

GRAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WebEx MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 23rd, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Marcus Davis Will MacDonald
 Ingrid Karlstrom Kim Shepton
 Tara Fournet Bob Gnuse
 Henry Broadhurst Deborah Fitch

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Davis Alex Taft
 Taylor Schlueter Jacob Cote
 Maxine LaBarre-Krostue Patty Kemper

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Marcus Davis at 6:30 PM. Roll call was taken.

Marcus Davis had a few reminders before we start the meeting. Please mute yourself if you are not talking. Be patient this evening as we work through the meeting. This meeting is being reordered.

There are no minutes to review at this meeting.

Marcus Davis stated to the Public, if you have a comment to share, there is a Chat Room, please send me a note stating that you would like to comment. There will be an opportunity for the audience to comment.

There were 42 members of the Public in attendance by WebEx for the September 23rd Special Meeting.

Hickam Subdivision Exemption – Sketch Plan

Presented by: Alexander Taft, LEED Green Associate

CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission September 23, 2020 (Special Meeting) ; Board of County Commissioners
T.B.D. October 2020

PROJECT NAME : Hickam Subdivision Exemption- Sketch Plan

APPLICANT : David M. and Sara K. Hickam

LOCATION : Northwest ¼ of the Northeast ¼ of the Northeast ¼ , part of Section 27, Township 1 South, Range 75 West of the 6th P.M. Grand County, Colorado totaling 10acres 204 GCR 448.

APPLICABLE

REGULATIONS : Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Exemption Regulations, Master Plan

ZONING : R- Residential District

ATTACHMENTS :

- a) Application and Narrative Letter
- b) Sketch Plan (Plat)
- c) Title Commitment
- d) State Water Well Permits 48312-A and

STAFF PLANNER : Alexander Taft, LEED Green Associate

REQUEST : The Applicant is proposing a Subdivision Exemption to subdivide a 10.425 acre parcel into 2 parcels.

I. BACKGROUND

a. **PROPOSAL**

David and Sara Hickam, the Applicant, are proposing a subdivision of an approximately 10 acre Metes and Bounds parcel by process of Subdivision Exemption to create two (2) separate lots. The two lot proposal would consist of Lot 1 being 2.613 acres and Lot 2 being 7.812 acres. The subject parcel is located inside Urban Growth Area No. 2 as defined by the Grand County Master Plan. Proposed water will be well and sanitation from Three Lakes Water and Sanitation.

The Grand County Subdivision Exemption Regulations outline the process of how to divide land on a small scale under circumstances in which the need to comply with Grand County Subdivision Regulations would cause undue hardships and the impact of the proposed division would not require it for the Subdivision Regulations. Subdivision exemptions apply to the division of land into a maximum of three (3) single family residence lots with one (1) single-family residential unit per lot. This has historically been interpreted to also restrict uses to single family residential.

b. **HISTORY**

This approximately ten acre parcel is a remnant parcel divided from one of several federally granted homesteads which are throughout the region.

The Applicant approached Staff in October 2019 about the possibility of subdividing the property. Following this discussion, staff reached out to the State of Colorado Division of

Water Resources (DWR). After a pre-application meeting. Staff sent a referral to DWR which was returned to our office at the end of October 2019 and suggested there were two available wells on the existing parcel and if the County approved a Subdivision Exemption well permits would be granted or clarified on each parcel.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

This proposed division of land, as provided for under the Subdivision Exemption Regulations, meets the requirements of controlling density as outlined in the Grand County Master Plan. The neighboring parcels are primarily residential use. The parcels to the north, south, and east are larger residential use buffering from Soda Springs. West of the property is Lake Ridge Mountain Valley Subdivision, which is approximately 25 half acre lots.

This Subdivision Exemption request is intended to maintain the current character of the area. It uses the 10 acre parcel to the highest possible density and benefit. The parcel is surrounded on three sides by similar parcels some of which have also been approved for division under the Subdivision Exemption Regulations.

There is currently a constructed well through State Well Permit Number 48312-A for the existing residence. The well permit will be surrendered for three “exempt” or household use only well permits. Proof of this well permit is the most significant factor in being able to complete the proposed Subdivision Exemption.

III. COMPLIANCE/NONCOMPLIANCE WITH GRAND COUNTY REGULATIONS

a. Grand County Master Plan

The Grand County Master Plan contains seven (7) Plan Elements that form the core of the Master Plan. The Plan Elements include policies and implementation actions, of which two (2) is relevant to this proposal.

Plan Element 2 - Land Use - Growth and Development

As stated in Plan Element 2 in the Grand County Master Plan, density is encouraged within the urban growth areas where existing infrastructure and public services exist. This subdivision exemption is located inside Urban Growth Area #2 and is bordered by 5-10 acres residential lots to the north, east and south and half acre residential lots to the west.

Plan Element 3 - Development: The Built Environment

Plan Element 3 in the Grand County Master Plan, speaks to maintaining a high quality of life while taking advantage of existing infrastructure. This subdivision borders existing county roads and is adjacent to existing electric utility infrastructure. The development minimizes additional impacts on open lands adjacent to wildlife corridors.

b. ZONING - Section 4.1 Residential District

The zoning for this parcel is Residential District. This application complies with the regulations in the following ways:

- Single family dwellings have or will be constructed on the parcels. This use is in compliance with the regulations.

- These parcels are inside the Urban Growth Area No. 2 as defined by the Grand County Master Plan, and are required to have a minimum lot area of 15,000 ft² per Residential District served by public sanitation (sewer). The proposed parcels are 2.613 acres and 7.812 acres and therefore comply.
- These parcels shall comply with the minimum standard yard setbacks of the Residential District.
- New single family dwellings are required to comply with the parking requirements detailed in Section 14.4 of the Zoning Regulations.

c. SUBDIVISION EXEMPTION - Article 2 - Design Standards

The application shall be compliant with the Grand County Subdivision Exemption Regulations. The following is how each item was addressed under the submittal of Sketch Plan: [Sketch Plan (2)]

2.1 SPECIAL SITE CONSIDERATIONS

This property is surrounded by residential uses on large and small lots, there are no significant hazards on the property or surrounding which appear and may endanger life or property restricting platting for residential occupancy [2.1 (1)].

The property is located in an upland area with no apparent flood or drainage hazards. This has been further justified with the NCRS soil survey which suggest the soil composition to be glacial alluvium, a typical soil type for developed areas in Grand County [2.1 (2)].

The property does not border any highway or railroad rights-of-way necessitating a buffer strip [2.1 (3)].

As stated above, Ranch Creek is adjacent to the subject property and the natural drainage should be preserved for this purpose in conjunction with [2.1 (4)].

There is an existing home on the 10 acre property. No hazards have been identified for this property in the survey or application [2.1 (5)].

The applicant shall be aware: “Once submittal of a sketch plan has been made to the Grand County Planning Department for review of a Subdivision Exemption, no disturbance of the site, nor installation of any improvements associated with the proposed subdivision is allowed until after approval of the final plat by the Board of County Commissioners, or prior approval of any site disturbance or installation of required improvements has been authorized by the Board of County Commissioners. The developer will be allowed to do any soils and geologic testing, soils borings, surveying, etc. that are needed to provide the technical reports required for review of the Subdivision Exemption.” [2.1 (6)].

2.2 DRIVEWAYS, ROADS, STREETS AND EASEMENTS (2.2) (1-14)

There are existing roads which serve the property and have been improved to a local, low volume road standard to the south and north. There is no need for additional interior roads, therefore, paragraphs 1, 3-7, 9 & 10 do not apply.

There is an existing driveway from County Road 448 which will be used to access Proposed Lot 1 and an existing private road easement is intended to serve Lot 2. Confirmations of access shall be included with the Final Plat [2.2 (2)].

Right of way with 60' width has been provided to the road in the northeast corner of the subject property [2.2 (8)].

Utility Easements shall be provided for all lots of not less than twenty (20) feet in width and shall be provided along rear or side lot lines for utilities. Such easements may be provided by ten (10) foot easements on each of adjoining lots. **Utility easements shall be reviewed by MPEI, Xcel, CenturyLink, and Comcast . All utilities shall be placed underground where not already existing [2.2 (12)].**

The new lots shall be assigned County Road numbers and addresses consistent with the area. **The Applicant shall work with Staff and the local Fire District to establish addresses to best serve first responders and emergency services [2.2 (12)].**

The Grand County Road and Bridge Standards and the Grand County Storm Drainage Design and Criteria Manual have been integrated into the Subdivision Exemption Regulations wherever applicable and at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners. Standards may be reduced according to density impacts [2.2 (14)]. It is Staff's opinion that the Grand County Storm Drainage Design and Criteria Manual cannot be integrated with these Subdivision Exemption Regulations since it is not included under the jurisdiction in the Section 1.2. Staff would believe that the authority and purpose of the Grand County Road and Bridge Standards sufficiently protect the public safety and welfare as a portion of the Subdivision Regulations.

2.3 LOTS

The proposed lots are 2.613 and 7.812 acres which is greater than the required 2.4 acres, therefore complying with these regulations and the zoning district [2.3 (1)].

These lots do not have access to a street right of way directly adjacent to the lot. As suggested above, the easement for access shall be confirmed with the Final Plat [2.3 (2)]. **The front of the lot shall be that side adjacent to drive way or road access noted on the Final Plat.**

No lots in this proposed Subdivision Exemption have double frontage [2.3 (3)]. Being not directly adjacent to a County Right of Way, the proposed lots will not be required to be at right angles from the existing ROW for County Road 448 [2.3 (4)].

