



## DISCUSSION OF CODE AMENDMENTS REVIEW

**PREPARED BY:** County Planning Staff

**PREPARED FOR:** Planning and Zoning Commission Review  
May 13, 2025

### **MEMO:**

#### **Areas for Consideration of revision.**

**Noticing procedures.** Review 67-6509 which gives the PZC noticing requirements for adoption or amendment of a Comprehensive Plan, and planning review processes which rely on this language. Should the county revert to minimum notice requirements for Variances or other notices not relying on 67-6509?

**Integrate all relevant state statutes addressing subdivision of irrigated lands or where irrigation infrastructure exists.** (including replacing setbacks language for irrigation canals 15').

**Traffic study thresholds, and triggers for Traffic Impact studies and potentially NP evaluations.**

**Dan Leemon is researching standards from other jurisdictions related to wetlands and water resources setbacks.**

**Short Plat language which refers to Administrative approval.**

**Separate procedures for Requests for reconsideration and appeals, with clearer process and notice language.**

**Wildfire Hazard Overlay provisions.**

**How should public input and recommendations be considered at this time? Does the PZC want to entertain individuals with specific suggestions for revision or should they follow a different process outlined in the LDC?**

**(4) Any person may petition the commission or, in absence of a commission, the governing board for a plan amendment at any time, unless the governing board has established by resolution a minimum interval between consideration of requests to amend, which interval shall not exceed six (6) months. The commission may recommend amendments to the comprehensive plan and to other ordinances authorized by this chapter to the governing board at any time.**