

Jim Harris, Chair
Tiffany Wilson, Vice Chair
Suzannah Ballard
Joan Dzuro
Paul Lehr
Gabriele Medley
JP Thornton
Phil Annett, Alternate
Mary Costa, Alternate
Lonnie Stevenson, Alternate



Lake Havasu Unified School
District Boardroom
2200 Havasupai Boulevard
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403

Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting

Minutes - Final

Wednesday, May 6, 2026

9:00 AM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Harris called the meeting order at 9:00 a.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

Chair Harris led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Present: 8 - Suzannah Ballard, Joan Dzuro, Paul Lehr, Tiffany Wilson, Lonnie Stevenson, Jim Harris, Gabriele Medley and Mary Costa

Absent: 2 - JP Thornton and Phil Annett

Vice Chair Wilson is attending remotely.

With one vacancy, Chair Harris invited Commissioner Costa to the dais.

4. CORRESPONDENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Planning Division Manager Chris Gilbert explained the Planned Development/Rezone requests for Circle K at 51 Riviera Drive and Clean Freak Car Wash at 1871 Mesquite Avenue have formally been withdrawn. The Commission's recommendations will not be presented to City Council on Tuesday, May 26, 2026, as noticed.

The terms for one regular seat and two alternate seats on the Commission will end June 30, 2026. The Board of Adjustment will also have three regular seats and three alternate seats available. Applications are available on the City's website and through the City Clerk's Office. The deadline for applications is Friday, May 29, 2026, at 5:00 p.m.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Harris provided a brief overview of the public hearing process.

[ID 26-5202](#) Public Hearing for the Draft 2026 Lake Havasu City General Plan (Chris Gilbert)

Mr. Gilbert stated the City hired Logan Simpson to assist with the General Plan Update (GPU). He introduced Terri Hogan, from Logan Simpson.

Ms. Hogan stated she is excited to introduce the draft GP. For the benefit of the public, she started with a brief overview of the GPU process, covering the following:

- What is a General Plan?
- How it is used as a visioning tool for other documents such as the zoning code, capital improvement projects, and master plans.
- The statutory requirements in the Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) that determine the process and timeline.
- The 19 topics, or elements, included in the GP.
- The City's GPU Process & Schedule, which started in February 2025 with the project launch and will end in November 2026 with the GP being on the ballot for voter ratification.

Ms. Hogan explained the GP is 30,000-foot policy document that guides the community's vision for the future. It is a living, long-range policy document for growth, land use, infrastructure, services, and investment. It is important to note that it is a policy document, not zoning. Any future rezone requests must conform to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM).

Ms. Hogan stated that since the project launched in February 2025, the team has completed data collection and many community visioning and outreach sessions. In February 2026, the City started the statutorily required 60-day public review period. Today's meeting marks the start of the legislative review process. She provided an overview of that process:

- Two public hearings in front of the Planning & Zoning Commission, one of which must be in a different location.
- The first public hearing is for comments and discussion only, with no action taken.
- At the second public hearing, scheduled for May 20, 2026, the Commission will vote to make a recommendation to City Council to approve or disapprove the 2026 GP.
- The City Council will host a public hearing on Tuesday, June 9, 2026, and will have the opportunity to adopt the 2026 GP via resolution.
- If the GP is adopted by City Council, it will go on the ballot in November 2026 for voter ratification.
- The 2026 GP will not go into effect unless it is ratified by the voters.

Ms. Hogan stated there has been a lot of community participation throughout the GPU and one of the ways they track that is through engagement. Engagements are defined as someone taking an action to participate in the process, such as visiting the website,

responding to a questionnaire, or attending a workshop. To date, there have been over 27,000 community engagements. Ms. Hogan acknowledged that some of the engagements may be redundant, such as someone visiting the website and attending a workshop, but the numbers are very significant for a community of this size and represent about 30% of the population. In addition to engagement, there was a lot of effort to make the public aware of the GPU. Staff attended 23 different drop-in events, which involved speaking to local community groups and attending events to pass out flyers and answer questions. Staff, Commissioners, Council Members, and others shared flyers and information at local events and on social media. Information was shared on the City's social media pages, in the local newspaper, and on the radio. These outreach efforts helped to drive the engagement numbers, but it is reasonable to believe that even more people in the community are aware of the GPU and have chosen not to actively engage.

Chair Harris asked how our community compares to others in terms of participation. Ms. Hogan explained she been in the field of planning in Arizona for 35 years and they get very excited if they can get 10% of the population to engage. To have about 30% of the community engaged is a great number the City should be proud of it. She acknowledged the average person doesn't usually get very excited by planning documents, so it can be challenging to get people interested and excited about participating.