Pursuant to these Regulations, a 14"x 18" Mylar is to be produced as per the required Final Plat recording package. Staff has historically recommended that Applicants of new development provide addresses on the Final Plat Mylar to reduce the unnecessary extra

hard copies which are maintained by Grand County GIS. Staff will need to propose an amendment to these regulations to ultimately change this practice. The Board of County Commissioners shall ultimately waive this requirement if they agree it is unnecessary.

Addresses for lots shall be determined before approval of the final plat [2.3 (5)].

There are no corner lots being created by the proposed plat [2.3 (6)].

2.4 DEDICATIONS

The language included below is directly quoted from the Subdivision Exemption regulations and is to serve as a reminder to the Applicant that no new county roads are being accepted for maintenance.

Any dedication of rights-of-way for streets giving access to adjacent lands and adjoining dedicated streets, and drainage and utility easements, may be required [2.4 (1)].

Approval of a division of land under these Regulations shall not constitute acceptance by the County of the roads, streets, or other public lands as indicated for dedication on the plat. The dedication of any of these lands for public use of any nature within the county shall be accepted by the County only by specific action of the Board of County Commissioners. [2.4 (2)].

2.5 DESIGN STANDARDS FOR DRAINAGE, SEWER AND WATER

Staff has done some initial research to determine that the area surrounding Ranch Creek is not applicable to a Nationwide (404) Wetland Permit. Staff reviewed a National Wetlands Inventory Map provided by US Fish and Wildlife and USDA National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) [2.5(1)].

Sanitary Sewer will be supplied by Three Lakes Water and Sanitation as a main extends this far north and west. The OWTS shall be located outside of any drainage to minimize impacts to surface water in Ranch Creek, a note shall be added to the plat in this regard [2.5 (2)].

Water Supply is provided by two permitted wells for which uses are described by Well Permit No. 48312-A and 89486. These well permits are proof of adequate water supply for the **proposed development pursuant to §29-20-103 (§29-20-304) Colorado Revised Statutes** [2.5 (3a)].

Quoting from the Regulations: “Water supply systems, whether on-lot or otherwise, located in floodplain areas, shall be designed and located so as to minimize or eliminate infiltration and avoid their impairment during or subsequent to flooding [2.5 (3b)].

2.6 DESIGN STANDARDS FOR NATURAL HAZARD AREAS

In areas determined to have significant flood, fire, geological, or other natural hazards the Board of County Commissioners may, in the interest of public safety, require applicants to submit for review plans to eliminate or reduce hazards to a reasonable level. Such plans may include, but are not limited to engineering designs, fuel modification, emergency water systems, etc.

While Staff has not discovered any natural hazards which would cause concern to public safety or welfare, plat notes shall be added to ensure areas around homes are protected from fire by creating a defensible space.

2.7 IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED

In each proposed land division, the applicant and the Board of County Commissioners shall agree on the type, location and extent of necessary public improvements depending on the characteristics of the proposed development and its relationship to the surrounding area. **The applicant shall be made aware: Improvements shall be made by the applicant at his expense according to standard specifications prepared by a qualified professional engineer and approved by the Board of County Commissioners.**

Permanent survey monuments shall be set as required by Colorado Revised Statutes [2.7 (1)].

There is an assumed access from County Road 448 to serve Lot 1 through an adjacent property shown on the proposed plat, also an existing private road to serve Lot 2 to the north. **Any existing access easements shall be amended and recorded with the Final Plat to grant access to both proposed lots [2.7 (2)].**

Electric utilities shall be placed under ground typical of all new subdivisions created in Grand County . A plat note shall be added to the Final Plat to this effect [2.7(3)].

Staff notes that “The Applicant(s)/Developer(s) will be responsible for paying all engineering fees associated with any new subdivision exemption. In addition to the initial costs associated with the development, the applicant/developer will be responsible for ongoing engineering fees throughout the project (i.e., traffic study reviews, subdivision improvement inspections, etc.)” [2.7 (4)].

Staff recommends that Electric Utilities be supplied to all lots to prevent extensions of service over head and to avoid multiple road cuts. Staff understands that there are no “appropriate county officials having jurisdiction over such improvements” for electric service.

2.8 SLASH REMOVAL/DISPOSAL

Slash removal and disposal is not anticipated on the subject property but if any is to occur, it shall be done compliant with this provision and requirements of the Department of Natural Resources [2.8 1-2].

2.9 SOLID FUEL BURNING DEVICES

This has been repealed via Resolution 2016-7-34.

2.10 SCHOOL LANDS

This application is subject to school impact assessment, fees and land dedication have been calculated below.

Land areas dedicated for future school sites follows the following calculation

2 units

$3 \times .045 = .135$ acres

Money in Lieu of Land Calculates to:

$2 \times .50 = 1.0$

$1.0 \times .090 = .090$

$.090 \times \$25,516.00/\text{acre} = \$2,296$ in school impact fees.

Two comps were used in the calculation above being the subject property and a vacant parcel to the north.

A letter shall be sent to the East Grand School District for a decision on their preference in receiving lands or fees in lieu.

2.11 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

[2.11 (1-2)] Areas of disturbance are anticipated to be less than 1 acre and therefore not triggering a Storm Water Permit through CDPHE. The only anticipated construction will be connected to the new dwelling proposed on Lot 1.

2.12 DESIGN STANDARDS FOR MINERAL RESOURCE AREAS

This Application shall comply [2.12].

Mineral extraction and exploration are prohibited in order to protect public health and safety as the same also contradicts the purpose of the Subdivision Exemption process. The Applicant has represented that the mineral rights are not severed from the surface rights of this property.

2.13 DITCH CROSSINGS

The Title Commitment does note ditches, any which cross the property shall be identified on the Final Plat [2.13 (1- 10)].

2.14 POST CONSTRUCTION

[2.14 (1-9)] Post construction procedures are not applicable since no new county roads are being provided.

d. SUBDIVISION EXEMPTION - Article 3 - Sketch Plan

The application shall be compliant with the Grand County Subdivision Exemption Regulations, the following is how each item was addressed under the submittal of Sketch Plan:

[Sketch Plan (3.2) (1) (a-c)] The proposed land division shows the creation of two (2) new parcels within the 10.415 acres owned by the Applicant (a&b). A vicinity map was also included to show the parcel in relation to a two mile area. (c)

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (a)] This application complies. The applicant has supplied the proposed the name of the exempted tract which is: Hickam Subdivision Exemption.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (b)] The title on the Sketch Plan contains a legal description of the entire property to be divided along with the conveyance to the Applicant. The title on the Final Plat shall be reviewed by the County Attorney

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (c)]

The proposed Plat includes the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the applicant(s). **The Final Plat shall also include, land surveyor, engineer, and/or designer of the proposed division, if any (who shall be licensed by the Colorado State Board of Examiners for Engineers and Land surveyors).**

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (d)]

Date of preparation, scale at 1"=60' is on the proposed and North sign (designated as true North) are included on the Sketch Plan and shall remain on the Final Plat.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (e)]

Location and approximate dimensions for all proposed street Rights-of-Way, easements and lot lines have been shown. A thorough analysis of all existing and proposed easements and Rights-of-Way shall be completed with the Final Plat submittal.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (f)]

Location and principal dimensions for all existing streets (including their names), alleys, easements, water courses, and other important features within and adjacent to the tract to be divided. The Final Plat shall include the width of adjacent private and County Right-of-Way.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (g)]

All surrounding property owners and boundaries have been included on the proposed Sketch Plan/Plat and shall remain.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (h)]

This condition has been substantially met all lots show acreage to the 1/1000th.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (i)]

The Final Plat shall include any natural drainage that exists on the property and the seasonal drainage and wetlands for Ranch Creek shall be accurately dimensioned.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (j)]

In a good faith effort, the Applicant has not found mineral estate owners pursuant to C.R.S. 24-65-101 et seq. It would appear that the mineral rights were not severed from the property.

[Sketch Plan 3.2 (2) (k)]

The title insurance commitment has been provided as a portion of this application and is dated August 13, 2020.

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission hearing scheduled for September 23, 2020.

V. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the approval of the Hickam Subdivision Exemption Sketch Plan with the following conditions to be met prior to submitting an application for Final Plat approval:

1. There is an existing driveway from County Road 448 will be used to access Proposed Lot 1 and an existing private road easement which is intended to serve Lot 2. Confirmations of access shall be included with the Final Plat [§2.2 (2)].
2. The proposed Plat will be referred for comment by utility companies including: MPEI, Xcel, CenturyLink, and Comcast [§2.2 (12)].
3. Addresses for lots shall be determined before approval of the Final Plat [§2.3 (5)].
4. All residences shall be served by OWTS, and designs shall comply with current County regulations. A plat note shall be added to the Final Plat to this effect [§2.5 1-3].
5. Electric utilities shall be placed underground typical of all new subdivisions created in Grand County. A plat note shall be added to the Final Plat to this effect [§2.7(3)].
6. The Applicant shall be responsible to pay any impact fees associated with this application including but not limited to: School Impact and Fire Impact Fees [§2.10 1-6], prior to the recording of the Final Plat.
7. The Final Plat shall also include, land surveyor, engineer, and/or designer of the proposed division, if any (who shall be licensed by the Colorado State Board of Examiners for Engineers and Land surveyors) [§3.2 (2) (c)].
8. The Applicant shall enter into a Water Quality Agreement with the County [§3.3 (3) (g)].
9. The title and legal description shall be reviewed by the County Attorney.
10. Statement of taxes due showing current taxes paid. This shall be provided prior to recording of the Final Plat.
11. The applicant shall meet all Final Plat requirements.

All legal documents required in conjunction with the final approval of this request are subject to the review.

Commissioner Davis asked Mr. David Hickam, the applicant if he has had a chance to review the Certificate and does he have any questions/concerns?

