

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW STRUCTURE

Update:

Revised annexation process to require a **Conceptual Development Plan** rather than a “PUD Concept Plan.”

Why:

The previous requirement did not align with the stage of development at annexation and was not clearly defined, making it difficult to administer. A conceptual plan better reflects the level of information available at annexation and creates a clear, usable process.

Update:

Added a **Conceptual Development Master Plan (CDMP)** process.

Why:

Previously, projects were either pushed into a full PUD or left without a structured planning step. This creates a logical “middle step” that allows for planning-level review without triggering unnecessary regulatory burden.

Update:

Clarified and redefined the purpose and use of **Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)** and removed the blanket requirement for parcels over one (1) acre.

Why:

The previous code overused PUDs, requiring them in situations where they were not appropriate. This created unnecessary complexity and delays. The update ensures PUDs are used only when flexibility from base zoning is truly needed.

PERMITTING SYSTEM RESTRUCTURE

Update:

Created a **tiered permitting system** (Affidavit → Minor Construction → Building Permit).

Why:

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

The prior system only had two extremes—very minimal review or very intensive review. Many projects fell in between. This change allows the level of review and cost to better match project complexity.

Update:

Expanded and clarified the **Minor Construction Permit** and removed items that now have their own permit categories.

Why:

The previous Minor Construction section was overly broad and duplicative. This update improves clarity and reduces confusion for both staff and applicants.

Update:

Created specific permit categories for:

- Decks
- Roofing projects
- Demolition and relocation

Why:

These project types were previously lumped into other categories, which did not reflect their actual complexity. This improves consistency and fairness in permitting.

Update:

Added permit categories for:

- Driveways
- Right-of-Way Excavation / Encroachment
- Grading and Excavation (Private Property)

Why:

These activities were either not addressed or scattered throughout the code. This created gaps in regulation and enforcement. These additions provide complete coverage of common development activities.

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

Update:

Clearly distinguished between **permit types** (what the project is) and **permit classifications** (level of review: affidavit, minor construction, building permit).

Why:

Previously, these concepts were blended together, which caused confusion in application routing, fee assignment, and review authority. This clarification allows the Town and the CitizenServe system to correctly categorize projects and apply the appropriate level of review based on complexity.

Update:

Created a comprehensive **Permit Matrix (Table 2-1)** aligning all permit types with review authority, application requirements, public hearing triggers, and appeal processes.

Why:

The previous table was incomplete and did not reflect actual permitting practices or newly added permit types. This update creates a single, consistent reference point for staff, applicants, and decision-makers.

Update:

Established a clear **review authority hierarchy** between Administrative Staff, Building Official, Planning and Zoning Commission, and Town Council.

Why:

Previously, review authority was inconsistent and unclear, leading to inefficiencies and unpredictability in the process. This update ensures that review level is proportional to project complexity and impact.

Update:

Added **escalation authority** allowing staff to elevate applications to higher levels of review when warranted.

Why:

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

Rigid processes can allow projects with higher impacts to bypass appropriate oversight. This provides necessary flexibility to protect public health, safety, and compatibility with surrounding land uses.

TEMPORARY USES AND STRUCTURES

Update:

Created separate processes for:

- **Temporary Uses (land use regulation)**
- **Temporary Structures (building code regulation)**

Why:

Previously, these were not clearly defined and were often processed under the Minor Construction Permit, which did not align with building code requirements. This update aligns the code with the IBC and clarifies how each is reviewed.

Update:

Aligned Temporary Structure requirements with **IBC Section 3103** (including 120 sq. ft. and occupant thresholds, and 180-day duration).

Why:

The previous code did not reflect adopted building code standards, creating inconsistencies and potential safety issues.

Update:

Clearly distinguished between **permits (authorization to perform work)** and **certificates (authorization for occupancy or completion)**.

Why:

Previously, these processes were not clearly separated, creating confusion regarding when each applied. This update improves workflow clarity, enforcement, and legal defensibility.

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

APPLICATIONS AND SUBMITTALS

Update:

Standardized application requirements across all permit types and clarified required submittals.

Why:

Application requirements were previously inconsistent and scattered, leading to confusion and incomplete submittals.

Update:

Aligned permitting and inspection processes with **real-world workflow and sequencing of approvals**.

Why:

The previous code did not reflect how projects are actually reviewed, inspected, and approved in practice. This update ensures consistency between the code and day-to-day operations.

Update:

Reduced required hard copies of plans from three (3) to two (2).

Why:

This aligns with current I-Code requirements and reduces unnecessary burden on applicants.

Update:

Added provisions allowing **digital submittals and electronic signatures**.

Why:

The previous code assumed paper-based processes and did not support the Town's transition to an online permitting system.

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

Update:

Updated submittal requirements to distinguish between a **Topographical Site Plan (existing conditions)** and a **Grading/Excavation Plan (proposed work)**.

