



PLANNING & ZONING MEETING MINUTES

April 20, 2026, at 7:00 PM

Meeting Type – 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:

Member Dan Schou, Member Rachael Stewart, Chairman Wilson, Councilman Larsen, and Citizen Brett Bennet are all present.

A quorum was established.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

The meeting consisted solely of discussion items, focused on proposed updates and revisions to the **Land Use Development Code (LUDC)**.

A. Code Update Structure & Clarity

- Positive feedback was provided on the format and organization of proposed code updates.
- Commission appreciated the breakdown of:
 - What changes are being made
 - Why changes are necessary
- Noted that additional review time is needed due to the volume and complexity of revisions.

B. CDMP (Conceptual Development Master Plan)

- Discussion focused on:
 - When a CDMP is triggered

- Its role as an intermediate step between annexation and PUD
- **Key points:**
 - CDMP intended for large-scale or phased developments
 - Provides a conceptual (non-regulatory) planning framework
 - Helps avoid requiring full PUDs for projects that do not warrant it

Consensus:

- CDMP fills an important gap between:
 - Annexation-level review (high-level)
 - Full PUD (detailed and regulatory)
- Some flexibility and interpretation will be necessary in determining applicability.

C. Annexation vs Development Expectations

- Clarified that:
 - Annexation requires only a conceptual report (high-level feasibility)
 - Development proposals follow later through CDMP or PUD
- Discussion emphasized:
 - Applicants are responsible for infrastructure costs related to development
 - Annexation does not guarantee development

D. Excavation, Grading, and Land Disturbance

Key Issues Identified:

- Current code is too vague regarding:
 - Definition of excavation
 - When permits are required
 - Thresholds for regulation
- No clear excavation permit framework exists
- Difficulty enforcing standards due to lack of specificity

Concerns Raised:

- Large-scale excavation impacting:
 - Drainage
 - Adjacent properties
 - Hillside stability
- Stockpiling of dirt on adjacent or vacant properties
- Distinction between:
 - Minor landscaping activities (e.g., flower beds)
 - Significant land disturbance

Discussion Highlights:

- Need to balance:
 - Property rights
 - Health, safety, and welfare
- Avoid over-regulation of minor activities
- Address extreme cases (e.g., hillside cutting, erosion, safety hazards)

Potential Solutions Discussed:

- Define excavation more clearly in code
- Establish trigger thresholds, such as:
 - Square footage of disturbance
 - Cubic yards of material moved
 - Slope percentage
- Consider tiered review system (similar to Jackson/Teton County):
 - Low impact → exempt
 - Moderate → limited review
 - High impact → full review/engineering

Consensus:

- Current code section requires significant revision
- Direction to:
 - Research comparable jurisdictions (Jackson, Teton County)
 - Develop clear, enforceable thresholds
 - Avoid subjective interpretation where possible

E. Building Height & Grade Determination

- Identified inconsistencies in how building height is measured:
 - Finished grade vs native grade vs road elevation
- Concern:
 - Applicants can manipulate finished grade to increase building height
- Issues include:
 - Drainage impacts to neighboring properties
 - Inconsistent building elevations

Discussion Points:

- Consider using:
 - Native (undisturbed) grade
 - Or “whichever is more restrictive” between native and finished grade
- Importance of requiring grading plans for proper evaluation

Consensus:

- Further research needed
- Must align with grading and excavation standards

F. Change of Use / Occupancy

- Clarification provided:
 - Applies when a structure changes use (e.g., restaurant → apartments)

- Triggers:
 - Code compliance updates
 - Life-safety requirements (egress, etc.)

G. Application Validity (90 Days)

- Clarified that:
 - Applications remain valid for 90 days
 - If incomplete after 90 days, application must restart

H. Permit Transferability

- Discussion regarding:
 - Transfer of permits when property ownership changes
- General understanding:
 - Permits run with the land, not the applicant
 - Extensions are tied to the permit, not ownership
- Noted as an area needing clarification in code

I. Site Plan Requirements

- Discussion on whether plans must be stamped
- Clarified:
 - Not all site plans require professional stamps
 - When required, should specify appropriate professional:
 - Civil Engineer
 - Landscape Architect

J. Definitions – Accessory Structures

- Discussed whether to explicitly include greenhouses
- Determined current language (“similar subordinate structures”) likely sufficient

5. GENERAL CONSENSUS / DIRECTION

- Significant portions of the draft LUDC require:
 - Additional refinement
 - Clearer definitions
 - Better enforcement mechanisms
- Priority areas for revision:
 1. Excavation & grading standards
 2. Building height measurement
 3. Permit processes and thresholds

ADJOURN MEETING:

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

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

Motion carries. Meeting adjourned at 8:32 PM

Melisa Wilson, Chairman Date

Gina Corson, Planning & Zoning Administrator Date

Prepared and Transcribed By:

** Minutes are a
summary of the meeting
**

Gina Corson, Acting Planning & Zoning Administrator
Date

DRAFT