Staff Report

To:	City Council
From:	Jade Krueger, Community Development Director
Report Date:	10/27/26
Meeting Date:	11/3/26
Project Name:	Request for Reconsideration – SUB25-3 Corona Valley Su
Project File:	AP26-2 (SUB25-3)
Review:	Subdivision Preliminary Plat
Future Routing:	Written Statement of Decision Review

ACTION REQUESTED: ☐ Ordinance ☐ Permit ☒ Motion ☐Discussion ☒Public Hearing

APPLICANTS (AFFECTED PARTIES): Brett and Elizabeth Bowhan, Dawn and Delaney Smith, Kim and Rob Bailey, Dirk and Patty Leasure, Jerai Moulton, Nicholas Harbert and Sarah Dunn, Christina Heilman, Jay and Susan Pence, Jenny and Brian Van Winkle, Karin and Joe Sadauckas, Meghan Traynor and Craig Smith, Edward Twohey, Cheryl Letchworth, Jen Maisch Calder, Vickie and Neil Van Dresar, Michael Coyle, Linsey and Phillip Edmonds, Aaron and Rachel Colldeweih.

REPRESENTATIVE: Trentadue Law Office, Anna Trentadue

SUMMARY: On September 29, 2026, a request for reconsideration was received for the City Council's decision to approve SUB25-3 Corona Valley Subdivision's preliminary plat application for a master plan and phase 1 approval. City Council conditionally approved the preliminary plat application on September 1, 2026 and subsequently approved the statement of decision on September 15, 2026. The motion and conditioned approval was as follows:

> **Council Member Knowles made a motion** to approve the proposed Corona Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat Phase I and Master Plan, based on the finding that the proposal as presented meets the criteria for approval, as listed in the Staff report and in Article 14.5.6 of the Driggs Land Development Code so long as the following conditions are met:
>
> 1. All remaining technical public works comments be addressed and resubmitted in the improvement plans prior to submission to DEQ for review. Public Works to confirm all comments are addressed.
> 2. An avigation easement agreement be executed and referenced on the final plat.
> 3. Developer to provide 1 additional ADA parking slots to be ADA compliance for the park space.
> 4. Staff incorporate the additional mitigations measures into the development agreement:
>   a. Developer agrees to voluntarily contribute $158, 852 to offset direct capacity impacts to Teton County School District. This will be proportionate by phase/unit and paid to the school district prior to recordation of each phase's final plat.
>   i. Phase 1 units: (14 detached + 34 attached) = $45,988
>   ii. Phase 2 units: (36 attached) = $29,808
>   iii. Phase 3 units: (8 detached and 24 attached) = $30,064
>   iv. Phase 4 units: (32 attached) = $26,496
>   v. Phase 5 units: (32 attached) = $26,496
>   b. Developer agrees to contribute $45,000 annually for five years from the first building permit to Teton County Sheriff Department. A separate agreement will be negotiated and executed.

Council Member Popilsky seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken on the above motion. Council Member Knowles, aye; Council Member Popilsky, aye. Council Member Johnston, opposed. The motion carried 2-1.

RECONSIDERATION PROCESS: Under the LDC Art.14.3.7, there is an administrative process for an appeal or a request for reconsideration. In this instance, City Council was the decision-making body on the Preliminary Plat materials, and therefore the application is a request for reconsideration of that final approval decision. Any applicant or affected person seeking judicial review of a final decision must first request reconsideration of the final decision. The request must be submitted no later than the 14th calendar day following the date the written decision was issued. The item is then to be scheduled with City Council. A written decision shall be provided to the applicant or affected person within 60 days of receipt of the request for reconsideration or the request is deemed denied.

REQUEST: The applicants raise the following items for grounds for reconsideration *(numbered 1-11 in **bold italics** below).* The staff response for Council's consideration immediately follows.

1. ***Demand for full disclosure of ex-parte communications with staff and "specifically explain why one set of facts was more compelling or accurate than the other."***

   City Council communications with City Staff are not considered ex-parte. Staff does not understand the applicant's request of differentiating between different sets of facts.