Mr. David Hickam, property owner has had a chance to review, no comments or questions right now. I am available for questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Davis asked if there was any one from the Public for the Hickam Subdivision Exemption Sketch Plan agenda item. Hearing no public reply we moved onto the Commissioners for comments.

Commissioner Fitch stated no comment.

Commissioner Broadhurst stated no comment.

Commissioner Shepton asked, in review of the paperwork there was talk concerning wells and how this still needed to be taken care of as a household use well only. Yet the presentation that Alex gave stated this property was being served by water and sewer. Can this be addressed?

Alex replied, this property is being served by public sewer instead of a septic system and there are 2 existing well permits available on the lot.

Commissioner Shepton replied, so the 2 well permits has been solidified?

Alex stated correct, we have a confirmation letter from the Division of Water Resources.

Commissioner Shepton added, the property is divided by a road, the 1 section is very small, and I want to make sure this is designated on the plat.

Commissioner Davis added, is there an easement going through or is it a dedicated driveway?

Alex replied that it is a private access easement at the moment.

Commissioner Davis asked if anything needed to be done with this easement.

Alex replied, that we should review with the Assessors Office.

Commissioner Davis stated, typically if it is an easement or a driveway we don't really get too concerned about that because it is not a public thorough fare and there are different rules especially on an easement on what you can build up to.

Alex replied, to the best of his knowledge that smaller piece of the property is too small to be buildable.

Commissioner Davis stated it does not need to be addressed separately because it is just a driveway or an easement.

Commissioner Karlstrom asked per the Certificate, it says the well can be exchanged for 3 wells. The applicant is only asking for 2 wells, which they already have. Is this correct?

Alex stated it was a typo.

Commissioner Karlstrom continued, the domestic use only well is this going to be running with the home that is already constructed on the smaller lot? Then the other well will go with the new lot, the larger lot?

Alex replied, both well permits will have to be amended with the new legal description, so they will be clarified at that point. Whatever is currently attached to the home will remain.

Mr. Hickam added right now the well that is in use for the existing home is the domestic well. What has been worked out with the state is, we will construct a new well for the 7.8 acre parcel (vacant land). The domestic status will be moved to that well. The existing well that is here will be the household use only well. We have everything back from the state, we have our permits to go ahead and proceed.

Commissioner Karlstrom added, Alex when you mentioned Growth Area, would you not only mention the number but also the area.

Alex replied, understood.

Commissioner MacDonald stated no comment.

Commissioner Gnuse asked for clarification will the 7.8 acre lot be served by the same easement that is crossing the corner of the lot with the existing home on it. Will there be a driveway from that easement that serves both lots or is there a different way you are going to get into the larger lot?

Mr. Hickam replied the plan is Lot 2, which contains the existing home that will be its own lot with no additional access to Lot 1. The point of access for Lot 1 will be the road to the north, entering the property at the northeast corner.

Commissioner Fournet asked, the existing easement for the existing house and the road that goes to the top of the Lot 1 is that a county road?

Commissioner Davis added, the existing one for Lot 2 is that a dedicated driveway or an easement?

Alex replied on the plat it is noted as an apparent easement and Mr. Hickam has represented that he has documentation that there is a recorded easement for that access.

Commissioner Davis asked, because it cuts across unit 4 to the west?

Alex replied, correct.

Commissioner Davis continued, then Lot 1 to the northeast?

Alex replied there is a private access/easement that goes through Dethmers Subdivision Exemption and they have granted access for several of the additional properties adjacent, which will be shown on the final plat.

Commissioner Fournet continued, has this property been granted access to use that easement?

Mr. Hickam responded yes, when we bought this property, we have paperwork going back to the 1960's with all the easements and access recorded. We have utility and access easements for the existing home and shop and also on the road to the north.

Commissioner Davis according to the Division of Water Resources, it is indicating that Well Number 1, 48312-A and that was a replacement of an original 1972 and is limited to historical uses specially ordinary household uses inside one single family. The second well is currently Well Number 89486 which was issued in 1997, for household use only, one single family and is not to be used for irrigation. It sounds to me like there is not a (inaudible) anywhere here for those 2 households. I understand the third paragraph is getting into exemption, but it sounds like everything is good to go. Where was the domestic well coming in? Looks like both wells are slated as household use only. Is that where we are at?

Alex replied, so Well 48312-A is noted as a domestic well and the reason it is a domestic well is that it was for additional outdoor watering.

Commissioner Davis stated OK, so what they are saying is because they are going to limit it to (inaudible) uses of the original well, specially fire protection and irrigation. So you have the rights of a domestic well but was limited to one household to begin with. So are they going to keep the additional uses available or restricted to purely household use only?

Alex replied, we are unclear. The state does not give you straight language on it until you make application for the well which will occur after the plat gets recorded.

Commissioner Davis stated, great if you can get the well permit to provide you with as much water as possible. The second piece would be, specifically on the northeast driveway can we get a condition to review the ADT's with Road and Bridge and see if that needs to be formally upgraded to a driveway surface because it is also serving properties beyond the proposed Lot 1. I think we are probably fine leaving it as just an easement and people can use it as private or whatever they want to do. If you have not talked to Road and Bridge, is that something you feel you need to do or is it fine as it is with the current usages that is has?

Alex replied we are going out there to take a look at it but with the Dethmers Subdivision Exemption, they had to improve to County Road 4, so we know that portion is up to date to local road standards.

Commissioner Davis stated there does need to be a chat with Road and Bridge to see if that standard needs to be extended for Lot 1 and the adjacent property.

Alex replied it is fine if they are both were improved to somewhat beyond the driveway standard.

Commissioner Davis asked, there is no other irrigation, utilities or any other easements, so we are in sketch plan stage so when you send out to reviewer agencies, would they be extending the utilities on the west into Lot 1 or extending utilities from a different area?

Alex replied, the Dethmers Subdivision which is to the north, they extended a lot of the same utilities so they will be accessible within a few feet of the property boundary.

Motion to recommend approval by Ingrid Karlstrom for Hickam Subdivision Exemption – Sketch Plan with staff conditions. Seconded by Kim Shepton. Not further discussion. All in favor "aye", none opposed. Motion carries.

Rural Growth Area No. 3, Master Plan Amendment

Presented by: Robert Davis, Director Community Development

CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission: September 23, 2020; Board of County Commissioners

PROJECT NAME : Rural Growth Area Amendment

APPLICANT : Gold Medal Ranch, LLC represented by Jeff Vogel, AICP

LOCATION : South of County Road 73

APPLICABLE

REGULATIONS : Grand County Master Plan, Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations

ZONING : Split Zoned F/R - Forestry and Open District; Residential District

- ATTACHMENTS :** Ranch Headquarters and Byers Peak Ranch Estates Project Overview
- STAFF PLANNER :** Alexander Taft, LEED Green Associate, Jacob Cote, Planner I and Robert C. Davis, AICP, SMP, Director
- REQUEST :** The applicant request Rural Growth Area No. 3 be amended to include a 138 acre parcel to accommodate 10 homes on approximately 5 acre lots.
-

II. BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

a. Proposal

The request to amend Rural Growth Area #3 was precipitated by a site-specific proposal from Gold Medal Ranch to develop a 10 lot subdivision on 138 acres. Because the subject site is located outside of any growth area, the only way to develop the subdivision other than through the Subdivision Exemption process is through the Rural Land Use process. The Rural Land Use development process requires a minimum of seventy (70) acres, partitioning two lots per thirty-five (35) acres. Using this process, however, would require modification of the proposal by either enlarging the size of the site, reducing the size of the site or reducing the number of lots. As such, the applicant requests that the growth boundary be amended to include a 138 acre parcel to accommodate 10 homes on approximately 5 acre lots.

b. History

At the July 8, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, Staff presented a request for a Rural Growth Area Amendment for the subject Gold Medal Ranch HQ Sketch Plan. It was discussed that amendments to growth areas should only occur twice a year during the months of March and September. It was then decided to table the item to bring it back to the Planning Commission at its September Planning Commission meeting. Because of the need to meet with interested parties and to gather information, the Planning Commission agreed to have a second meeting in September to continue hearing the case.

c. Urban and Rural Growth Boundaries

The intent of growth area boundaries were to establish growth centers, directing development where it would be best accommodated and provided with the necessary public facilities and/or services in an environmentally sensitive and fiscally responsible manner. Across the nation towns and counties attempt to limit the quantity of land available for developmental uses by delineating urban and rural growth boundaries. Comprehensive plans call for the majority of new dwellings and commercial/industrial development to occur in urban growth areas. This is done in order to deter development of agricultural or rural landscapes and discourage 'leap-frog' development patterns. Much of the rural growth area focus has been on long term sustainability of agriculture. The focus here in Grand County includes a concern for the preservation of agriculture and also habitat, environment and protection of scenic views.

d. Grand County Master Plan and Growth Area Amendment History

Grand County adopted its first Comprehensive (Master) Plan in January 1970. A complete overhaul of the Master Plan, in an entirely new document, Grand County's 1998 Master Plan was adopted establishing policy for land use and planning. The most current version, noted as a rewrite of the 1998 plan was completed and adopted in 2011.

The 1998 Plan was the original plan which identified four growth areas being: Urban Growth Area No. 1 (Tabernash area), Urban Growth Area No. 2 (Winter Park Ranch), Rural Growth area No.2 (Pole Creek/ Crooked Creek extending from CR 73 north to CR 5221(Prairie Sage Rd)). The Master Plan deemed these areas as growth areas where subdivisions may occur and where growth seems most suitable.

