

As GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Preliminary AGENDA: Friday, December 18, 2009

- 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. Edstrom Subdivision, joint public hearing/work session/possible action, request for the subdivision of Lot 8, Ohio Meadows, F#1, into two lots, located at 564 Seneca Drive, northwest of the City of Gunnison, Upper Castle Mountain

9:30 a.m. Planning Commission Work Session:

- Annual review of *Land Use Resolution*, including identification of, and direction to staff to begin drafting needed amendments
- Wrap-up assessment of past year's tasks, accomplishments; forward to BOCC; how to work and interface with public; assessment of processes
- Possible consensus agreement (or formal action, depending upon the pleasure of the Commission), to forward *Planning Commissioner's Handbook* to the Board

Noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Mike Lee, County IT Director, work session; discussion of County's technological capabilities, advancement of document management organization, etc.

End of Meeting

- Report of actions taken by BOCC.
- A brief period in which Commission debriefs on the day's processes, etc. No discussion or action on any specific Land Use Change Permit applications will take place at this time.
- Tasks for staff and/or Planning Commission members that have been identified in discussions throughout the meeting

Adjourn

GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
December 18, 2009

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting, in the Commissioners' Meeting Room in the Blackstocks Government Center, Planning Commission meeting room. **Present were:**

Chairman- Ian Billick	Director of Planning- Joanne Williams
Vice- Chairman-Richard Karas	Assistant Director of Planning- Neal Starkebaum
Commissioner- Ramon Reed	Planner- Cathie Pagano
Commissioner- John Messner	Administrative Assistant- Beth Baker
Commissioner- David Owen	
Alternate Commissioner- Selma Eastman	
Alternate Commissioner-Sam Lumb	

Others present as listed in text

Commission John Messner arrived at the meeting at 9:45 A.M.

With a quorum present Chairman Ian Billick opened the regular meeting of the Commission.

MOVED: by Reed seconded by Karas to approve the December 4, 2009 minutes, as amended. The motion passed unanimously

EDSTROM SUBDIVISION: The Planning Commission (Commission), Board of County Commissioner (BOCC) member Hap Channell, and applicant Karen Edstrom participated in a joint public hearing. They reviewed Edstrom's request for the subdivision of Lot 8, Ohio Meadows, F#1, into two lots, located at 564 Seneca Drive, northwest of the City of Gunnison, Upper Castle Mountain.

With a quorum present Chairman Ian Billick opened the joint public hearing.

Billick seated Commissioner Sam Lumb, for this review.

Assistant Director of Planning Neal Starkebaum confirmed the applicant had submitted the proof of posting and certified mailing receipts; the Planning Department had the joint public hearing notice published in the Crested Butte News and Gunnison Country Times.

Applicant Karen Edstrom explained her objectives, and summarized the history of the parcel, beginning at the subdivision of the original ranch. She had originally purchased the parcel with the impression it had been subdivided into Lots 8A and 8B. The Assessors office taxed the property in that way for many years, but has now let her know the lot was never formally subdivided, and it is still one parcel. She is now requesting the subdivision of the parcel.

BOCC member Hap Channell asked about the plat ditch easements; Commissioner Ramon Reed said the setbacks had been addressed on the newly submitted plat. Channell asked about traffic capacity of County Rd. 48; Starkebaum responded, noting that Public Works had noted no traffic issues in their comments. Channell asked about animal control, and the comments made by the County Sage-grouse coordinator. Billick suggested that some of the conditions in the decision document be inserted in the covenants, which would include the Sage-grouse coordinator's comments.

Owen asked if the new covenants applied to both lots; Edstrom explained the covenants apply only to the newly created Lot B. Owen was uncomfortable with the covenants, because the covenants did not specifically state there could be only one unit on both Lot A (the original lot), and Lot B (the newly created lot), this could lead to confusion in the future. Owen was uncomfortable that the only public notice that these lots can have only one unit is contained in the LUC. He noted that LUCs do not show up in normal title searches, but covenants do. By not having the covenants specifically state that there can be only one unit on each lot, the public is not likely to know this fact at an appropriate time, namely, when the lots are sold and re-sold. Given silence in title concerning the number of units allowed, the public is likely to rely on the LUR which states two units are allowed per legal lot in the county, and therefore the public is poorly served without appropriate notation in the covenants.