2. ***Technical review of the improvement plans must be completed and approved prior to any finding that the preliminary plant criteria have been met.***

Improvement plans include many pages of technical specifications for all roadway, water, sewer, sidewalk, parks, and grading plans, to name just a few items. This project in particular has an improvements plan set of 27 pages for phase 1. Public Works last review before the City Council meeting on September 1, 2026 was dated August 24, 2026 (Exhibit D); this review included the Improvement Plans for Phase I dated August 12, 2026 (included as Exhibit K). There were minor requested adjustments to the improvement plan set and cost estimate, but the minor requests were appropriate to condition upon approval by City Council. Idaho Department of Water Quality (DEQ) will not review plan sets until City Council has approved the development and therein grants a will-serve for the development to utilize City Services. It is a reasonable and appropriate for that review to occur once the plans have been approved by the City.

Ultimately the preliminary plat is not considered approved for construction until the conditions placed on the application by City Council are met. The Land Development Code further establishes this in Article 14.5.6.H, which indicates that "following approval of a preliminary plat from the City Council, the applicant will work with staff to ensure the following items are resolved prior to receiving a letter of Preliminary Plat Approval, which allows construction to start. 1. Recordation of the Development Agreement. 2. Approval of Improvement Plans and financial guarantee received per Section 12.1.3."

3. ***The record is insufficient to sustain a finding of fact or draw conclusions of law that the Criteria 14.5.6.F.5 has been met. The applicants raise the following components as "Missing or inadequate development agreement components:"***
   a. *No condomininium declaration*
      There are no condominium units being proposed in this project. All units are single family attached or detached.

b. *No construction management plan*
Construction Management Plans are submitted prior to construction, along with copies of the improvement plans and construction schedules, and they must contain all of the cited provisions within the development agreement. A construction meeting occurs between the development team and the City of Driggs' public works prior to construction.

c. *No timeline or plan regarding phasing*
The phasing plan is included in the Improvement Plans (Sheet C-7). This phasing plan will be incorporated into the development agreement and was reviewed by City Council at the September 1, 2026 City Council meeting.

d. *Specific development agreement language*
The Force Majeure event language is standard language in the development agreement template. Each phase of the subdivision (phases 1-5) will have to obtain preliminary plat approvals and subsequently prior to construction must submit financial surety in the form of 125% of the cost estimate of that phases' public improvements to ensure that phase's infrastructure is completed and accepted. After the improvements have been accepted, a 10% warranty for the cost estimate of the public improvements is held for two years in case any repairs are required. The development agreement in this instance is for the master plan of the development and phase 1 construction.

4. Council has granted a multi-phase master plan entitlement where there is only enough water for Phase 1.

The preliminary plat approval is granting construction for phase one of the master plan. The water modeling concludes that phases one and two would not require any off-site improvements. For any phase requiring those off-site improvements, the preliminary plat review would require that necessary mitigation to occur. To further clarify, Phases 2-5 would be required to go through preliminary and final plat approval processes, including public hearings.

Each phase is required to mitigate its impact to the water system based on the number of lots being platted prior to recordation of any final plat. The development agreement for the master plan captures this requirement at .85 gpm per ERU or equivalent residential unit. No phase would be approved without the required water mitigation.

City Council has the ultimate authority to approve each phase's preliminary and final plat, similar to all master planned development within City limits (such as Shoshoni Plains).

5. Applicants claim there is "lack of deliberation on conflicting facts regarding fiscal impacts."

Deliberation on specific comment letters received is not a requirement of the City Council. Staff has reincluded the specific referenced comment "CV-FIA" for Council's consideration as exhibit "J". The Request for Reconsideration brings forward the following points as flaws in the applicant's Fiscal Impact Analysis:

1. *Fundamental lack of understanding of how taxes are determined in Idaho.*

Applicant assumes that growth included in this subdivision will result in more than 8% growth per year. Each phase is required to go through the preliminary and final plat phases of a subdivision and the request is for preliminary plat approval of Phase I and the Master Plan.

