



PLANNING & ZONING MEETING MINUTES

March 25, 2026, at 7:00 PM

Meeting Type – Special Meeting and Work Session

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Wilson called the meeting to order at 7.00 PM

ROLL CALL & ESTABLISH QUORUM:

Administrator Corson took roll call.

Present:

Dan Schou and Chairman Wilson are all present.

Absent:

Member Stewart,

A quorum was established.

TONIGHT'S APPOINTMENTS/ NEW BUSINESS:

a.) Approval of Updated Site Plan

Project: RB26-000004 – New Single-Family Residence

Applicant: Graciela Lopez Corona

Location: 456 Riverview Drive, Lot #99, Riverview Meadows

Staff and Commission reviewed the updated site plan. The applicant presented the revisions and responded to questions.

- The Commission indicated the site plan appeared satisfactory.
- It was noted that final review comments from the Building Official (Dee J.) were still pending.
- The applicant inquired about beginning excavation; the Commission advised that no excavation may occur until approval is received from the Building Official.

Motion:

Member Schou made a motion to approve RB26-000001. Chairman Wilson seconded

the motion. Voting Yea: Member Schou, & Chairman Wilson. Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. PUD Process Evaluation & Annexation Review Requirements

The Commission held a work session discussion regarding the current Planned Unit Development (PUD) process as outlined in the LUDC and its application to annexations.

Staff Presentation

Planning & Zoning Administrator Gina Corson provided an overview of concerns identified through recent annexation applications:

- The current LUDC requires:
 - A PUD concept for annexations
 - A PUD for properties over one (1) acre
- Staff identified that:
 - The PUD process is being applied as a blanket requirement, rather than a targeted tool
 - PUDs are intended for site-specific zoning deviations, not conceptual planning
 - Requiring a PUD at annexation forces applicants into premature, detailed commitments
 - This creates inefficiencies, repeated amendments, and unnecessary administrative burden

Proposed Direction

Staff introduced the concept of a three-part framework:

1. Master Plan (Conceptual Level)
 - Required at annexation
 - Provides general vision and intended use
 - Flexible and non-binding
2. Zoning / Standard Permitting
 - Used when development complies with base zoning
3. PUD Process
 - Reserved for deviations from base zoning

The intent is to:

- Align review level with project complexity
- Improve efficiency
- Maintain appropriate oversight

Commission Discussion

The Commission discussed:

- The difference between **conceptual planning vs. binding PUD requirements**
- Whether requiring detailed plans at annexation is appropriate
- The burden placed on applicants when no deviation from zoning is proposed
- The importance of maintaining oversight without overregulation
- The need to evaluate **complexity vs. acreage** rather than using a 1-acre trigger

Key themes included:

- Support for shifting toward a **Master Plan-based approach**
- Agreement that current PUD requirements can be **overly burdensome**
- Recognition that **future development still undergoes additional review stages**

Public Comment

Multiple members of the public provided comment, including:

General Topics Raised:

- Infrastructure capacity (water, sewer, roads)
- Legal access concerns
- Development expectations following annexation
- Long-term impacts of density increases
- Importance of clear limitations and enforceability

Concerns Regarding Proposed Changes:

- Eliminating PUD requirements may reduce safeguards
- Need for **engineering and safety review early in the process**, especially for:
 - Steep slopes
 - Landslide-prone areas
- Risk of relying on non-binding conceptual plans
- Potential environmental and geotechnical impacts

Suggestions from Public:

- Maintain PUD requirements for **hazardous or complex terrain**
- Require clear development expectations at annexation
- Consider **phased or tiered review processes**
- Ensure infrastructure capacity is evaluated early
- Explore adding **hazard mitigation standards** to the LUDC

Commission Response to Public Comment

The Commission acknowledged:

- The importance of **safety, infrastructure, and environmental considerations**
- That current code lacks clear standards for **hazardous terrain and slopes**
- The need to potentially incorporate:
 - Slope limitations
 - Geotechnical requirements
 - Environmental protections

Staff clarified that:

- The proposed changes aim to **improve clarity**, not reduce oversight
- Engineering, infrastructure, and safety reviews would still occur at appropriate stages
- The current PUD concept requirement is **undefined and inconsistently applied**

Next Steps / Direction

The Commission agreed:

- The draft framework presented by staff is a **good starting point**
- Additional review and refinement are needed
- Commissioners will review the draft language and provide feedback

ADJOURN MEETING:

Motion made by Planning & Zoning Commission Member Schou to adjourn, seconded by Chairman Wilson.

Voting Yea: Planning & Zoning Commission Member Schou, and Planning & Zoning Chairman Wilson

Motion carries. Meeting adjourned at 8:23 PM



Melisa Wilson, Chairman

5.12.26

Date



Gina Corson, Planning & Zoning Administrator

5/12/26

Date

Prepared and Transcribed By:



5/12/26

Gina Corson, Acting Planning & Zoning Administrator
Date

** Minutes are a summary of the meeting **