

MEMBERS	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
DIANE LOTHAMER, CHAIR	X		
HARVEY HARRIMAN – VICE CHAIR			X
JIM SEITZ	X		
BOB BEDA	X		
JOHN TALIAFERRO	X		
DELANEY KEATING	X		
COUNCILMEMBER ELLEN HARRIMAN	X		

OTHERS PRESENT: DIRECTOR STEVE WESTBAY, PLANNER ANDIE RUGGERA, CITY MANAGER KEN COLEMAN, CITY CLERK GAIL DAVIDSON, DICK BRATTON, VICKI ROACH ARCHULETA, AND RICHARD KARAS

CALL TO ORDER AT 7:00PM BY CHAIR DIANE LOTHAMER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSED GUNNISON RISING ANNEXATION

Director Steve Westbay presented a hypothetical three dimensional model of the proposed annexation. The model was based off of the applicant's submittal for phase two. Steve explained that the model shows the mass, scale, and extent of the proposed annexation.

Chair Diane Lothamer stated the next three Commission meetings would be dedicated for discussion of the proposed annexation and the drafting of a recommendation to the City Council. Diane stated the Commission would be looking at the City's *Master Plan* as a starting point for reviewing the proposed annexation.

Richard Karas stated he believes the *Master Plan* should have been looked at when the annexation review criterion was developed. Richard also stated he thinks reviewing the Master Plan now is redundant and that it is not right to judge the proposed annexation based on the City's *Master Plan*.

Chair Diane Lothamer informed viewers that the first criteria of the Annexation Policy is to make sure the proposed annexation complies with policies of the City's *Master Plan*.

The Commission discussed the following issues and concerns:

Community Character

1. Design standards should be integrated into land uses as part of the annexation
2. Travel connections – current plan channels all traffic onto Highway 50
3. Trails integration with the *Trails Master Plan*

4. No pedestrian and bicycle access is provided between the development and the downtown area
5. Where is the entrance of the community?
6. How does development on the hillside affect the visual character?
7. Ensure buffer landscape elements

Education

1. What is essentially needed from WSC – what is crucial?
2. Would not recommend annexation without WSC direction
3. What is the impact to RE1J – facilities, employee housing, and service personnel

Environment

1. Water sufficiency: quantity, quality, and ownership
2. Ditch water supply for homes on hillside
3. Impacts to sage grouse from development and trail connection
4. Wildlife and fishing
5. Dark skies and full cut-off fixtures
6. Viewshed and looking up on hillside
7. Energy-efficiency and LEED standards
8. Electrical and natural gas (ATMOS) capacities
9. Climate protection agreement
10. Possible noise pollution in the industrial zone

Land Use

1. How much commercial is really needed? (Would be an addition of 4 acres of building footprint)
2. Is the proposed commercial use in the appropriate area?
3. What limits should there be?
4. Community character and energy efficiency
5. Master Plan states that sprawl will be avoided
6. Development resource zones – trigger points ...too vague
7. Density controls to preserve community character
8. Discourage sprawling commercial corridors
9. Need for more industrial – do we want industrial uses along Tomichi Creek?

Housing

1. Service jobs created by this development are not addressed (plus seasonal jobs at the RV Park)
2. Needs assessment (applicants should provide solution)
3. Impact fee for residences not commercial
4. Affordable housing

Economics

1. Does industrial along highway make sense?
2. Protection and growth of the college
3. Business incubator facility
4. Tourism

Transportation

1. Extensions of Virginia and Georgia (proposed plan shows a dead end and the start of the commercial area)
2. Bypass connection
3. Mass transit – bus stops and park and rides
4. Multimodal transportation – sidewalk connectivity and bicycle lanes
5. CDOT – access points, speed limits, left turns, deceleration and acceleration lanes, increased traffic/congestion
6. Street standards – hillside portion
7. Traffic around the college and parks
8. All uses – complete street approach (ditches, etc)

Utilities

1. Sewage south of the highway
2. Water quality
3. Road standards and drainage
4. No financial risk of using a Metropolitan District
5. Ditch systems
6. Underground utilities
7. Pay fair share

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Bob Beda moved to excuse Commissioner Harvey Harriman.

Commissioner Jim Seitz seconded the motion.

Roll Call Yes: Diane, Delaney, John, Ellen, Jim, and Bob

Roll Call No: none

Motion Carried

PLANNING STAFF UPDATE

Director Steve Westbay asked each Commission member to provide statements for or against the proposed annexation based on land uses (north and south), transportation impacts, urban and architectural design, and environmental consequences for the next meeting on January 16th.

ADJOURN

Chair Diane Lothamer closed the meeting at approximately 9:30p.m.

Diane Lothamer, Chair

Attest:

Andie Ruggera, Secretary