2. *Under-estimates the cost of schools and law enforcement and financial contributions of Corona Valley to each of these.*
   Teton Valley School District produced a Growth Fund Contribution Study that indicates specifically that single-family development will have a $1,274 cost per newly constructed unit. The applicant has agreed to a voluntary mitigation amount to be paid to the school per platted phase of the project.

3. *County law enforcement and school district calculations show evidence of "double-dipping."*

   City council can discuss and determine if additional analysis is needed.

6. Demand for disclosure of the full details of Keller's Travel Demand Model which the City is now using to determine compliance with LDC 14.5.6.F 5 and 6 in lieu of a revised Traffic Impact Study "TIS" as required by Code and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

This point does not support reconsideration of the decision. Applicant has been provided full records of the travel demand model, including inputs, through a public records request that was satisfied on July 7, 2026.

The Planning and Zoning Commission, clarified in the meeting where a recommendation was made that they were seeking the updated demand model inputs from the third-party consultant, Keller. Article 14.5.11 of the LDC for Large-Scale Development Subdivision specifies that a quantified analysis of impacts on public services that would be provided to the development, including a traffic impact analysis is required with the preliminary plat. The LDC does not specify that an update is required.

7. Non-conformance with the Preliminary Plat Review Criteria 14.5.6.F.6 requiring the application to "substantially conform with underlying zoning and applicable elements of this Title and conform with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and polices, such as the Transportation Plan and Recreation Master Plan, and established maximum residential densities."

a. *Non-conformance with the RS-7 Zone.*
   City Council confirmed that the RS-7 zone district definition allows for multiple building types including both attached and detached single-family homes. There is no other codified definition of percentages of building types allowed in a specific zoning district. The base density is codified for the RS-7 district in Article 14.5.6.B as 4 units per acre, which aligns with the Comprehensive Plan's vision in the Future Land Use Map as 2-5 units per acre for this area.

b. *Lot size/lot width/driveway configuration*
   - *Applicant states Lot 1 in block 4 is below the 7,000 SF min.*
     The Master Plan indicates that this lot is 6,995 SF, which meets the requirement for an attached home of 4,500 SF but not for a single family detached. The schematic drawing, which is not a requirement, had indicated this lot as a single family. **This should be clarified and corrected. The adjacent lot boundary can accommodate for the 5 feet if the lot is for a detached home. Staff recommends City Council modify the decision to review a preliminary plat for just phase 1.**

   - *Applicant states Block 1, lot 5 and 6 are below the minimum required lot size.*

The Master Plan indicates that Lot 5 is 8,648 SF and Lot 6 is 7,659 SF both of which meet the minimum lot size requirement for a SF detached lot of 7,000 SF. In reviewing lot width:

> Per LDC 2.1.2.B "Lot width is the distance between the two side lot lines measured at the primary street property line along the straight line or along the chord of the property line on a curvilinear lot."

When reviewing these lots and the curvilinear lines, it is found that Block 1, Lots 4, 5, 6 and 7 (which are included in Phase I) and Block 4, Lots 10 and 12 (proposed phase 3 are slightly too narrow at the property line frontage (see staff exhibit C). Staff recommends City Council modify the decision to review the preliminary plat for Phase 1.

- *Applicant states several lots have a width of under 40 feet which would not allow for parking and driveway areas to be less than 40% of frontage (reference to LDC 11.1.3.A)'*

  Lots for an attached home are allowed to be 35' in width. Detached homes are to be 65' in width. Staff indicates above (and as an attached exhibit) that 6 lots are too narrow based on the definition of lot width measurements of curvilinear line at the primary street. Staff recommends review of Phase I Preliminary Plat.