Wolfgang Spore secretary of Ohio Meadows subdivision was present to support Edstrom's subdivision request. He was concerned with Edstrom's covenants. Edstrom explained the covenants placed on Lot B would restrict the size of a home and the colors used. Spore said all properties in the subdivision adhere to a set of covenants, which have been extended into perpetuity.

Commissioner Sam Lumb pointed out the new covenants for this subdivision do not allow for a rental unit. Spore said the Ohio Meadows subdivision does not allow long term rentals.

The commission reviewed the recommendation document.

Billick closed the joint public hearing.

Owen said he did not want to vote no, but reiterated his concern with the covenants; they do not specifically state that there will be only one residential unit on each lot.

MOVED: by Karas seconded by Reed to approve LUC-2009-30 as amended. The motion passed with Karas, Billick, Reed, and Lumb voting yes and Owen voting no.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Karen Edstrom has requested a Land Use Change permit to subdivide Lot 8, Ohio Meadows, Filing 1; Lot 8 is approximately 7.454 acres. The applicant proposes to subdivide Lot 8 into two parcels, Lot 8a (5.75-acres), on which there is an existing residence, and 8b (2.7-acres). The Ohio Meadows Homeowners' Association has approved the subdivision request in a letter dated August 10, 2009. The applicant proposes an additional driveway that will serve Lot 8b. Both Lots 8a and 8b will be subject to the Protective Covenants of the Castle Mountain Co. Ohio Meadows Subdivisions. Individual wells and sewage disposal systems will serve each lot. A permitted well exists on each lot; the existing residence is served by an individual sewage disposal system; the new additional lot will be served by a new ISDS.

The subject parcel is located approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the City of Gunnison at 562 Seneca Drive. Surrounding land uses include residential lots within the Ohio Meadows Subdivision and Bureau of Land Management land which is approximately ¼ mile west of the subject parcel.

IMPACT CLASSIFICATION:

The project, by definition, is classified as a minor impact pursuant to Section 6-102: *Projects Classified as Minor Impact Projects.*

MEETING DATES:

The Planning Commission held work sessions and a public hearing to discuss the Edstrom application on the following dates:

- November 20, 2009 Work Session
- December 4, 2009 Site Visit
- December 18, 2009 Public Hearing
- December 18, 2009 Work Session

ONSITE VISIT:

The Planning Commission conducted an onsite visit on December 4, 2009. The Commissioners observed the location of the ditches and proposed building envelope. Commissioner Karas noted that the building envelope could be moved closer to the road to accommodate driveway and emergency access.

PUBLIC HEARING:

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on December 18, 2009. At that time, Wolfgang Spohr, representing the Ohio Meadows Homeowners Association, noted that the Association supported the request. He also noted that the Ohio Meadows covenants will apply to the proposed lots.

REVIEW AGENCY REFERRAL COMMENTS:

A copy of the complete application was sent by certified mail, receipt acknowledged, to the following review agencies: Colorado Division of Wildlife, Public Works, Division of Water Resources, Gunnison Fire Protection District, and City of Gunnison. Comments were received from the following agencies:

State of Colorado Division of Water Resources: Comments from Craig M. Lis, P.E. Water Resource Engineer in a letter dated November 3, 2009 noted that:

The domestic water supply is to be provided through two existing wells which were completed pursuant to Well Permit Nos. 53659 and 61466-F.... The well with Permit No. 53659 was issued as a domestic well on March 21, 1972. As such, the use of the well is limited to the use contemplated at that time. So long as providing well water to the house, garage and landscaped yard (the lesser of one-acre or the existing area) were contemplated at that time, the well is valid for such use, but no expansion of use may occur at this time. The well with Permit No. 61466-F was issued on June 8, 2005 for fire protection, ordinary household purposes inside one single-family dwelling, and the irrigation of 2,000 square feet of irrigated lawn, garden and landscaping.... Regarding physical adequacy of the wells the data in our files for the well with Permit No. 53659 is from a Well Construction and Pump Installation Report received May 10, 1972, and may not reflect the current production of the well. Likewise...the well with Permit No. 61446-F is insufficient...effectively negating meaningful review of the physical adequacy of this well as a water supply. Based on the above...the proposed water supply will not cause material injury to decreed water rights. However, due to a lack of information we are unable to comment on the physical adequacy of the water supply.