Previously proposed and approved Growth Area amendments have historically been specifically tied to subdivision proposals. Between 1998 and March 2007 there were approximately 13 proposals for growth area amendments. These were spread throughout the County, including areas near Grand Lake, Granby, and Fraser. For example,

- Lodges at Hudler Ranch reviewed and approved amendment to allow subdivision outside Grand Lake UGA September 2003,
- Andre DeBakker, requested an amendment in September 2006 to subdivide a parcel consisting of approximately 39 acres into 6-9 lots. The property is just north of County Road 8, south of said County Road is the "Winter Park Ranch Growth Area" currently Urban Growth Area No. 1. This request was approved.
- Lake Granby Tract B, request in October 2006 to amend because of density of pre-existing development created in the 70's - 80's prior to the growth area amendments.

The majority of proposals were reviewed in 2006 which triggered a request to Planning Commission to amend the Master Plan to allow for review of amendments to the Growth Area twice a year.

There are currently six designated growth areas in the Grand County Master Plan:

1. Kremmling Growth Area,
2. Hot Sulphur Springs Growth Area,
3. Grand Lake Growth Areas (Grand Lake Growth Area and the Grand County Urban Growth Area No. 2),
4. Granby Growth Areas,
5. Tabernash Growth Areas (Grand County Rural Growth Area 1, Grand County Rural Growth Area 2 and the Tabernash Urban Growth Area) and the
6. Fraser -Winter Park Growth Areas (Grand County Rural Growth Area 3, Grand County Urban Growth Area 1, Fraser Growth Area and the Winter Park Growth Area).

The 2011 Master Plan identified two "rural" growth areas, RGA No. 1 (Pole Creek/Crooked Creek Basin, and RGA No. 2 (Silver Creek). The two "urban" growth areas are UGA No. 1 (Tabernash), and UGA No. 2 (Winter Park Ranch).

e. **Master Plan and the Gold Medal Ranch Site**

The Gold Medal Ranch parcel (ID #1589-251-00-181) was excluded from Grand County's Rural Growth Area 1 in the 1998. Again, in 2011, the County's Master Plan excluded the property from any Rural Growth Areas—though the “Rural Growth Area 1” boundaries and title were adjusted, becoming “Rural Growth Area 3”. This suggests that the criteria established in both Master Plans to identify areas of the County most appropriate for Growth Areas—whether Urban or Rural—deemed the Gold Medal Ranch inappropriate as a Growth Area parcel.

While a portion of the Gold Medal Ranch is not located in a wetland/riparian area some of the site may be. The Master Plan would discourage designating a portion of the parcel while excluding another as this would create a discontinuous Rural Growth Area (RGA). Both Master Plans recommended that proposed RGA's be contiguous to an existing RGA. If the entire Gold Medal parcel was included, the RGA would be contiguous on a map, but it could also be deemed as being discontinuous as any proposed development would be required to “jump across” the St. Louis Creek riparian corridor.

It is reasonable to conclude the Gold Medal Ranch has historically been excluded from Rural and Urban Growth Areas in Grand County due to its environmental and aesthetic (view-shed) importance and because development of the parcel may not result in contiguous residential development within the Rural Growth Area. Since the 2011 Master Plan, however, Grand County has experienced considerable evolution and focus toward development in the Winter Park/Fraser Area. Given the recent site-specific Gold Medal Ranch proposal and request for an amendment, Staff felt it appropriate to re-consider if and how the RGA is applicable to existing County policy and its impact to the rural character or open lands adjacent.

f. The Gold Medal Ranch Subdivision Proposal

As illustrated on the Ranch Headquarters Sketch Plan, the intent is to configure 10 home sites around a central open space system that includes the St. Louis Creek riparian corridor. The Ranch Headquarters residential enclave is located on approximately 138 acres that is located within the northwest quadrant of the Byers Peak property. Utilizing site sensitive planning and sustainable design principles, the intent is to create a clustered development that will be comprised of ten home sites and the existing Eisenhower camp parcel. These principles include maintaining the integrity of the existing site characteristics including slopes, natural drainages, and view corridors. Clustering home sites to preserve large areas of contiguous open space including the St. Louis Creek riparian corridor is a primary objective of the plan.

A majority of the 138 acres is currently undeveloped and has been utilized for agriculture and recreation. As illustrated on the enclosed Existing Conditions Map, a cluster of existing buildings are located along the eastern boundary and south of the two ponds. Some of these structures served as a retreat to President Dwight D. Eisenhower. The intent is to preserve these buildings and associated structures to serve as an educational interpretive center. Adjacent land uses include low density residential along the eastern and western boundary of the parcel. The property located to the south is currently undeveloped.

The property to the south is referred to as the Byers Peak Ranch Estate parcel. The applicant is currently developing 10 thirty five acre lots and is including this larger portion as part of the analysis of the Rural Growth Area. If it is determined that this area is needed to accommodate growth, it may be considered.

Roads

County Road 73 is located to the north of the parcel. Access to the property is currently provided via County Road 73. An existing unpaved road located at the eastern boundary connects to County Road 72. This existing road provides access to the parcel located on the south side of St. Louis Creek with County Road 73 providing access to the property located on the north side of the creek.

Topography

Natural characteristics includes topography that descends from the north to south. Minor tributary drainages extend down from the hillside to the St. Louis Creek corridor. As illustrated on the attached existing conditions map, the slopes range from 5 to 30%. Existing slopes that are 30% or greater shall be preserved.

Vegetation and Wetlands

Existing vegetation includes native grasses and shrub massing including large stands of willows within the St. Louis Creek riparian corridor. Forest management practices have been utilized including the removal of dead trees. Existing clusters of healthy evergreen trees and aspen groves have been maintained. Wetland areas are located within the St. Louis Creek corridor and within the southeast quadrant of the 138-acre parcel. As noted above, the intent is to maintain the St. Louis Creek corridor in its natural state. Upland areas include a combination of native grasses, sages, and evergreen shrubs. The Byers Peak Ranch Estate parcel included mature massing of evergreens along the southern perimeter of the property. Forest management practices were implemented to remove the large massing of dead evergreen trees. A large wetland complex is in the northeast corner of the parcel. Building envelopes are strategically located to preserve the wetlands. The upland areas are comprised of native grasses, sages, and evergreen shrubs. Both parcels are located outside of the respective forest protection areas.

Geology and Floodplain

As illustrated on the attached, the property is not located within a geologic hazard area. Most of the parcel is classified as Valley-floor alluvium. A geo-technical report will be prepared for each building site prior to construction. As illustrated on the attached, the property is not located within a flood hazard area (see Flood

Hazard Map).

Open Space and Wildlife Habitat Preservation

The master plan for both parcels has been configured to preserve large contiguous areas of open space. Building envelopes are utilized to preserve existing natural features including St. Louis Creek and the existing wetland complexes. Approximately 131.1 acres or 95% of the Ranch Headquarters property is to be preserved as open space. The Byers Peak Ranch Estates parcel will include approximately 322.2 acres or 91.5% of open space. This will total approximately 453.3 acres of natural open space. Preserving large contiguous areas of open space will further preserve wildlife habitat. As illustrated on the Ranch Headquarters Plan, the intent is to preserve the St. Louis Creek riparian corridor. Wildlife barriers such as fences will be restricted within the open space areas. The preservation of the corridor will also include applying stream management practices such as bank stabilization and improvements to fisheries. The proposed pond that is to be located on the Byers Peak Ranch Estates will also benefit habitat. Preservation of the vegetation along the southern boundary will provide continued forest habitat.

The Applicant states Commercial or private shooting ranges will be restricted within the 138-acre parcel and within a 100' boundary of the 138-acre parcel.

g. The Gold Medal Ranch Development Options

Grand County's general policy for land division has been that the Subdivision process, administered through the Grand County Subdivision Regulations, has only been allowed for proposals inside Growth Areas. Subdivisions through this process can create densities of between

.5 dwelling units per acre (one home per two acres), to 20 dwelling units per acre. The density is dependent on the Zoning District the property is located within and the availability of public water and sewer. Land divisions outside of growth areas are allowed to go through either Subdivision Exemption or Rural Land Use Process.

Subdivision Exemption is typical for 35 or larger acre tracts which have access to an existing or ability to construct a “domestic well.” The well can be converted or surrendered for three (3) household use “exempt” or “residential” well permits. This is a low density, low impact type development.

Rural Land Use cluster development is also available to properties outside of any Growth Area. These subdivisions create 2 dwelling units per 35 acres which is consistent with the language in Colorado Revised Statutes 30-28-401 et seq. This process also is allowed wells for household use with some additional outside watering/irrigation use typically.

h. EXPANSION OF THE GRAND COUNTY RURAL GROWTH AREA 3

The general location of the Rural Growth Area 3 expansion would be immediately south of the existing Rural Growth Area 3 boundaries at CR 73 and immediately west of the Fraser Growth Area. Roads serving the proposed expansion include CR 73, CR 731, CR 50S, CR 72 and an Access Drive connecting CR 72 to the site (see map).

The location of public places or facilities relatively close include the St. Louis Creek Campground, Colorado Adventure Park, Fraser Tubing Hill, Safeway Grocery, Arapahoe National Forest, Winter Park Horsemen's Association (Rodeo), Fraser Amtrak Station, Fraser Valley Library, Fraser Valley Elementary School, US Post Office, restaurants and shopping.

Further east is a proposed 295 acre, 2,400 unit Byers Peak Ranch development located within the Fraser Growth Area.

The Upper Fraser Valley Wastewater Treatment Facility and the Town of Fraser provide water and sewer services to properties within the Town and could also provide service to the Fraser Growth Area. There is a potential for some water and sewer provisions in the proposed expanded Rural Growth Area.