  Parking is reviewed at the time of individual building permit. The parking requirement for single family residence (attached or detached) is two spaces as defined in Article 11.1.3 of the LDC. Tandem parking is permitted which must have a combined dimension of 9 feet wide by 36 feet in length, as is the use of garages or shared driveways. The residential one-way minimum width for a residential one-way is 12 feet. It is feasible to accommodate a driveway and various parking configurations that would be compliant so long as the lot widths meet the minimum dimensional requirements.

c. *Nonconformance with 2025 Transportation Master Plan shows Cowboy Trail as a recommended Minor Residential Collector where the planning and public works team recommended minimizing driveway accesses. Here, the preliminary plat (master plan) proposes 9 driveways will empty onto this collector road.*

   An access management policy has not been adopted at this time. The Land Development Code Article 12.1.5 specifies accesses to collector streets are to be minimized. In this instance, the developer has worked with City Staff to reduce the access points onto Cowboy Trail. The finding is that access points were minimized on the future Minor Residential Collector.

d. *Nonconformance with Comprehensive Plan FLUM (future land use map).*
   The specific criteria for approval of a preliminary plat Article 14.5.6.F.6

   > "The plat and development plans substantially conform with the underlying zoning and applicable provisions of this Title and conform with the City's Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and policies, such as the Transportation Plan and Recreation Master Plan, and established maximum residential densities."

City Council found substantial conformance with the Comprehensive Plan as the articulated density is 3-5 units per acre. This parcel could have theoretically yielded 194 units and still be in conformance with the 3-5 units per acre as identified in the FLUM.

The Staff report (page 4) included analysis of the application as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan, which indicates compliance of the subdivision as restated below:

> **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** The Preliminary Plat has been reviewed for its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan (Res 379-20). The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) indicates an area, which includes the subject property, as being appropriate for single-family and two-family Residential (2 to 5 units per acre). The single-family and two-family residential future land use designation is described as:
>
> *The Single-Family and Two-Family Residential category should be developed or maintained as quality neighborhoods with architectural features that support a cohesive but not identical character. They should be accessible to Downtown through pathways and sidewalks and support a diversity of park types and other amenities.…*
>
> More specifically, the FLUM includes the following description for this area:
>
> *ST2: This recently annexed area has the ability to infill existing great neighborhoods with easy access to trails, Downtown, and schools*
>
> The Comp Plan stresses the importance of pathways and sidewalks, easy access to trails, downtown, and schools, and supporting a diversity of parks and other amenities. Additionally, the Comp Plan emphasizes goals in the Transportation Plan including future connections. The Comp Plan recommends a multi-use pathway along the irrigation canal, which the applicant has included access to in their plans. The Comp Plan echoes the Transportation Plan in calling for road connections between Ross and LeGrand Pierre, which this application does in its master planning through Cowboy Trail.
>
> GOAL 2.1.3: Meet the housing needs of the community while optimizing City services and amenities. *The application may meet this goal.*
>
> GOAL 2.1.4: Facilitate the development of diverse, attainable housing options within City limits that will enhance the local economy, add vibrancy to Downtown, and help preserve the character of the area as indicated in the 2016 Teton County housing program goals and the 2019 Teton County, Idaho Affordable Housing Strategic Plan. *The application may meet this goal*.
>
> The proposal supports these visions for our residents by providing smaller lot sizes, with a variety of housing types such as medium density single family and attached single family homes outside of the downtown core but near services via public infrastructure, and trails to downtown, schools, and recreation. The unit proposal is an appropriate amount over the base density, providing deed restricted workforce housing units for the QWHIP program but not out of character of the surrounding neighborhoods that are also single family and twin home. The proposal utilizes existing zoning, creates connected parks and open spaces, and provides a collector street between Ross and LeGrand Pierre.

8. Violation of Driggs LDC 15.5.6.B.2: Density Bonus and Idaho's Vesting Rule.

Applicant submitted their concept plan, which is reviewed for conformance not an approval or denial under the City of Driggs' subdivision ordinance Article 14.5.6.C. The preliminary plat for SUB25-3 was first submitted on November 21, 2025 but not deemed complete. The complete application utilizes the effective ordinance for the Land Development code 492-25.