Gunnison County Wildlife Conservation Coordinator: Comments from James O. Cochran in a letter dated October 8, 2009 noted:

I ...find that the proposed subdivision will not impact Gunnison Sage-grouse or their habitats beyond that which has already occurred. Because there are Gunnison Sage-grouse in this immediate area, the following requirements will be applied as conditions of all Gunnison County permits issued for projects on this parcel, to protect Gunnison Sage-grouse:

- 1. That non-indigenous gallinaceous game-birds (including but not limited to pheasants, chukar, and quail), shall be imported only from a source certified by the State of Colorado to be disease free. Prior to importation of any species of gallinaceous game-birds to a parcel within this subdivision, the person proposing such action shall submit a list of species, with numbers proposed, and a disease certification, with a listing of diseases certified, from the source proposed. No importation (movement onto the property) of any wild birds, as defined above, shall occur without written approval by Gunnison County. This requirement is necessary because of significant use of the area by the Gunnison Sage-grouse and will help prevent the potential transmission of disease from outside avian sources to Sage-grouse.*
- 2. Per Section 11-106 G.3.d.1. of the Gunnison County Land Use Resolution, dogs and cats must be kept under appropriate control, by means which may include kenneling or other physically secure methods to ensure that negative effects to wildlife from pets do not occur. This includes construction workers' pets.*

Gunnison County Public Works: Comments from Allen Moores, Assistant Director of Public Works, dated November 10, 2009 did not indicate any significant issues with the subdivision and notes that an Access Permit will be required for Lot 8b at such time that the property is developed.

Gunnison County Environmental Health: Comments from Richard Stenson, Environmental Health Specialist, in a memorandum dated November 16, 2009 noted that "...it is feasible to provide a Gunnison County ISDS for the proposed new lot."

COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF THE GUNNISON COUNTY LAND USE RESOLUTION:

Section 9-101: Uses Secondary to a Primary Residence.

Applicable; all uses shall comply with this Section.

Section 9-200: Special Residential Uses.

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

Section 9-300: Commercial and Industrial Uses.

Not applicable; there are no commercial uses proposed as part of this application.

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

Not applicable; there is no exploration, extraction or processing of minerals and construction materials proposed at the subject parcel.

Section 9-500: *Miscellaneous Uses and Activities.*

Not applicable; there are no miscellaneous uses or activities proposed as part of this application.

Section 10-102: *Locational Standards for Residential Development.*

Not applicable; the applicants are not proposing more than two lots or residences.

Section 10-103: *Residential Density.*

Not applicable; the applicants are not proposing more than two lots or residences.

Section: 11-102: *Voluntary Best Management Practices.*

Voluntary; not mandated. The applicant is encouraged to utilize these practices during construction, as appropriate.

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

Not applicable. County maps indicate that the proposed site is not located within an area subject to flood hazards.

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

Not applicable. County maps indicate that the proposed site is not located within an area subject to geologic hazards.

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

Not applicable. The site is in an area of moderate wildfire hazards. No wildfire mitigation plan is required.

Section 11-106: *Protection of Wildlife Habitat Areas.*

Applicable; a copy of the application has been sent to the Colorado Division of Wildlife. No comments have been received regarding this application. The applicant requested a pre-application conference with the Gunnison County Wildlife Conservation Coordinator and his comments are noted above.

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

Not applicable; there are no water bodies on the subject parcel. There are irrigation ditches along the property lines for which a 25-foot maintenance setback is required to be identified on the subdivision plat. Agricultural irrigation ditches are not subject to the standards of this Section.

Section 11-108: *Development on Ridgelines.*

Not applicable. The site is not on a ridgeline.

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

Not applicable. No agricultural lands are located near this site.

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

Not applicable. The site is not beyond snowplowed access.

Section 11-111: *Development on Inholdings in the National Wilderness*

Not applicable. The site is not within the National Wilderness.

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

Not applicable. The site is not located above timberline.

Section 12-103: *Road System.*

Applicable; any new driveway proposed for Lot 8b is required to obtain an Access Permit as noted in the comments from Gunnison County Public Works.