Much of the surrounding area is residential. Adjacent residential subdivisions include Icebox Estates, St. Louis Creek Subdivision, Sky View Acres, Ski Ranch Estates, most of which are to the north.. To the south, much of the proposed growth area will abut the Arapahoe National Forest land.

i. Analysis of Existing Conditions in Grand County

Population

Several Colorado State agencies have provided population analyses as it relates to Grand County. Both the Colorado Department of Local Affairs and the Colorado Department of Transportation predict continued growth for the state and Grand County. DOLA indicates population will continue to grow in the state at a slower rate than in the past but more in a concentrated pattern. Colorado's growth rate in 2018 was 1.42%, up from 1.35% in 2017. Colorado was one of only 4 fast-growing states (growing by 1% or more per year) to grow at a faster rate in 2018 than in 2017. Grand

County saw a .6% growth of 691 persons between 2010 and 2018 and a 68% growth between 1985 and 2018.

According to a June 28, 2019 article in the Winter Park Times, CDOT utilized a demographer to project Grand County’s population growth in the next 25 years. The analysis found:

- Population would grow 47% from 2020 to 2045
- 17% of the population would be over the age of 65 by 2045
- 5.3% of the population has a disability
- 13.1% live below the poverty line
- 2.7% of Households do not have a vehicle available to them
- Individuals aged 25-34 are the fastest growing segment of the population

DOLA estimates by the 2050, Grand County’s population will reach 23,672 persons.

More analysis is needed to apportion where the growth could occur. Much of it is presumed to occur in the Fraser/Winter Park areas. How much of this growth can be accommodated within the Urban Growth Areas and within existing Rural Growth Areas would need to be estimated.

Rural Growth Area 3					
<i>Parcel Data Land Use Classification</i>					
Parcel Classification	# of Parcels	% of Total Parcels	Total Acreage	% of Total Acreage	Avg Parcel Size (acres)
Residential	195	70.14%	568.78	36.51%	2.92
Multi-Family	6	2.16%	6.42	0.41%	1.07
Vacant	49	17.63%	240.47	15.43%	4.91
Agricultural	9	3.24%	223.07	14.32%	24.79
Tax Exempt	5	1.80%	101.33	6.50%	20.27
Other	14	5.04%	417.98	26.83%	29.86
TOTAL	278		1558.04		5.60

The predominant land use in RGA 3 is residential consisting of 70% of all parcels. Of the 278 parcels, 49 or 17.63% are vacant. Although the average parcel size is 5.6 acres, the very large parcels that exist are agricultural or tax exempt land.

Rural Growth Area 3

Parcel Data - Lots by Decade of Construction

Last Updated: 8/26/2020

Decade of Construction	# of Parcels Developed	% of Total Parcels	Total Acreage	% of Total Acreage	Avg Parcel Size (acres)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------------

Pre-1970	10	3.55%	43.76	2.71%	4.38
1970-1979	51	18.09%	83.92	5.20%	1.65
1980-1989	41	14.54%	84.50	5.24%	2.06
1990-1999	50	17.73%	268.21	16.63%	5.36
2000-2009	41	14.54%	209.63	13.00%	5.11
2010-2020	7	2.48%	35.26	2.19%	5.04
Vacant*	49	17.38%	240.47	14.91%	4.91
Undevelopable**	33	11.70%	647.32	40.13%	19.62
TOTAL	282		1613.08		5.72

*Vacant classification determined by Land Use Classification data

**Undevelopable classification determined by parcels without Decade of Construction data, excluding Vacant parcels. "Undevelopable" parcels include lands owned by organizations such as the City & County of Denver or by any of the several HOA's present in the RGA.

From the table above, only seven (7) parcels out of 193 parcels (excluding vacant and undevelopable) were developed since 2009.

Staff hypothesizes that the dramatic drop-off in rate of development in RGA 3 can be attributed to the Great Recession and to developers' inability to market lots in aging subdivisions as well as "new" lots in new subdivisions. When sales of lots in existing subdivisions slows, new land can be developed and more easily marketed.

Note of the 32,268 acres in the Fraser Urban Growth Area, roughly 14.58% is vacant.

Growth Areas in Colorado

Staff reviewed some nearby examples to further understand why Growth Areas are established. All Colorado jurisdictions are required to adopt a Master Plan, Counties consistent with C.R.S. 30-28-106 and Municipalities consistent with C.R.S. 31-23-206. In both sections of the law, there are suggestions made for the Master Plan to detail the location and extent of housing along with supporting services needed to accommodate the housing. Staff would interpret this being the basis of reasoning behind establishing growth areas within a Master Plan.

Boulder and Boulder County

Boulder is often noted in various articles and analysis as having a Greenbelt. This is due to the Boulder County Comprehensive (Master) Plan which has closely pushed growth to the incorporated

towns. Also the plan strongly encourages rural character in the surrounding unincorporated areas with open space and recreation available. The overarching philosophy that Boulder County uses is noted on the website as follows:

- Growth should be channeled to municipalities.
- Agricultural lands should be protected.
- Preservation of our environmental and natural resources should be a high priority in making land use decisions.
-

In planning circles, Boulder and Boulder County are widely used case studies in smart growth and growth management. The successes of this have been protection of open space, environment, habitat, and cultural resources and to be enjoyed by residents throughout the region creating trail and access linkages. The difference between Boulder County and Grand County is the amount of existing Public Lands and tools being used by the county to obtain and maintain open space.

Routt County

Routt County is another rural and resort community similar to Grand County, and shares a border to the northwest. The Routt County Master Plan, adopted April 2003, details specific objectives of growth in the unincorporated areas of the County. In summary, Routt County calls out the objective of reducing sprawl and maintaining a low density. Routt County also has several Sub-Area Plans which focus on areas surrounding the towns and with the potential for development. The Sub-Area Plan which is most relevant to this concept is the Steamboat Springs Community Area Plan.

Routt County and the Town of Steamboat Springs also maintains an Intergovernmental Agreement along with a Growth Management Advisory Group. This helps focus new development into the town where there is the support for road maintenance, water and sewer. This planning tool gives Routt County more strength in limiting sprawl.

Grand County

The case studies above are being used to compare the objectives of Growth Areas as a planning tool and way to deduce how drive development policy. Grand County established Growth Areas as a portion of the 1998 Master Plan suggesting the following:

From the county wide and town community workshops and the public opinion survey conducted during the creation of the Grand County Strategic Growth Plan, a number of key goals emerged to provide a foundation for building an effective growth strategy, and thus an effective implementation program as well. These include the following:

- **Maintain open space and wildlife habitat throughout the county.**
- **Protect the county's rural character, existing ranching economy and culture while enhancing and maintaining the general county economy.**
- **Improve the quality of new development and minimize its impact to the natural environment.**
- **Target new development to suitable land in and around towns and existing development areas such as Tabernash, Silver Creek, and Winter Park Ranch.**
- **Promote a range of attainable housing choices for all citizens.**

- **Ensure that new development is served by adequate infrastructure such as roads, water and sewer.**

These policy goals are also recognized in the 2011 Master Plan Update which are further detailed in the seven Plan Elements covered in Chapter 3. Those seven Plan Elements note specific action within each goal but does not get into tools on how to create regulatory action. Staff still reviews the Grand County Master Plan to ensure new proposals are in line with The Vision of the Plan which is the driver of those Plan Elements.

The Grand County Master Plan, Chapter 4 more fully details the use and intent of Grand County's Growth Areas to align with the requirements under State Law. Chapter 4 notes the importance of assessing new development to assure protection of natural features and levels of service are not being significantly impacted. Chapter 4 also notes:

“While it is likely that growth area boundaries will be modified in the future as the County grows, Areas outside of growth boundaries will continue to be subject to existing and changing zoning regulations in the same manner they have been for the past four decades... It is important to note that no existing rights will be taken away by adopting this Master Plan for anyone not within a growth area. Nor does the adoption of the Master Plan provide anyone with additional rights.”

Staff believes this is reflective of past and current County Policy that Property Rights are to be protected and any developer has the right to ask for solutions to benefit a development within the existing regulations and policy adopted by Grand County.

Commissioner Davis stated that tonight's Rural Growth Amendment number 3 is a “discussion” of the Master Plan Amendment. Before we even start on this presentation, a couple items of note. First of all thank you all for coming and being part of this process, it is wonderful when the public is involved and here to voice their thoughts, questions, concerns, etc. What I would ask is that everyone be patient tonight, there are a lot of people on the call and we want to hear from anyone who would like to talk with a few restrictions. If the point that you would like to make has already been made don't repeat it. We don't even need a here, here. The second point is there will be a limit of 3 minutes, the chair does have a timer. This is an information and discussion, in a lot of ways for the Commissioners to discuss a change to the Master Plan. The changes to this plan are very few and far between. We really want to hear what the public has to say and if you feel like through this discussion it would be better to email staff, feel free to do so. Feel free to send a chat to Commissioner Davis and he will make sure you can comment. If you send a chat of a comment, Commissioner Davis will read the comments out loud.

Mr. Jeff Vogel presented an overview of the Gold Medal Ranch project.

- Preserve and Enhance the St. Louis Creek Riparian Corridor.
- Preserve large contiguous open space areas by clustering building envelopes.
- Preserve steep slopes that are 30% or greater.
- Preserve view corridors.
- Preserve cultural resources including the Eisenhower Camp.
- Incorporate compatible land use and density.

- It is the intent to expand the Grand County Growth Area to include the 138 acre parcel located within the north quadrant. The extended growth would include approximately 51.6 acres of property that is currently zoned Residential.
- Upon amending the Growth Area, it is the intent to rezone the balance of the 138 acres as Residential, which will be compatible with the zone districts located north and east of the property.
- Parcels located north of the parcel range in size from 5.1 acres to 13.8 acres.
- Minimum lot size is proposed to be 5.0 acres. With the intent to maintain large contiguous lots are proposed density of .08 dwelling units per acre.
- The low density combined with the minimum lot size is compatible with the adjacent parcels. These 5.0 acre lots serve as a transition between the 1.0 and 2.0 acre lots located to the west.
- The Fraser Growth Area is located along the east perimeter. Approximately 47% of the property is contiguous to an existing growth area.
- The 138 acre parcel is located adjacent to County Road 73.
- Five of the residential parcels and the museum parcel is to be accessed by the road that connects with County Road 72.
- Central water is located on the south side of St. Louis Creek. Well and septic is envisioned to serve the residential lots located on the north side of St. Louis Creek.
- The extended growth area can be adequately served by the East Grand Fire District and the respective law enforcement agencies.