The qualified workforce housing incentive program is an opt-in program, meaning it is not a requirement of any developer. The density bonus is calculated using the base density of the property and requiring that 20% of the "bonus units" be deed restricted as workforce units.

> 38.8 acres (parcel size) x 4 units/acre allowed in the RS-7 Zone District = 155.2 units as the base density. The applicant, under the City of Driggs LDC (CH 14 Qualified Workforce Housing Incentive) has submitted an application with a density higher than the base density as codified in 14.5.6.B.

Applicant's proposal of 180 units – 155.2 units as the base density is 24.8 "bonus" units. To receive the density bonus, participation in the qualified workforce housing incentive program is required. The developer is obligated to deed restrict 20% of the bonus units, in this case 4.96 units or contribute the payment in lieu as calculated in the Qualified workforce housing incentive program.

The developer is deed restricting 9 units in the master plan, which is more than the obligation of 4.96 units. The development agreement articulates this by phase and final plat under Section 11.

> reflects the breakdown of 9 required QWHIP deed restricted units required with the final plat of each phase of development:
>
> a. Phase 1: Block 10, Lots 2 & 4. Block 2, Lots 7 & 13. Block 2, Lot 4.
> b. Phase 2: Block, 5, Lot 1 & 3.
> c. Phase 3: Block 6, Lot 1 & 17.
>
> If for any reason, a physical unit is not provided with a QWHIP deed restriction by the time of a final plat application, payment in lieu for each unit required in that phase, utilizing the current adopted administrative procedures and housing guidelines, must be transmitted to the City of Driggs.

9. No phase 1 plat has been submitted or reviewed by the Council.

Staff notes this is correct. As stated in the September 1, 2026 City Council Meeting, the Master Plan was presented but a plat only showing Phase 1 and what is being platted should be presented. Staff recommends this be corrected. City Council can modify their approval for a review of this specific item.

10. The City has failed to produce a "reasoned statement" in the final decision per I.C. 67-6535.

Staff presented City Council a Statement of Decision for the Preliminary Plat approval, which articulates the applicable plans, ordinances, public record, motion made by City Council and all conditions associated with an

approval. This was presented at the following City Council meeting, approved and signed on September 15, 2026.

> §67-6535 states that "*the approval or denial of any application required or authorized pursuant to this chapter shall be in writing and accompanied by a reasoned statement that explains the criteria and standards considered relevant, states the relevant contested facts relied upon, and explains the rationale for the decision based on the applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, relevant ordinance and statutory provisions, pertinent constitutional principles and factual information contained in the record.*"

11. ***Incorporate by reference all of the City's planning documents***

The Staff report references the Land Development Code (Ord 292-25), Comprehensive Plan – 2020, and Transportation Master Plan 2025. The statement of decision references these documents and incorporates the staff report as the record.

PUBLIC HEARING: This item was duly noticed in Teton Valley News as a public hearing on October 14, and October 21, 2026. Mailed notices to property owners within 300 feet of the affected property were sent on October 16, 2026, and the property was posted on October 19, 2026.

Public Comments received by October 26, 2026 at 5:00 PM as indicated on the public hearing notice are attached to this staff report.

ACTIONS: Per Art.14.3.7.E.2, City Council can affirm, modify or reverse the decision after compliance with applicable procedural standards on the preliminary plat approval for Corona Valley Subdivision, Phase I and Master Plan (SUB25-3).

APPROVAL CRITERIA OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT: As stated in the Staff Report for City Council on September 1, 2026, the following articulates the approval criteria for a Preliminary Plat following the process for a Full Plat Subdivision (LDC Art. 14.5.6), which requires a public hearing by the PZC and approval by City Council. The approval criteria (bold and underlined) for Preliminary Plat, staff comments from September 1, 2026 City Council meeting (purple), City Council conditions on the September 1, 2026 decision (*red*), and staff recommendations for any modification (**Blue**) are as follows:

1. **The plat has been created and stamped by a licensed land surveyor in the State of Idaho and includes the minimum requirements set out in Idaho Statutes Section 50-1304.**
   Plat will need to be updated to reflect final decisions. The final plat will be reviewed by the Teton County survey reviewer for technical review after City Council's approval of the final plat.