Ms. Hogan reviewed the GP themes. The 19 elements included in the plan are divided into the 5 themes and each theme has an aspirational statement that sets the tone for the chapter. Community input at the virtual and in-person workshops and direction from the General Plan Steering Committee (GPSC) guided the creation of the themes and aspirational statements. The aspirational statements help drive the goals and objectives. The 5 themes are:

- Balanced Growth
- Connected Community
- Prosperous Economy
- Thriving Residential Areas
- Healthy Environment

Ms. Hogan provided an update on the 60-day review period, explaining that after the draft was reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), GPSC, and Staff, it was presented to the public and statutory review agencies for a mandatory 60-day public review period. Highlights from the review period include:

- The public review period ran from February 17 – April 18, 2026.
- Staff sent the draft to statutory review agencies, such as the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), and Mohave County, Lake Havasu Unified School District, and others.
- Staff sent the draft to enhanced reviewing agencies and community partners, like

utility companies, the Chamber of Commerce, Havasu Regional Medical Center, Mohave College, and others.

- An in-person open house at the Mohave County Library on Wednesday, February 25, 2026, kicked off the public review period, with 37 residents attending.
- There were 883 individual views of the draft on the website.
- 86 comments from 32 individuals were collected.

Ms. Hogan stated the comments received were constructive and positive overall. They helped to refine the plan and reinforced the community's priorities, such as shoreline preservation, open space, and long-term planning for roads and infrastructure. Some changes and technical edits were made because of the comments, which are included in the draft presented today. Planning Staff and Logan Simpson reviewed and responded to each comment, a list of which is included in the agenda packet. Some comments were more questions or related to a specific City document or masterplan. In those cases, the response is to direct the commenter to the correct document or source.

In addition to collecting updated data and community input, Ms. Hogan explained there are three major changes from the 2016 General Plan:

1. Simpler Land Use Framework – The 2016 GP had 16 FLUM categories, making it difficult for the public to understand and Staff to administer. The 2026 GP has 7 FLUM categories. The team utilized a crosswalk exercise (included in the 2026 GP Appendix) to group the zoning districts into FLUM categories. This helps align broad place types with the zoning code and development patterns, rather than relying on many narrowly defined categories.
2. Updated FLUM – There were many areas on the 2016 FLUM in which the category did not match the zoning of already developed, stable land use areas, resulting in a lot amendments. The FLUM has been updated to better reflect stable patterns and previously approved entitlements.
3. Refreshed Goals & Objectives – With the help of the GPSC and TAC, Staff did a full plan audit of the 2016 goals and objectives to determine what needed changed, what was no longer relevant, and what was missing. Many of the overall ideas stayed the same, but the objectives were refreshed to better reflect the community's current priorities and visions for things such as shoreline preservation, enhancement of parks and open space, desire for affordable housing options, and infrastructure priorities.

Displaying the 2016 and 2026 FLUMs, Ms. Hogan provided an overview of how the FLUM categories were reduced and combined.

Throughout the next few slides, Ms. Hogan discussed how the themes, aspirational statements and goals & objectives work together and explained how community input

from the in-person and virtual workshops, as well as guidance from the GPSC and TAC, helped to create these items.

- Themes – Big picture. Themes are the overall title for each chapter, which contain the 19 required plan elements.
- Aspirational Statement – A high-level vision statement that expresses the desired future for the City. It reflects community values and long-term aspirations for each theme to help shape subsequent goals and objectives.
- Goals & Objectives – Goals are concise statements that support the vision statements and provide focus for specific objectives. Objectives are a specific policy derived from a goal to help guide public and private decision making. They provide clarity on what needs to be accomplished to implement the community's vision and serve as a progress benchmark. The goals & objectives are what Staff and elected officials can refer to when evaluating projects and land use requests, both private and public.

Ms. Hogan explained the Action Plan from the 2016 GP has evolved into Chapter 7: Achieving Our Future, which highlights implementation tools. These are regulatory tools, long-range improvement plans, capital improvements plans, monitoring, and reporting documents that can be used as a road map to coordinate with other City divisions to help implement the community's vision, while also providing the flexibility for City Council to manage annual budgets and address other priorities that may arise.

Ms. Hogan explained the GP is still in the draft phase and public input is still being accepted. Changes may be made based on public hearing comments or direction from the Commission or Council. She thanked City Staff for their responsiveness and for being the boots on the ground when it comes to engaging the community. She is happy to answer any questions.

Referencing Chapter 3, which addresses transportation, Commissioner Dzuro mentioned a recommendation for reduced vehicles speeds. Traffic is a major concern and she was wondering where these recommendations came from and how they get implemented.

