

**CITY OF CHEYENNE  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
June 5, 2023  
6:00 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Philip Griggs, Chair; Brian Tyrrell, Vice-Chair; Robert Chamberlin, Secretary; Meghan Connor, Bob Mathia, Boyd Wiggam, Amy Hernandez

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Charles W. Bloom, AICP, Planning & Development Director; Valerie Pickard, Planning and Development Office Manager; Stephanie Boster, City Attorney; Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner; Connor White, Planner II; Erin Fagan, Planner II; Cassie Pickett, Staff Engineer

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Trey Rinne, Kristy Richardson, Jason Stephen, Pete Laybourn, Dr. Michelle Aldrich, Kade Luthi, Elizabeth Stapel, Jack Studley, Peggy Escamilla, Rebecca Murchie, Amber Reagan, Kelly Schroeder, Roger Alexander, Ethel Rabel, Bernie Lowery, Ryan Schields, Seth Schwartz, Michael White, Jon Cecil, Steve Askey

**ITEM 1: CALL MEETING TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

Philip Griggs, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM

Roll Call was done by Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner. There was a quorum with 6 members present. Brian Tyrrell arrived later.

Mr. Lloyd requested Items D and E be switched on the agenda. Boyd Wiggam made a motion to adopt the agenda modification. Robert Chamberlin seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

**ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

Robert Chamberlin made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from May 1, 2023. Bob Mathia seconded the motion with corrections. The minutes from the May 1<sup>st</sup> Planning Commission Meeting were approved unanimously.

**ITEM 3: PLANNING PROJECTS**

**ITEM A:** **POSTPONED FROM 05/01/2023**  
PUDC-23-12 / Sunnyside Addition, 11<sup>th</sup> Filing, Expedited Plat  
Agent: Bradford Egan, EIG14T  
Case Planner: Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record. He stated the agent has requested postponement of the item to the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Robert Chamberlin made a motion to postpone the item. Meghan Connor seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

**ITEM B:** PUDC-23-21 / Christensen Park, 2<sup>nd</sup> Filing, Zoning Map Amendment  
Agent: AVI, PC  
Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record.

Philip Griggs, Chair, asked for the applicant to present the item.

Trey Rinne, agent, presented the item.

Connor White, Planner II, gave the staff report.

Bob Mathia asked how many units would be built.

Mr. White stated there are 6 units proposed.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment.

Robert Chamberlin made a motion the rezoning of Lots 14 and 15, Christensen Park, Cheyenne, Wyoming to MR as shown in the attached zone change map, noting that the project meets the review criteria for approval. Mr. Mathia seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

**ITEM C:**        [PUDC-23-22 / Christensen Park, 2<sup>nd</sup> Filing, Expedited Plat](#)  
Agent: AVI, PC  
Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record.

Trey Rinne, agent, presented the project.

Philip Griggs, Chair, asked for questions from the Board.

Connor White, Planner II, gave the staff report.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment.

Robert Chamberlin made a motion to approve the Christensen Park, 2nd Filing Expedited Preliminary Plat, advancing the Final Plat to the Governing Body. Bob Mathia seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

**ITEM E:**        [PUDC-23-28 / Sunrise Hills North Subdivision, Zoning Map Amendment](#)  
Agent: AVI, PC  
Case Planner: Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record.

Kelly Schroder, agent, presented the project.

Mr. Lloyd, Senior Planner, gave the staff report.

Bob Mathia asked how this would affect the property to the north.

Mr. Lloyd stated the property has not been under the same ownership for a long time. He stated it would be nice to develop it together, but it is under separate ownership.

Boyd Wiggam asked what if this is annexed and a zone is not assigned.

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

Mr. Lloyd stated it may be ok for it to not have a zone temporarily. He stated they would need to have a zone on the property to affectively regulate it. He stated he highly recommended the Planning Commission recommend an appropriate zone for the property.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment.

Michael White asked for the address or location of the property.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is northwest of Ridge Road and Thomas Road.

Mr. White stated the property to the north was annexed without a zone. He stated they should not change the zone before doing an annexation.

Mr. Lloyd stated an annexation needs to have a zone change associated with it. He stated the zone change goes to the Planning Commission, but the annexation does not. He stated the zone change and annexation will go before the Governing Body at the same time.

Rebecca Murchie asked how many lots would be proposed for the annexation.

Mr. Griggs stated lots would be shown with the plat.

Roger Alexander stated he supported an MR zone.

Elizabeth Staple stated the MR zone was reasonable and just for the area. She stated the roads in the area are narrow.

Mr. Griggs asked for further public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment.

Mr. Wiggam made a motion to approve the rezoning of a portion of the south 144-1/2' of Tract 25, Dell Range Addition, Laramie County, Wyoming to MR Medium-density Residential as shown in the attached zone change map, noting that the project meets the review criteria for approval. Robert Chamberlin seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

**ITEM D:**        PUDC-23-27 / Sunrise Hills North Subdivision, Expedited Plat  
Agent: AVI, PC  
Case Planner: Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record.

Philip Griggs, Chair, asked for questions from the Board.

Kelly Schroder, agent, presented the project.

Mr. Griggs asked if there would be a retention pond.

Ms. Schroder stated there is a moratorium on discharging anything new into Child's Draw. She stated there would be an interim retention pond on Lot 7. Nothing will be allowed to be built on it until additional drainage infrastructure is built off site.

Mr. Lloyd gave the staff report.

Brian Tyrrell arrived at the meeting at 6:24pm.

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

Boyd Wiggam stated there is a block size issue. He asked if there was anything planned to correct the block size issue. He asked if there was any leverage they had before they recommended approval of the block size.