Section 12-104: *Trails.*

Not applicable. There is no trail proposed or impacted as part of this application.

Section 12-105: *Water Supply.*

Applicable; the applicant has two individual wells installed on the subject parcel. Well Permit No. 61446-F, issued on June 28, 2005, is proposed to serve Lot 8b and is approved for ordinary household purposes inside one single-family dwelling, and the irrigation of 2,000 square feet of irrigated lawn, garden and landscaping, or 0.05 acres of irrigated landscaping for the residence. Well Permit No. 53659, issued on March 21, 1972, is currently used for the existing residence on the

proposed Lot 8a. According to the Division of Water Resources, the use of the well is limited to the use contemplated at the time it was installed in May, 1972.

Section 12-106: Sewage Disposal and Wastewater Treatment.

Applicable, an individual sewage disposal system (ISDS) is proposed for the site. The applicant has met with Richard Stenson, Gunnison County Environmental Health Specialist for an initial site inspection to determine feasibility of ISDS installation. Stenson noted in his comments above that the installation of an ISDS is feasible for Lot 8b.

Section 12-107: Fire Protection.

Applicable; the subject parcel is located within the Gunnison Fire Protection District. A copy of the application was sent to the District and no comments have been received. The applicant did contact the District regarding the application for the purpose of being informed of their standards.

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

Applicable; the site plan submitted September 25, 2009 complies with the required setback measurements from property lines; the subdivision plat must reflect this compliance this prior to review by the Gunnison Board of County Commissioners.

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

Applicable; the proposed building envelope and improvements are depicted on the subdivision plat, submitted December 17, 2009.

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

Applicable; compliance with this Section will be determined at the time of Building Permit application.

Section 13-106: Energy and Resource Conservation.

Applicable; compliance with this Section will be determined at the time of Building Permit application.

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

Applicable; compliance with this Section will be determined at the time of Building Permit application.

Section 13-108: Open Space And Recreation Areas

Not applicable. No open space is required for Minor Impact Project subdivisions.

Section 13-109: Signs.

There are no signs proposed as part of the application.

Section 13-110: Off-Road Parking And Loading.

Applicable; there is adequate off-road parking for the existing residence and the proposed Lot 8b.

Section 13-111: Landscaping And Buffering.

Not applicable. A landscaping plan is not required for a Minor Impact Project.

Section 13-112: Snow storage.

Applicable; the County Public Works Department has reviewed the application and noted that there is no requirement that snow storage areas be included as part of this application.

Section 13-113: Fencing

Not applicable; no fencing is proposed or required as part of this application.

Section 13-114: Exterior Lighting.

Applicable; compliance with this Section is determined at the time of Building Permit application.

Section 13-115: Reclamation And Noxious Weed Control.

Applicable, the construction of a new driveway and other improvements are required to obtain a Reclamation Permit as noted in the comments from Public Works.

Section 13-116: Grading And Erosion Control.

Applicable; a Reclamation Permit is required for road cutting and/or construction, homesite clearing and berm construction. The applicant shall obtain a Reclamation Permit and provide for weed control as part of the reclamation.

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

No drainage plan is required to be submitted as part of a Minor Impact Project subdivision. Access and Building Permits are required to comply with this Section.

Section 13-118: Water Impoundments

Not applicable; no water impoundments are proposed as part of this project.

Section 13-119: Standards to Ensure Compatible Uses.

Applicable. There were no comments received expressing concern about any potential conflicts between this proposed use and adjacent uses. The proposed use will not result in significant net adverse impact to adjacent lands and will be compatible with surrounding land uses.

Article 15: Right to Ranch Policy.

Not applicable; no agricultural operation is located adjacent to, or would be affected by the proposed use.

