for development in those areas within the Land Use Resolution.
- Impact Fees for larger homes and/or energy loads. They could consider impact fees for larger homes and could go over them with the Board. It would take a couple of months to determine those fees. Time would depend on what type of fees they were requesting.
- Information relative to the number of residences constructed on parcels larger than 70 acres. 31 of the 818 permits issued since 2001 are over 70 acres. 291 lots could be created additional lots could be created by State statute. Pagano believes it is one of the exceptions to the rule. Seminick stated that there was no additional analysis for areas that couldn't be developed on them due to wetlands, conservation etc. It was a straight mathematical analysis of lots over 70 acres divided by 35 acres. They would likely be required to go through a County process to develop roads and would have to go through a Minor Impact review with the Planning Commission.

Cox stated that the core of his question was how often larger homes were being developed on properties of 70 acres or more. Seminick stated that the closest answer she has is that they don't track the lots that are 35 acres or larger because it is a State process. Pagano said that they don't have the analysis that he was requested but stated that most of what she is seeing is that they are on 35 acres or larger. There are a few that are on 70 acres or more. It is more the exception than the rule.

- Update from the County Attorney on the status of partially exempt development as described in Section 1-10-6:D of the LUR. Development on 35 acre lots that existed prior to 2000 and also had protective covenants that were recorded before July 1, 2000. When they adopted the LUR in 2000 they

determined which subdivisions were exempt from the size requirements; Cement Creek at CB South, Eagle Ridge Ranch, East River Ranch, Red Mountain Ranches and all of Trapper's Crossing. They don't have to go through the County Land Use Change process. The commission has asked whether there can be a change to that exemption.

Hoyt stated that if you make a change or recommend a change to amend the size limitation section it will not have an effect on this exemption. They are approved for the purposes of the board and no changes would affect the approval of the covenants of those subdivisions. It is a vested property right of those lots. Puckett-Daniels asked for clarification on the approval of the covenants for those subdivisions. Pagano stated that the subdivision covenants were approved through the LUR defacto. Hoyt stated that regardless of the basis at the time, the Board was saying the covenants were approved and were not required to go through the process. The Board and Planning Commission can't go back and change it.

Puckett-Daniels said that the people have expressed a desire for smaller residential maximums, conservation and preventing negative impacts. They can see as a community those values are true on the ground, homes are average 2500 to 3500 square feet. There will hopefully be environmental impacts with the reduction. Puckett-Daniels recommended that 4200 be the maximum size for a residence with an additional 1500 square feet for additional structures for an aggregate of 5700 square feet.

Houck stated that originally, he was looking at 5000-6500 square feet but that was before he started looking more into but believes they need to find the sweet spot and agrees with Puckett-Daniel's range.

Sovick stated that the square footage is just reflective of what has already been occurring in the valley and doesn't believe Puckett-Daniel's recommendation is radical and believes it is reasonable.

Mason stated that as a builder his intent was not to make a drastic change to what the normal is but to put a limit on what people expect from here forward. Feels that giving people an option between 5,000 and 6,000 but believes that going between 4,000 to 5,000 will cause more minor impact reviews. Mason believes that bringing it down to where it was around 2003, 5,000- 6,00 with 2,000 aggregate, for a total of 7,000 square feet would be best.

Pagano stated that the LUR includes fourplexes in the requirements, but they can amend it to not include multi-family development. Puckett-Daniels doesn't want to discourage density development of affordable housing on approved parcels. Discussion followed on possible amendments to exempt multi-family development.

Seminick wanted to clarify that the aggregate square footage does include any integrated ADUs, which the LUR allows for 1200 square feet. This is for any ADU that is attached to the residence. Houck stated that true agricultural buildings do not count towards the total aggregate square footage.

Pagano stated that while it is always good to look at future consequences but that the LUR is a living document. As time changes they can be responsive to those changes and can address any issues at that time.

Sovick stated that if they reduce the maximum too much the amount of Minor Impacts may significantly increase. They don't want to bring it down so much so that there is so much more work. Pagano went over the permits that have been issued that have been over the proposed square footage and stated that there haven't been many and that she believes they would be manageable. Houck stated that it is the responsibility of the BOCC to address the issue of more work and whether they need to hire new people, find more money and tools. Discussion followed on whether creating more regulations will increase costs.

The planning commission recommended 4200 square feet for the primary residence, 1500 square feet for additional structures for an aggregate 4700 square feet and keep the current maximum square footage for multi-family residences. Requested the staff draft a recommendation for the BOCC. Puckett-Daniels asked for an analysis of multi-family residences. Cox doesn't agree with the recommendation. Pagano stated that staff will prepare a redline version of the amendments and present it to them at a future meeting, they will then take it to the BOCC for approval and acceptance.

Sovick asked that staff address all tools that could help discourage environmental health impacts, fees etc. Does believe it is important to go over all of those tools. Asked that the staff review the LUR for ways it's biased against medium and higher density and look at it in a broader spectrum in the future.

/S/ Rebecca Ricord
Administrative Assistant III
Gunnison County Community Development Department