Commissioners Davis added that the majority of the people on the call tonight are here to discuss a shooting range. He realizes this is a big point of concern for the public, he would like to address it. Our Forestry and Open, Section 6 in our Zoning Regulations state that there are outdoor recreational areas and incidental facilities, a storage equipment outside of a building and are noxious, offensive or objectionable because of obsessive noise, odor, dust or vibration. This is a Use by Right, this is permitted by Special Review. Per the zoning code, a shooting range, in a growth area or not is not specifically mentioned in the zoning code. We have 2 shooting ranges in the county, both are in Forestry and Open zoning, neither one have a Special Use Permit. In context, both shooting ranges are remote. We are talking about Growth Boundary and where we want to see things grow. I do not think it is appropriate to discuss this evening a shooting range. Growth boundary amendments have nothing to do with uses.

Mr. Ed Guiducci is a home owner in Moose Run Subdivision. He is opposed to this development because the owner of Gold Medal Ranch property should have known what the rules are regarding the density. There was discussion by staff regarding 1998-1999 and 2011 Master Plan. It is notable that the county choose to exclude this area from the Rural Growth Area #3 giving the owners a right to a higher density. The reason for that decision is this is truly the critical corridor for Grand County. Once this corridor is gone and developed it is gone forever. This is a permanent decision. Want to discuss open space, what kind of guarantees is the community given that this developer will not change his mind regarding the open space presented this evening. Will he propose a conservation easement? How does the community know this will actually take place? He now has a limited number of units, I think these are all things that need to be considered. You also have to consider the negative impact to the wildlife and the loss of enjoyment for the community. There will be noise pollution, the roads have to be able to handle this increase of traffic.

Commissioner Davis stated he wants all to realize that we do have a Subdivision Development Process. We are just starting to discuss, do we have growth in the right areas. The Subdivision Process also says, we have a sketch plan, we have a preliminary plat presentation. There is not a

guarantee how somebody who privately owns their property can develop it. But there is a process when we go through the subdivision development for public feedback. This is not the Subdivision Process, this is just an idea of what is driving it and we are not even at sketch plan yet.

Ms. Deborah Guiducci a home owner at Moose Run Subdivision, she stated the County Commissioners have a fiduciary duty to all residents in this county and those who will be future residents. The fiduciary duty is to protect, now is the time. I disagree that now is not the time to talk about the gun range and getting guarantees, in writing of the open space and that there will never be a gun range in this development before any approvals occur. Need assurances in writing before there is any approvals. Suggest talking to your County Attorney, a good lawyer will recommend getting all in writing. The assurance that it will never be amended in perpetuity. So we are protected for now and forever as citizens of this county. Look at what assurances can be put in place to uphold all the promises that are being made by the developer, that the promises are kept, that they are not hollow promises. The only way to do this is put it in writing and have lawyers look at it and make sure it protects the citizens.

Ms. Marina Koepke stated the 47% growth in the population in the next 25 years and extending the Rural Growth Area, if we are anticipating this type of growth, why are we building giant houses on these lots? You should be developing more housing for the people that live here. Why are we focusing on destroying these ranches when we don't have housing for our working class? I am a single mom who works full time at the resort and I can't find housing because we have all these empty mansions that are being developed and all these extraordinary condos that are being developed in the County. I think the Commissioners need to consider this as we go forward with developments. Consider, are we developing for out of town people, who have a lot of money or we developing for our citizens who live and work here. If we do need extra housing why don't we develop the pole yard? That is for sale and there is a lot of acreage there to develop normal people housing and it will not destroy our ranches.

Mr. Evan Banker stated the Rural Growth Area Boundary should only be amended in certain needs of the county, not private individuals. I read the Master Plan before deciding to buy in Grand County. It was an attraction to be in a county that values the preservation of rural land and the protection of nature. To be a community that really sees the irreplaceable value. The Master Plan is an incredible document. The amount of work and community input that is reflected in this plan is so impressive. In the Master Plan we have put our fingertip on the well-considered priorities of the county represented by towns, wildlife, and forest service. Commissioner Manguso, was then Director of Planning and Zoning, and involved stakeholders, including business interest and the citizens of Grand County. I understand this is an advisory document but let's heed its advise. It is an invaluable planning tool. The drafters of the Master Plan observed quote "Areas such as County Road 5 and County Road 50 Corridors have seen significant growth. The impact has begun to threaten the unique characteristics of the Fraser Valley. Will the next updates to the Master Plan have the loss of County Road 73? There are so many reasons to protect this land and views, but no compelling reason to sacrifice them. I want to respond to a shocking statement in the staff report, on page 11. After reporting the 49 parcel, 17% of developable parcels in Rural Growth Area #3 remain vacant, that land absorption has slowed dramatically since 2009. That only 7 Rural Growth Areas has been developed since 2009. After plainly establishing the lack of (inaudible) data, staff suggest that the problem is "developers inability to market lots in ageing subdivisions as well as new lots in new subdivisions." When sales of lots in existing subdivisions slow, new land can be developed and more easily be marketed." Could we be any more wasteful? These perfectly good existing lots haven't been developed, so let's develop a new land? No, let's first develop land within the Rural Growth Boundary's established by the community and if that land is

not needed, let's not rush to develop half our unspoiled natural resources. The Master Plans overarching vision is to promote conservation of the counties natural resources, including wildlife, rivers, diverse habitats and majestic scenery. Developers are asking the county to give over its view corridors, its wildlife habitat, its wetlands, its majestic scenery and its rural character. It is not offering anything back to the county in return. No one is suggesting that any of the developer's rights be taken away or even limited, we are suggesting that the developer not be given free range to expand those rights, and personally profit to the detriment of the county and the community that developed the Master Plan.

Ms. Shelly Banker owner of property on County Road 73, stated our property is completely surrounded by the property being discussed this evening in the Rural Growth Area Expansion. We received no outreach from the developer regarding the Rural Growth Area expansion, outside of a recent letter sent from the county. However we have received a series of empty promises from the property owner to us and our neighbors in our community along the St. Louis Creek. We have been assured that during the development, associated with the 35 acre lots within Byers Peak Ranch that wildlife and wetlands along our shared banks in St. Louis Creek would be preserved. The recent letters stated that specific to the wetlands, the intent is to maintain this St. Louis Creek corridor in its natural state. Those are the same banks where the developers bulldozed trails and filled in land near the Berkeley property this summer. Evan and I opened a survey and solicited feedback from neighbors this summer after hearing about this proposal to understand the perceptions of the area in question. This preliminary results were shared with the Planning Commission Staff meeting last month and I appreciate the opportunity to present. Since then, we have received 37 additional responses. 84 respondents or 63 households completed the survey to date. 94% opposed expanding the Rural Growth Area. More than 3 quarters demonstrated strong concerns with the detrimental effect on wildlife. A similar amount strongly agreed that there was no need to expand the Rural Growth Area boundary while there is still undeveloped lands. More than 3 quarters strongly agreed about the negative impact. We also developed questions that aligned with the Master Plan and growth criteria for Rural Growth Area and found that 77% strongly disagreed or disagreed that the expansion of the Rural Growth Area boundary in this location is compatible with the Master Plan growth criteria. 83% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that the expansion does not include areas critical to migration patterns of wildlife or take away from critical winter range for wildlife. 81% strongly disagreed or disagreed that the proposed expansion location includes natural features that are conducive to development which would include rolling topography, fewer wetlands not within flood plains and areas that are out of critically view corridors. Tonight I urge you to honor the Master Plan and not to forget the sentiment in favor of the wishes of 1 developer.

Commissioner Davis asked Ms. Banker to share her research with Community Development staff.

Mr. Jeff Amirani had questions. There was mention that 47% expected growth rate over the coming years, my understanding between Rendezvous, Arrowhead, Roam, Grand Park and numerous other large scale development that we are into thousands pre-approved future development units, is this correct?

Commissioner Davis replied some of those are within the county some are with the towns, so not sure what a good number would be.

Mr. Jeff Amirani continued, I think the town and county distinction is important for some purposes but for the understanding of this area those units will contribute to the capacity to meet that 47%. I also want to emphasize that not all parcels are the same. The parcel in question here is the Crown Jewel of the Fraser Valley. The St. Louis River Shed, the backdrop of Byers Peak that is probably

the most important element of Grand County that defines its natural appealing habitat. It is probably one of the most sensitive environmental areas so you can't just pair that corridor with the density of developments with other Rural Growth Areas. That is essentially equivalent (inaudible) tundra's in terms of its environmental sensitivity. I read the Vogel and Associates letter describing their approach and the claims that are being made about the sensitivity towards the environment that they are undertaking. Tonight we saw that actual development plan. I have driven County Road 73 and the Fraser Bypass Road to actually look at that and the statements made in that letter are simple misleading. There is no development in that area that cannot have significant human impact to the sensitivity to that environment. To allow development of any kind to proceed in that area is selling the soul of Fraser for the future of the community and economic benefits of the broader community to preserve the land. It is this area and similar areas that draw the outdoor oriented people, the tourist to our community and that is the foundation for our future, not the profit interest of one developer.