   Staff recommends City Council modify the decision to review the preliminary plat for phase 1. The submitted plat should be included solely as the master plan for the development.

2. **The plat contains an Owner's Certificate specifying ownership and maintenance responsibilities acceptable to the city for roads, parks, open space and other public or common facilities or areas.**
   Plat indicates streets will be dedicated to the public. Dedication and maintenance responsibilities will be updated on the plat to reflect final decisions. **See above.**

3. **The Improvement Plans have been approved by City Public Works, City Engineer, Teton County Fire Protection District, Idaho DEQ and any other agency or department having jurisdiction over the improvements or land thereon.**
   Public Works has completed a technical review of improvement plan. DEQ will review the plan set once a will-serve letter is issued for the development, which occurs after City Council approval of a project.

City Council conditioned this item that all remaining technical public works comments be addressed and resubmitted in the improvement plans prior to submission to DEQ for review. The LDC Article 14.5.6.H indicates that "Following approval of a Preliminary Plat from the City Council, the applicant will work with staff to ensure the following items are resolved prior to receiving a letter of Preliminary Plat approval, which allows construction to start. 1. Recordation of the Development Agreement. 2. Approval of Improvement Plans and financial guarantee received per section 12.1.3."

4. **Any proposed phasing is clearly shown on a development master plan and provides for orderly development of the land conforming at all times to this Land Development Code.**
   The proposed phasing is clearly shown on the development master plan and aligns with staff's recommendation. This phasing approach also supports the City's long-term transportation objectives by facilitating street build out of residential collector Cowboy Trail in the first phase as well as the park space. The water modeling technical review memo indicates that Phase I can occur without any offsite mitigations but completing Phases 2-4 may require a new transmission line, which can be addressed in the development agreement for future phases.

5. **The Development Agreement and subdivision design satisfactorily mitigate for the effects from the development and phasing timelines on the ability of political subdivisions of the state, including school districts, to deliver services without compromising quality of service delivery to current residents or imposing substantial additional costs upon current residents to accommodate the proposed subdivision. Delivered services include, but are not limited to transportation systems, public utilities, highway jurisdictions, law enforcement and emergency services, solid waste, health care, affordable housing, education, economic development, and environmental protection. Subdivision and offsite improvements may be required for any of the above, in proportion to the impact made by the development.**
   The impacts of the Corona Valley development are proposed to be mitigated through the following measures:
   - Collection of applicable impact fees, including parks, fire and rescue, and transportation.
   - Dedication of appropriate park space and amenities to the City of Driggs as well as offsite cross walk safety access improvements to restroom facilities and any additional offsite restroom amenities, as recommended and approved by City Council.
   - Water rights mitigation at 0.85 gallons per minute per equivalent residential unit (ERU), required to be transferred prior to recordation of any final plat, including the deed restricted units. No waiver is requested.
   - Participation in the QWHIP or the Density Bonus program, providing 9 units for deed restricted workforce housing.
   - The TIS impact mitigations (proportionate share) for off-site improvements identified in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) should be collected prior to final plat recordation. These mitigation requirements will be incorporated into the Development Agreement.
     - $271,800.43 as proportionate shares for Main/LeGrand Pierre, Main/Ross turn lanes, Main/Harper turn lanes, Main/Howard turn lanes, 1st/Little turn lanes only, 5th/Little roundabout, 5th/Ross roundabout.
     - Off-site improvements including crosswalk improvements to Mt. Shredmore Park, an additional bathroom facility at Mt. Shredmore Park, fixing the 5th & Ross "dip" and curb bulb-outs south of Ross Avenue on Cowboy Trail as a traffic calming measure.
   - The developer is offering to contribute to the School District's Growth Contribution Fund using the unit calculations within the study: $45,988 for Phase 1 and $158,852 at full buildout, paid by phase.