FINDINGS:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission finds that:

1. This project, by definition, is classified as a Minor Impact Project.
2. There are existing improvements on the subject parcel that include, but are not limited to, a single-family residence, outbuildings, an individual sewage disposal system and two individual wells.
3. The applicant has proposed only one single-family residence on each lot.
4. There is an existing well (Permit No. 53659) on Lot 8a.
5. A well permit has been issued for Lot 8b (Permit No. 661446-F); the well has been constructed on the subject parcel.
6. The subject parcel is in occupied Sage-grouse habitat. Based upon the comments from the Sage-grouse Coordinator the Commission finds that the proposed subdivision will not have negative impacts on Sage-grouse, provided that the conditions regarding importation of gallinaceous game-birds to the subject parcel, and confinement of domestic cats and dogs are followed.
7. A subdivision plat has been submitted, dated December 17, 2009.
8. This application is consistent with the standards and requirements of the Gunnison County Land Use *Resolution*.
9. 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.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission, having considered the submitted plan, site observations and public testimony, has reached the above Findings and recommends that Land Use Change Permit No. 2009-30 be classified as a Minor Impact, and be approved with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide a subdivision plat in compliance with Section 6-105: L. *Specification for Subdivision Plats* prior to scheduling of this Planning Commission recommendation for review by the Gunnison County Board of Commissioners. The subdivision plat shall be recorded with the Gunnison County Clerk and Recorder, at the cost of the applicant.
2. Any importation of non-indigenous gallinaceous game-birds (including but not limited to pheasants, chukar, and quail) to these lots, shall be only from a source certified by the State of Colorado to be disease free. Prior to importation of any such species, the person proposing such action shall submit a list of species, with numbers proposed, and a disease certification, with a listing of diseases certified, from the source proposed. No importation of any wild birds, as defined above, shall occur without written approval by Gunnison County.
3. Per Section 11-106 G.3.d.1. of the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*, dogs and cats must be kept under

appropriate control, by kenneling or other physically secure methods to ensure that negative effects to wildlife from pets do not occur. This includes construction workers' pets.

4. Only one residential unit is permitted on each lot.
5. This permit is limited to activities described within the "Project Description" of this application, and as depicted on the Plan submitted as part of this application. Expansion or change of this use will require either an application for amendment of this permit, or submittal of an application for a new permit, in compliance with applicable requirements of the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*.
6. This recommendation is founded on each individual requirement. Should the applicant successfully challenge any such finding or requirement, this approval is null and void.
7. This permit 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.
8. 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 permit.
9. 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.

Commissioner John Messner arrived at the meeting at 9:45 A.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION: The Planning Commission (Commission) conducted a work session to discuss:

- **Annual review of the *Land Use Resolution*, including identification of, and direction to staff to begin drafting needed amendments.** Reed suggested adding a LUR amendment addressing height restrictions; building height restrictions, cell towers height restrictions, etc.

Billick reiterated Messner's concerns with major and minor impact classifications; too strictly tied to the number of lots proposed. Billick suggested possibly giving concessions to developments closer to municipalities. Reed urged the commissioners to address this issue in their annual retreat with the BOCC. He added that the retreat should ultimately result in resolution / direction from the BOCC, concerning their priorities on directing growth. Messner urged the Commission and BOCC to have serious discussions with the municipalities. Billick suggested using meetings with the City of Gunnison and the Town of Crested Butte to begin a dialogue which expresses the need for IGAs. Owen added that the smaller municipalities should also be included; there is a need to be more inclusive.

Reed said the concept of negotiation is a high priority, because it is an ongoing issue; having a broad understanding is important. He went on to say that code revision may not be required, but discussion is needed. Karas suggested including the County Attorney in those discussions. Starkebaum added that they could also include the continued public hearing issues in those discussions.

Karas pointed out the need for discussions on carbon neutrality and ancillary alternative energy sources, such as wind, and solar, etc. He also suggested looking at regulations for asphalt batch plants and other similar operations, and ridgeline applications- pointing out the need for computer visualizations.

Reed said during a ridgeline review it would be beneficial to see a photo of the ridgeline with a residence overlay; to better visualize the impact. Billick agreed, noting that it would be helpful to see how a project actually turns out. This could be done with a site visit or photographs. He suggested asking follow-up questions; what helped- what didn't help? Did it change the ultimate outcome? Reed added that reviewing past approvals would be helpful.

