



## **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

Date

---

Gina Corson, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Date

Prepared and Transcribed By:

---

Gina Corson, Acting Planning & Zoning Administrator  
Date

\*\* Minutes are a summary of the meeting \*\*

DRAFT

DRAFT