- The Developer is offering $45,000 annually for five consecutive years to fund supplemental public-safety police & Sheriff services for additional, measurable services that will be outlined in the Development Agreement and further an Instrument accepted by all parties.

Legal Counsel had no comments on the development agreement.

City Council conditioned that staff incorporate the additional mitigation measures into the development agreement:

a. *Developer agrees to voluntarily contribute $158, 852 to offset direct capacity impacts to Teton County School District. This will be proportionate by phase/unit and paid to the school district prior to recordation of each phase's final plat.*
    i. *Phase 1 units: (14 detached + 34 attached) = $45,988*
    ii. *Phase 2 units: (36 attached) = $29,808*
    iii. *Phase 3 units: (8 detached and 24 attached) = $30,064*
    iv. *Phase 4 units: (32 attached) = $26,496*
    v. *Phase 5 units: (32 attached) = $26,496*
b. *Developer agrees to contribute $45,000 annually for five years from the first building permit to Teton County Sheriff Department. A separate agreement will be negotiated and executed.*

6. **The plat and development plans substantially conform with the underlying zoning and applicable provisions of this Title and conform with the City's Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and policies, such as the Transportation Plan and Recreation Master Plan.**

A detailed zoning analysis is attached as **Exhibit V.** An analysis of adopted plans is included above as well. The zoning analysis indicates that the application conforms with the underlying zoning, applicable provisions, and other City plans and policies. *City Council conditioned that an avigation easement agreement be executed and referenced on the final plat, and that the developer to provide 1 additional ADA parking slots to be ADA compliance for the park space.* **Staff recommends City Council modify the decision to review Phase 1 Preliminary plat.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends City Council review the request for reconsideration, hold a public hearing and deliberate.

Staff recommends City Council modify the decision of approval for SUB25-3 in one of the following ways:

1. The preliminary plat for Phase 1 be reviewed by City Staff and included in the Development Agreement as an exhibit. This ensures that each lot proposed as part of Phase I meets all lot dimension requirements for the respective home type. All detached single-family lots must be a minimum of 65' in width, and all attached single family lots must be a minimum of 35' in width.
2. The preliminary plat for Phase 1 be reviewed by the City Council at a public meeting and included in the Development agreement as an exhibit. This ensures that each lot proposed as part of Phase I meets all lot dimension requirements for the respective home type. All detached single-family lots must be a minimum of 65' in width, and all attached single family lots must be a minimum of 35' in width.

MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

AFFIRM: I move to affirm the decision to conditionally approve the preliminary plat for Corona Valley Subdivision Phase I and Master Plan (SUB25-3) after finding the review criteria for approval of a preliminary plat in LDC Art.14.5.6 can be met.

MODIFY: I move to modify the decision to conditionally approve the preliminary plat for Corona Valley Subdivision Phase I and Master Plan (SUB25-3) in the following ways…

REVERSE: I move to reverse the decision issued on September 1, 2026 for Corona Valley Subdivision, Phase I and Master Plan (SUB25-3) and hereby move to deny the preliminary plat application, having found that the following approval criteria in LDC Art. 14.5.6 cannot be made…

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Request for Reconsideration Application
B. Statement of Decision for the Preliminary Plat Approval of SUB25-3
C. Staff Exhibit on lot dimensions
D. Public Works Comments on the Preliminary Improvement Plans
E. Draft Development Agreement Reviewed by Council
F. City Council Meeting Minutes September 1, 2026
G. SUB25-3 Staff Report for City Council on September 1, 2026
H. SUB25-3 Preliminary Plat (should be labeled Master Plan)
I. Public Comments
J. Referenced CV-FIA Comment – (opposed) Haar, Kathleen
K. SUB25-3 Improvement Plans Phase I_081226