Why:

Previously, site plan requirements did not clearly differentiate between existing site conditions and proposed land disturbance activities, which created confusion for applicants and limited the Town's ability to evaluate grading, drainage, and excavation impacts. This update establishes a clear distinction between the two plan types, ensuring that:

- Existing site conditions (including contours, elevations, and natural features) are properly documented;
- Proposed grading, excavation, and drainage modifications are clearly illustrated; and
- Staff can effectively review potential impacts to drainage patterns, adjacent properties, and public infrastructure.

This improves clarity, consistency, and enforceability while aligning submittal requirements with standard engineering and planning practices.

CITIZENSERVE INTEGRATION

Update:

Added language supporting the use of the **CitizenServe online permitting system**, including automated workflow routing.

Why:

To ensure the code reflects how applications are actually processed and to allow the system to guide applicants to the correct permit type based on inputs.

CONSTRUCTION SITE MANAGEMENT

Update:

Added a new **Construction Site Management section** addressing:

- Noise
- Dust
- Trash
- Parking

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

- Material storage
- Sanitation facilities

Why:

These items were either not addressed or scattered throughout the code. This creates a centralized and enforceable standard.

SUBDIVISIONS

Update:

Renamed the “Master Plan Report” to **Technical Report** and updated requirements.

Why:

To eliminate confusion with the Town’s adopted Master Plan and the new conceptual planning process.

SPECIAL USE PERMITS

Update:

Expanded and clarified the **Special Use Permit** section.

Why:

The previous section was minimal and relied heavily on a separate ordinance, making it difficult to interpret and apply.

CERTIFICATES AND OCCUPANCY

Update:

Clarified and expanded:

- Certificate of Occupancy (CO)
- Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO)
- Certificate of Completion
- Certificate of Change of Use / Occupancy

Why:

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

The previous code did not clearly define these processes or when they were required.

Update:

Added authority to **revoke certificates**.

Why:

Provides enforcement capability when compliance is not maintained.

Update:

Added a formal **Change of Use / Occupancy process**.

Why:

Previously not clearly defined, creating gaps in enforcement and life-safety review.

INSPECTIONS AND ENFORCEMENT

Update:

Clarified required inspections and consequences for failure to obtain them.

Why:

Ensures compliance and provides clear authority for enforcement.

Update:

Incorporated **mandatory electrical inspections** by the State of Wyoming.

Why:

Aligns local processes with state requirements and ensures consistency.

Update:

Clarified **Stop Work Order authority and procedures**.

Why:

Provides clear enforcement tools and avoids ambiguity in application.

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

ADMINISTRATION AND PROCESSING

Update:

Updated the **Application Processing Schedule** and recommended moving it to resolution format.

Why:

Allows flexibility to adjust timelines without requiring full code amendments (e.g., meeting schedule changes, CitizenServe workflow updates).

Update:

Removed duplicate public notice requirements and referenced **Public Notice Ordinance 2026-002**.

Why:

Creates a centralized and consistent approach to public notice.

Update:

Performed a full **consistency and cross-reference cleanup** throughout Part 2, including terminology alignment and removal of conflicting or duplicative language.

Why:

The previous code contained inconsistencies and internal contradictions that made it difficult to interpret and enforce. This update improves clarity, usability, and legal defensibility.

DEFINITIONS

Update:

Updated and expanded definitions to reflect:

- New processes
- Missing terms

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

- Clarifications of existing terms

Why:

The previous definitions section lacked clarity and did not support the updated code structure.

PERMIT PROCESSING AND FEES

Update:

Updated the **Permit Processing Schedule** and **Fee Schedule** to reflect the revised permit structure, including the addition of mid-level permits and new permit categories.

Why:

The previous schedules were based on an outdated permitting framework that did not account for the expanded permit types or the newly established tiered system (Affidavit, Minor Construction, Building Permit).

These updates ensure that:

- Processing timelines align with current review procedures and meeting schedules;
- Fees are proportionate to the scope and complexity of each permit type;
- New permit categories (e.g., accessory structures, grading, driveway, right-of-way, temporary uses/structures) are accurately reflected; and
- The Town can administer permits consistently and efficiently.

This also ensures that applicants are not overcharged for simpler projects while more complex projects receive the appropriate level of review, oversight, and associated fees.

Additionally, updating the processing schedule supports integration with the CitizenServe system and allows for more flexible administrative updates when adopted by resolution rather than ordinance.

OVERALL RESULT

Update:

Comprehensive restructuring of Part 2.

Why:

LUDC UPDATES AND RATIONALE- RUNNING LIST

The previous code:

- Contained gaps
- Had inconsistent processes
- Was difficult to administer
- Did not align with current codes or practices

This update creates a system that is:

- Clear
- Consistent
- Scalable
- Enforceable
- Aligned with modern permitting practices