Commissioner Davis wanted to reflex on a few comments through the chat room. Marcus asked, do we have growth in the right areas? Shawna Yaussi commented on (inaudible) Comments: stick to the Master Plan, you are relying on current people's opinions. Tim Koepke, the developer states he wants to preserve St. Louis Creek, but the plan shows 10 sites in this critical area. The upper Fraser Valley, what Evan says is correct these areas are worth far more than what we are receiving in return as a community it is time to stop (inaudible)

Bio Break occurred at 8:30pm will be back at 8:40pm

Ms. Melanie Zwick added, it took a long time and many people to draft the Master Plan, now because a developer wants to change it to his advantage it could quickly and by the decision of a few be changed. Perhaps by some of those people who would vote on it have never even seen the property. I realize there has been some past amendments and some of those amendments were unfortunate. The property has been deemed inappropriate for a growth area since day 1 and it is still not appropriate for a growth area. The fact that it is next to other growth areas makes it all the more important to keep it out of the growth area. There is no public need for development, it serves no one but the developers to expand into the growth area. It actually harms the rest of the world, just because there is so much development is a very poor reason to even consider allowing more. Leaving it outside the growth area will make Fraser more valuable and less costly to the community and be more pleasing to residents and tourist. Leaving it out of the growth area will be less taxing to town and county services. Residential development does not see it this way, allowing more of it what is more costly to the community. The Master Plan is for the community and not to be controlled by developers. The developers knew what their property rights are. The request is greed. To grant this request goes strictly against the intent of the Master Plan. Uphold your rules and respect the community, please do not support the greed of a few individuals. Developers will do just fine without changing the Master Plan as much as they might cry to you they will be laughing all the way to the bank. Please consider first for the community.

Ms. Gail Stokowski, I understand the inclusion into the Rural Growth Area is approved that you intend to rezone the rest of the area that is not zoned into Residential? Why does this need to be done? Why can't it stay as split zoned Residential and Forestry and Open? Is it because you want to be able to put in higher density lots?

Mr. Vogel responded, just to clarify, the intent is not to rezone. There was some consideration related to the Eisenhower Camp early on and trying to figure out how to make that a decent parcel size so it would work for the historic districts. At the time, one discussion was rezoning but I am on the record here tonight to say the intent is not to rezone. It will stay zoned just like it is today, with

split zoning. The 51 acres that is already zoned Residential and you can have lots as small as 2 1/2 acres. The intent is to remain with the split zone, Residential and Forestry and Open.

Ms. Gail Stokowski continued that her major concern is, our lot is 20-30 feet from where Lot 7 & 8 will be which will totally destroy our view of the Continental Divide.

Commissioner Davis stated there was a question brought up regarding review agencies. One of the review agencies that goes through the Subdivision process is Colorado Parks and Wildlife. As far as the Growth Boundaries, I believe they should be on the interested parties list and staff that would be something for you to consider.

Ms. Michelle Murray-Hedland stated as we know the biggest risk factor to Grand County we will be facing is the climate crisis in water. In decades to come, the municipalities in Grand County will have water due to diversions but wells might run dry. My concerns and questions to the Planning Commission are, with regard to any development including Gold Medal Ranch are you doing scientific research to determine what the carrying capacity the aquifer and water table is to insure there will be sufficient water to support the proposed density. Alex mentioned that the 35 acre parcels would be able to have multiple dwellings on them, so is that being taken into consideration and also how is this going to jeopardize or impact those of us who are on wells on the west side of Highway 40. It just does not seem sustainable. Are you doing the research to insure there is enough water for developments like this?

Commissioner Davis replied, the short answer to that is absolutely. The long answer is we get that data through the Colorado Division of Water Resources. The way the state of Colorado was platted was every 40 acres was given a domestic well. A domestic well allows for 3 household uses on that property. You say with our first agenda item the Subdivision Exemption process allows us to turn those 3 buyer right uses into 3 individual household use only, anything beyond that requires a water augmentation plan which typically takes up to 2 years to try to buy and sell the different water so we are not continuing to overuse our water resources. You can find information online with Colorado Division of Water Resources.

Ms. Michelle Murray-Hedland stated she understands that, but the climate crisis has presented a whole new animal like everything has changed. So all of the developments that we undertake have to be respectful of what is going to happen. All I am asking is that the County before you rubber stamp these developments that come across your table that you think about the future.

Ms. Sharon Slaeter stated, ever since the July meeting I have been researching to find out about the process and the property. I was surprised as to how much about this property that has not come to the forefront yet. Grand County did an assessment on all the streams and creeks in the county so I looked at St. Louis Creek and their assessment was critically and environmentally sensitive that it should be a conservation easement. There was a grant in 2017 to look at the history from a Coloradoan Historian group and ended up putting it on the natural registry of historic places. The Natural Registry had 2 listings, one being the Eisenhower Cabin and the other being the entire ranch itself. This should be a critical consideration. The Master Plan does talk about trying to keep growth out of historical areas. Looking over the Master Plan, I just don't see how the Commissioners would be able to reconcile this language because they did a hotspot map of landscape sensitivity in 2011 and this area is in a live area corridor and having such unique visual world landscape was put on the hotspot. Looking at the map, in the Master Plan (page 30) you will see that they made this a hotspot of landscape sensitivity which they said should be protected from development. There is data, in my letter, regarding the 8000 visitors per month that travel on County Road 73.

Commissioner Davis thanked the public for all their feedback, this is really wonderful and has given staff a lot to think about and they have some research to do.

Commissioner Fitch, no reply.

Commissioner Broadhurst, no reply.

Commissioner Shepton stated, it was good to listen to all the comments, I took many notes. It is a good time to be looking at the Master Plan and review statements that were interpreted from the Plan. Tonight is just a discussion no decisions will be made. I will review my notes and review the Master Plan.

Commissioner Karlstrom stated she would like to thank all who have participated tonight. I have learned a lot from the presentation by staff and all the neighbors. I was surprised to see there was no recommendation at the end, does that mean we are not voting tonight?

Commissioner Davis stated tonight is just discussion and a general public forum so we can provide any additional feedback for staff as they continue to research. Is it time for a large discussion, do we like the thought of utilizing the infill between the National Forest and the existing Growth Boundary Areas. Is it time to fill that in or is it time to say no we are going to continue to move forward. That is some of the thoughts we are trying to garner and give direction back to staff.

Commissioner Karlstrom continued, I want to talk a little bit about what would happen if the Growth Area were not OK'd. The owner would have the right to divide into 35 acre tracks without review and I did my arithmetic and it would be 3.94, 35 acre tracks per the 138 acres. Then each of those 35 acre plots could apply for a Subdivision Exemption and get up to 3 more lots. 4 x 3 is 12 which is more than the 10 sites and the 12 sites could build their houses just about anywhere they want on the lot. So it would not be as well of a planned development as what is being offered. I don't like the idea of unbridled growth just because the statistics say we might have 47% growth in 25 years. It doesn't mean that is what is going to happen. It is misleading to have the graphs that show the gradual rise based on facts that we do not know. It could be that our growth will slow down. We already have so much in the works to be developed that it seems premature to add to the Growth Area. I just wanted to be clear about what could happen if this end up not being OK'd.

Commissioner Davis added, people need to realize that property ownership provides certain uses by right and we have a couple different options moving forward. You will hear me repeatedly applaud the work that Jeff Vogel and Associates does because they do look at the intimacy of Grand County, they have done a tremendous number of applications that have not moved forward into development throughout this county. They are well voiced and researched and what I continue to hear from them is, here is a proposal what do you think? They come forward with way more than you would ever see at a sketch plan. That is not to say that it makes it a slam dunk it would be a yes or a no. It means that there is a tremendous amount of thought that goes into their projects and comparing that to the natural use by rights that the property owner has to begin with puts in a perspective where they are asking for public feedback. This is a better process because it does allow you the public and us the Commissioners to have a lengthy discussion and to provide feedback to that owner. There is a financial gratitude to any development and that is a use by right that we all have. I am seeing question about the 138 acres continuous. I think the point is that, by a surveyor you can survey down your land to 35 acres before it has to come before the Planning Commission and fall under the subdivision process.

Commissioner MacDonald thanked the public and stated it has been very informative. There are approximately 20,000 housing units in the county and a population of 18,000. There is at least

8,000 acres for development over the next 10 years that we know about. My prediction is we will have a huge increase in primary residents. I have properties much farther away that are different acreages in size. As a Planning Commissioner, we review the Master Plan and make amendments as social economics change. I feel they are changing pretty drastically right now. Teachers need to work 2nd and 3rd jobs in order to live here. There are probably not many people in this meeting in their 20's tonight. Working class people are leaving at a fast rate because they cannot afford to live here and that starts with housing. Workers will have to be bussed in from over an hour away. I appreciate and agree with most of the environmental impact concerns. Any time a governing force tries to regulate a market it tends to (Inaudible). What I hope we can all focus on is how we can allow growth, if the markets are clearly demanding more. How do we grow with minimal environment impacts while also improving our community? This property close to town makes it a good proximity for high density homes and our growth areas should be revised to reflex higher demand and encouraging sustainable growth closer to town. If we are going to sacrifice some of our environment I would like to see it go for housing giving back to the community.

Commissioner Gnuse stated one of the things he was looking at and thinking about was we ought to be looking at steering growth or channeling it towards our towns and municipalities. I have wondered a couple of things, one since this is property that the 138 acres is contiguous to Growth Areas, one being Rural Growth Area #3 and the other being the Fraser Growth Area. If we were going to expand a growth area, wouldn't it make more sense to expand the Fraser Growth Area to include this property than the Rural Growth Area? We are going to try to steer development towards the municipality. I was not sure I heard a compelling reason at this point due to the vacancy lots that we have available to us right now, why is it imperative that we expand the Rural Growth Area #3 just to get 9 houses and they will be high end house to boot. I need a little more convincing as to what the urgency is for the amendment of this growth area.