Ms. Hogan explained the existing condition analysis and recommendations are very high level. Implementation often requires action by the City. In this case, the City is undergoing a Regional Transportation Masterplan (RTMP), which will look at traffic in greater detail and make recommendations for specific changes. The City may also work with other organizations, such as ADOT. The goals & objectives can guide the discussion and decisions the City makes as they review various masterplans and take action.

Commissioner Lehr complemented the photos throughout the GP. He noted the bypass shown in the 2016 GP transportation map is not shown on this one and asked if it is no

longer being considered. Ms. Hogan confirmed that is something that will be reviewed as part of the RTMP to determine if it is needed or even feasible.

Development Services Director Jeff Thuneman explained the bypass was identified by ADOT about 20-years ago when they were evaluating possible bypass loops for future growth in several cities. Construction would be driven by ADOT and funding was never provided. As there is no timeline or funding for the project, it was removed from the GP and moved to the RTMP. If the bypass comes to fruition in the future, it can be added to the 2036 GP or added to this one through the administrative amendment process.

Commissioner Lehr asked why the Island Shoreline Access Buffer is not green to differentiate it from the Mixed-Use category.

Mr. Thuneman explained the idea behind the buffer is to have it act as an overlay. The overall category of the land is Mixed-Use, but in response to the community's desire for shoreline protection, the buffer was added to indicate the need for shoreline preservation and access. Staff is currently in discussions with ASLD on a text amendment that would expand the current 15-foot shoreline access easement to 75-feet. The shoreline easement is what the buffer is intended to represent.

Ms. Hogan noted they can play with the coloring of the buffer to ensure the intent is clear.

Chair Harris thanked Ms. Hogan for her presentation. He opened the Public Hearing.

Kathy Willett, resident, expressed concerns about the large ASLD owned parcel (120-01-058) behind her home on Cabana Drive, including:

- Activity that is occurring on the property to alter it in ways that could make it developable, despite it being in a FEMA flood zone.
- The possibility that the parcel could be auctioned off by ASLD to a developer.
- The proposed FLUM category, Neighborhood Low, could make it desirable to developers and would make it easier to develop if it was sold.
- Concerns that her neighborhood has not had enough time to provide input.

Ms. Willett asked if there was an interactive map where citizens could see what kind of activity, building, and investments are happening in their area, noting the current maps are difficult to navigate.

Mr. Thuneman explained the City website has GIS maps that show current FLUM and zoning categories. The parcel she referenced has a current FLUM category of Low Density Residential (LDR) and a zoning of Agriculture-Preservation (A-P) District, which allows a density of one dwelling unit per acre. Under the proposed 2026 FLUM it would

be considered a Neighborhood Low category, and the zoning would not change. Mr. Thuneman explained that FEMA flood maps are different from the GP and FLUM. This parcel is not currently up for auction.

Mr. Thuneman stated Staff would be happy to speak with her after the meeting to answer her questions about the rezoning process and also better understand her concerns.

Bonny Toy, resident, asked if it would affect the City if less application fees were paid as a result of the corrections to the FLUM.

Chair Harris explained that if the process is more streamlined and fewer land uses changes are needed, the City would save on the cost of processing the requests and it will also save the developers money.

Mr. Gilbert noted the corrections made to the FLUM were primarily for stable land use categories in areas that are mostly built out and developed, not areas of vacant land.

Ms. Toy inquired about the difference between the Employment and Business Commerce categories. Mr. Gilbert explained Business Commerce implies uses like retail and office space, while Employment covers heavy commercial and industrial uses.

Dave Tunnell, resident, was a member of the GPSC. He has been on many committees and this has been an interesting and pleasurable process, as any comments or concerns a member expressed were discussed and listened to. To him, the primary importance of a general plan is that it can be easily read and understood by future developers to determine if their proposal fits the community's vision. It is an aspirational document for what the community inspires to be. Zoning is a separate issue that gets looked at within the context of the general plan. If you look hard enough, anyone will find things in the GP that they disagree with, but overall, he thinks it is a good visionary document and supports it.

Seeing no additional comments, Chair Harris closed the Public Hearing.

7. CALL TO PUBLIC

Chair Harris opened Call to Public.

Bonny Toy, resident, encouraged the City to be mindful of ADA requirements for future development to ensure the community remains accessible to all. She also recommended the City look into options to complete the walking path along Highway 95, possibly taking it all the way to SARA Park and The Shops, as it could be a great asset to the City.

With no additional comments, Chair Harris closed Call to Public.

8. FUTURE MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission is Wednesday, May 20, 2026. It will be held in the LHC Council Chambers, 92 Acoma Blvd S.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Harris adjourned the meeting at 10:17 a.m.

Jim Harris, Chair

Shelby Hennigan, Recording Secretary