The commission summarized their concerns;

- Addressing the issue of where development happens-pending discussions with the BOCC
- What determines a major impact application vs. a minor impact application

- Carbon neutrality – alternative energy sources
 - IGA discussions
 - Staff to explore the possibility of meeting with other municipalities
 - Sage-grouse
 - Height restrictions (not necessarily a priority)
 - Public hearing issues
 - Negotiating with applicants
 - Ridge line photos or site visits- review ultimate results of previous approvals
 - Asphalt batch plant regulations
 - Meet with County Attorney to discuss both public hearings and negotiation
- **Wrap-up assessment of past year’s tasks, accomplishments; forward to BOCC; how to work and interface with public; assessment of processes.** Billick said the Commission should look at the length of time/ number of sessions an application takes to get through the process. Reed added that it would be a benefit to know the typical time or range of time it takes before an application is considered complete and forwarded to the commissioners.

Billick suggested looking carefully at how well/ tactfully the commissioners work with the public. What can we do to make this a less threatening process? Reed suggested a training session conducted each year with the Director of Planning, on dealing with the public. The commissioners also suggested inviting past participants in the process back for their insight and comments.

- Billick complimented staff on the improvements made to the staff reports, etc. He added that there has been progress made in the recommendations and decisions written by staff. There is still a bit of confusion between the commission and staff, but it is improving.

Chairman Billick left the meeting at 11:00 A.M.

- **Possible consensus agreement (or formal action, depending upon the pleasure of the Commission), to forward the *Planning Commissioner’s Handbook* to the Board.** Karas complemented staff on the thoroughness of the handbook. Messner added that it was well done and will be a good resource for any new planning commissioner. Eastman agreed that it will be extremely helpful. Lumb thought it was very well done. Following a discussion, the commissioners agreed this should be a non-regulatory document. Reed had several additions that he wanted included. He asked for better follow-up with the school district to try to get them to comment; staff will put together a form, similar to the form used by Public Works. Reed pointed out that the State Water Engineer does not estimate amount of water needed. He urged staff to include a list of key issues discussed, in their recommendations and decisions. He found site visit records helpful, but they were not being included in the recommendations/ decisions consistently.

MOVED; by Reed seconded by Karas to endorse the *Planning Commissioner’s Handbook* and forward it to the BOCC. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioners John Messner, Selma Eastman and Sam Lumb left the meeting, for the day at 12:00 P.M.

IT DIRECTOR: The Planning Commission (Commission) conducted a work session with the County IT Director Mike Lee and County web-master Katherine Haase. They discussed the County’s technological capabilities, advancement of document management organization, etc.

Billick framed the conversation, by noting the challenge the commissioners face with the extreme amount of materials they receive, for their review. He suggested using computer document management as a tool for managing the documents, in a more central location. Billick noted a function allowing searching for documents using categories would be very beneficial. ITT Director Mike Lee informed the commissioners that the County Planning Department is currently in the process of looking for new document management software. Director of Planning Joanne Williams explained the Planning Department is in the process of replacing their permit tracking software. The current software does not provide an internet access, and the new software will.

The commissioners are interested in being able to use Google Maps, in the Planning Commission meeting room. Lee suggested using Map Maker and a lap top. Reed explained visualization is needed to help the commissioners understand the application’s impact in the specific neighborhood context. Reed said that overlays are beneficial, when trying to

understand the project; they can be viewed from different angles and from varied locations. Karas added that being able to view the different maps; fire hazard, flood plain, soil types etc, would be very useful.

The commissioners summarized their priorities;

- Document management available on the internet
- Visualization in the planning meeting room – Google Maps, Map Maker
- What can be reasonably done?

Staff will look into these issues and report back to the Planning Commission, the first meeting in February.

END OF THE DAY MEETING: The Planning Commission (Commission) conducted an end of the day meeting.

- The BOCC has defined their priorities.
- The BOCC signed the resolution denying the Upper Crystal Valley Special Area Regulations.
- The BOCC has begun advertising for individuals for the County energy research committee.
- The BOCC will be forwarding a letter to the Forest Service regarding the CBMR request to participate in the NEPA process.

Reed suggested that the recommendations and decisions should include any changes/ amendments that were made to the application.

Billick noted that the Planning Commission usually asks the applicant how many residences there will be on each parcel; rather the application should identify specifically how many residences the applicant is requesting. He suggested recapping the ultimate project description in the recommendation or decision.

Owen reiterated his concern that the public is not well served by not identifying the specifics in the covenants.

The regular meeting of the Gunnison County Planning Commission was adjourned at 2:30 P.M.

/S/ Beth Baker
Administrative Assistant
Gunnison County Planning