Commissioner Fournet thanked everyone for giving their opinions it is much appreciated. We have a lot to think about. I think there is still a lot of research that needs to be done, we still need to be provided with a lot more information. The biggest point is that there is a use by right and those are laws that are in effect and we can't really change those. The more we have to say in the process I think would be better. Unfortunately everything is getting developed. What we can control would be better in my opinion.

Commissioner Davis added staff I would like you to make sure you have gone through the chats, there are a number of good comments. Without the community involvement, we have 9 people on a Planning Commission that get to discuss with staff and applicants the pros and cons of development. I am proud of our community for stepping up and appreciate you all. I want to reiterate that this discussion is regarding a Rural Growth Amendment, if this subdivision were to move forward we would start at Sketch Plan and very similar conversations about the right way to develop a property for housing. I would encourage the community to not just find the one thing that becomes the talking point but to stay involved in our meetings. From a developer's standpoint, the developers want to preserve the same things that we love in Grand County because it helps them sell their properties. The more they hear from people about what is important the more they understand how it relates. People who want to build within their properties, expand or put a business in are doing the same thing, how can we support the infrastructure within our communities. How can we continue to model good development over urban sprawl? The interesting thing about Fraser Valley is that it is a bowl, a little tunnel that goes through surrounded by National Forest. Grand County is bigger than the state of Rhode Island, is 80% public lands. We still want to protect those areas that are not public lands. We take our Master Plan very seriously. To staff, you heard a lot of good feedback this evening and you have some good

direction. I will summarize what I can, it doesn't seem that there is good feeling either way on the expansion of this growth boundary. Maybe the charge would be to look at the improved attention the development would get if it were within a growth boundary. We are butting right up against the National Forest on the west side of Fraser. Does the proposal need to be steered towards the benefits of expanding our growth boundary right up to the edge of that, because that is where growth is happening anyway. We are talking Rural Growth area here versus Urban Growth Area which is good. Is the point we want to refrain from expansion because it takes away from the desire to in fill it? Look at, why this area was not included in the original growth boundaries. There have been several comments and resources that I think staff needs to dig into. Staff well done, great information, great statistics, and great data. Regarding the firing range, which is a hot topic, staff let's take a look at that as making sure that we have good data and good knowledge on how to discuss where that fits into the zoning regulations, if this comes up again that we will have a better understanding of what role we play in that decision. It is a separate issue in that we need to make sure we have a clear after moving forward within our zoning regulations. Public your comments have generated directions that staff is going to look into and the Planning Commission will take heed to.

Commissioner Karlstrom added you made a suggestion of looking at the Growth Area all the way to the National Forest Boundary, how much property is west of Gold Medal property until you hit the west Forest Boundary? Does staff know this? Can we be shown that at some point?

Commissioner Davis replied that it was actually on the map that was presented tonight. Staff you have had 2 hours of discussion here to absorb. Robert maybe you can lead the charge in telling us what you are thinking. What further questions do you have or what are the takeaways for staff.

Robert Davis, Director replied we appreciate the Planning Commissioners time and especially appreciate the civic mindedness of the Fraser Valley residents to constantly remind us of what we need to do to maintain the wonderfulness of our county. There are several areas of analyses we want to further look at. We want to look at the adequacy of public facilities and our services and the ability to expand on services if we need to. We talked earlier about the limitations on our Road and Bridge department. How do we accommodate growth, while maintaining our roads? A primary concern is the impact on wildlife, there was a question about did we hear anything form Colorado Parks and Wildlife. We have reached out a couple times but we have not been able to get a response from them yet. There was mention about affordable housing, we also want to take a look at housing needs assessment from the County, Winter Park and Fraser. We will try to make an assessment of what those housing needs are in a more detailed manner in terms of housing for the working class. I heard some communities actually have to bus in their workers. This is very important for us. A consideration would be, where can we best accommodate the worker housing and how can it fit in with existing neighborhoods. We want to look at the impact on our trails, bikeways and parks. The bigger question of Short Term Rentals and how that effects the sustainability of housing in our County. In regards to traffic, we see that there is not a lot of traffic on County Road 73, basically during the peak hours you have one direction 15 cars going in the morning and in the evening another 15 cars during peak hours, that could relate to around 150-200 cars a day. This project will not add that much traffic, but we want to take a closer look at how that works. There is a lot of information that we still want to collect, analyze and present.

Commissioner Davis added, the graphic being displayed noted the green is US Forest Service land. The purple is the Rural Growth Area #3 which stretches out to the Forest Service Property and looking to the south there is a big belt that was not included. I think the original intention was, that is not where we want growth. Does it provide us more? My brain wants to say "control" but

my mind says that is the wrong word, it is “attention”. Does it lead us to further discussion, do we have more leverage or options when folks are looking to discuss.

Robert Davis, Director added to your point about the exclusion to the Gold Medal Plat in previous Master Plan analysis, we did talk about this briefly in Section E of the staff report. The portion of Gold Medal Ranch is not located in the wetland area and our presumptions is the Master Plan may have discouraged this portion of the parcel, looking at it a contiguous Rural Growth Area. Both Master Plans recommended that the Rural Growth Area be contiguous to an existing Rural Growth Area. When you look at it on the map the Gold Medal site does appear contiguous but when you start to build out the Gold Medal site, because of the wetlands, you end up with development immediately next to a development within a Growth Area. So it could be perceived as leap frogging over the creek, these are presumptions on our part. We think that is why the Gold Medal site was not part of the both Master Plans.

Commissioner Davis added, to Commissioner Gnuse point, why isn't it part of the Fraser Growth Area, because it is not annexed into the Town of Fraser. It would make some sense from continuity to be discussed from the Town of Fraser side. Versus just having that County Rural Growth Area. I think there is a lot to move forward with.

Robert Davis, Director, added, on Commissioners Gnuse question on Rural Growth Area versus Urban Growth Area, from what we researched the Urban Growth Areas came first largely to accommodate growth around the towns. During a growth management era, it was affecting a lot of communities across the country. There was a feeling that we should identify Rural Growth Areas as well as a way to say we want to accommodate some development but not commercial or industrial development. The Rural Growth Area were brought about to accommodate residential growth but to exclude the commercial and industrial development.

Commissioner Davis stated, great point. To that end, moving the Town of Fraser in that direction, would leave that as an opportunity for a commercial stand point as well. Then it would really change the characteristics of the land.

Ms. Anne Berkeley, property owner on the south edge of the Gold Medal Ranch development plans. I have been here since 1987. Have worked for the state of Colorado for 25 years and understand rules and regulations. My questions are, surrounding the interpretive Eisenhower property that Gold Medal Ranch is proposing, I do not understand what is their plan for ingress/egress to this property? I do not understand the sanitation issues, the volume of people that may visit this interpretive site. Mr. Vogel represented that the members who come to the site would be allowed to walk upon the land, what part of this land are they allowed? Do they have appropriate ingress/egress? Do they have appropriate trails? Do they have appropriate water and sanitation? Do we have any frickin clue how many people might come visit this site? They created a grant through the Colorado Historic Society in 2016, which I provided the link. Mr. Carpenter received 17 thousand dollars for planning and survey to accommodate this new site, is it even zoned for this type of site? Mr. Carpenter has added gates to his property.

Commissioner Davis added, I think there is some definite discussion and in the chat room staff there are questions about the development that is currently happening prior to the subdivision process. So we could take a look at that from a zoning standpoint. The website is: historycolorado.org there is a full link in the chat room.

Commissioner Gnuse added, as he has been thinking about this project in closing I would like to ask staff if they would take a particular look at the riparian issue here. What do they think would

make the most sense in terms of being able to protect that sensitive environmental amenities that we have? It is part of our Fraser Valley and apparently it is important enough that it was put on a couple of list that say it should be protected. Staff should look at various options, either include it in the Rural Growth Area #3 or not include it. We should be thinking about what is the best way to protect that corridor and not lose our environmental quality of life. We can talk about conservation easements which would permanently protect at least the wetlands corridor and the riparian corridor.

Jeff Amirani wanted to ask 2 quick questions. Is there already set standards/guidelines for use when determining expansion of Rural Growth Area and the second part of that is what is the next step for the Commission proceeding with deliberations and considerations on this request?

Commissioner Davis stated he would answer the second question first. Second question is, staff needs to go back and see where there are gaps in their data and choose to either present a proposal or to have another discussion or to pull it off the table. So that will be up to staff. This is a workshop/discussion, this is not a decision making it is for staff to garner more information. Secondly, what we look at on Growth Rural discussions are, where is growth best accommodated for not only traffic ways but all the infrastructure, water, waste water, roads, the works.

Jeff Amirani added what I am actually looking for is there already established written guidelines for criteria that you will consider when looking at expansion request?

Commissioner Karlstrom added that you need to check out the Master Plan, it delineates things quiet well. We have gone through all this many times when we were having the Growth Plans developed, the Smart Growth. Governor Roy Romer had the whole state involved in this. We have been updating the Master Plan at times. I cannot add much beyond what the Master Plan says, except that it was neighbors and local people who sat down with maps. We had a group that ran the process. This group here is the same kind of people just bigger and louder. This is based on what residents want. We still have to weigh the consequences of denial and loss of control or acceptance.

Commissioner Davis thank all for coming tonight. Staff let us know at the next meeting if you would give a summary report on your take a ways and findings from this. If you would add that as an agenda item, give us a feedback loop of where we are at, at the next meeting.

Motion to adjourn. Approved Ingrid Karlstrom. Seconded Bob Gnuse. All in favor “aye” None opposed. Meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 9:43 pm.