Mr. Lloyd stated the Planning Commission did not have to recommend approval to the block size. He stated it would be a great idea to have the two developers work together but it could not be forced. He stated it would be a good idea to have a road going north and south through the block. The Planning Commission can recommend approval with the exception of the lot sizes or not recommend approval to the exception of the lot sizes.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment.

Michael White asked how they can do a final plat without the retention area being designated on the plat map. He stated there have been drainage issues in the area that are not resolved.

Jon Cecil asked why the zone change and annexation are not taken together. He stated the western most lot is a pipeline and would be unbuildable. He stated there has been a lot of fill on the property recently. He stated he was in favor of the MR zone.

Rebekah Murchie asked who the applicant is. She said she didn't understand the block size issue. She asked about the impact to the pipeline.

Peggy Escamilla stated she is in support of the MR zone. She said a road being built on the pipeline easement would not work.

Ms. Schroeder stated the applicant is Pronghorn Development. She stated they developed Sunrise Hills, 2<sup>nd</sup> Filing which is the development to the south. She stated the 30' easement on the west side is for the pipeline and it would prevent anything from being built on it. She stated since the retention pond is an interim retention pond it would not be on the plat. She stated there would be restrictions on building permits.

Mr. Lloyd stated there is a drainage easement on the east side of the plat and a pipeline easement on the west side of the plat. He stated none of the easements could be built on but there was still room to build on the lots. He stated due to fill on the lot they will be requested a geotechnical report for that area to ensure it is stable for construction. He stated the UDC has a limit of how big a block size can be and the way to repeal it is through City Council. He stated they could make the block smaller by creating a street through the block.

Mr. Wiggam asked if there would be an objection to a road included on this plat.

Ms. Schroeder stated there hasn't been a discussion on a proposed road. She stated there are two different developers for the two properties. She stated there would be additional costs to build a road.

Robert Chamberlin made a motion to approve the Sunrise Hills North Subdivision Expedited Preliminary Plat, advancing the Final Plat to the Governing Body, with a recommended exception to block size and Staff conditions. Bob Mathia seconded the motion.

Mr. Wiggam stated he would vote against the approval as it is a massive block size.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed by a vote of 5-1.

**ITEM F:** [PUDC-23-34 / 4512 Rawlins St., Zoning Map Amendment](#)

Agent: Jack Studley

Case Planner: Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record.

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

Philip Griggs, Chair, asked for the agent to present the item.

Jack Studley, agent, presented the project.

Mr. Lloyd gave the staff report.

Mr. Studley stated he had to do a zone change with the annexation even though it is already zoned in the County. He stated zone change requirements should be waived when annexing from the County to the City as they are an equivalent zone.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment.

Brian Tyrrell made a motion to approve the rezoning of a portion of the north 497.58' of Tract 227, Sunnyside Addition, 6<sup>th</sup> Filing, Laramie County, Wyoming to MR Medium-density Residential as shown in the attached zone change map, noting that the project meets the review criteria for approval. Robert Chamberlin seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**ITEM G:**        PUDC-23-37 / 5908 Ridge Rd., Zoning Map Amendment  
                    Case Planner: Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record and gave the staff report.

Philip Griggs, Chair, asked if there was a holding zone they could use temporarily.

Mr. Lloyd stated there are multiple agricultural zones but the AG zone is meant for a holding zone.

Mr. Griggs asked if the owner was aware of the zone change.

Mr. Lloyd stated the owner was notified of the change.

Boyd Wiggam asked what the owners response was.

Mr. Lloyd stated he didn't think the owner had a strong opinion either way, but he thought the owner wanted the City to give it a more developable zone.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment.

Amber Reagan stated she was in support of zoning the property AG and that in the future when a property is annexed it should be assigned a City zone that corresponds to the existing County zone.

Rebecca Murchie asked why it is not being zoned MR. She stated she was concerned about zoning it to AG because it may be changed into something else.

Elizabeth Staple stated the MR zone is a reasonable zone for this area. She stated there is not enough room on Thomas Road and that cars are parked on both sides of the street.

Jon Cecil stated he is not against the Agricultural zone. He stated they should zone it MR.

Dr. Michelle Aldrich stated the Council had tried to change the zone to MR but it was voted down so an agricultural zone would be appropriate and was closest to what it was in the County.

Seth Schwartz stated the MR zone was voted down because it wasn't going to receive the votes for the high density.

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

Mr. Griggs asked for further public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment.

Mr. Lloyd stated Item I is a text amendment to assign a zone to a property when being annexed. He stated the City would assign the zone that is closest to the existing County zone. He stated they need to give this property a zone so it can be regulated, and the AG zone is the closest to what was in the County.

Brian Tyrrell asked if the AG zone is a less tax classification.

Mr. Lloyd stated taxes are based on the use of the land. He stated agricultural uses are a lesser tax than other uses. He stated it more than likely will be taxed as vacant agricultural.

Mr. Tyrrell stated a developer could keep it AG and hold the land for as long as they can.

Charles Bloom, AICP, Planning and Development Director, stated this property will more than likely stay the same tax rate regardless of the zone.

Mr. Wiggam asked how the County and City AG zone uses compare.

Mr. Bloom stated they have compared the zones and the difference is that in the County it allowed duplex structures.

Bob Mathia made a motion to approve the zoning of a portion of the NW¼ of the NW¼ of Section 22, T14N, R66W of the 6<sup>th</sup> Principal Meridian, Laramie County, Wyoming as AG Agricultural as shown in the attached zone change map, noting that the project meets the review criteria for approval. Robert Chamberlin seconded the motion.

Mr. Wiggam stated they should not count on this parcel remaining as agricultural. He stated the TIP will address capacity issues and roadway capacity issues. He stated he is troubled by the idea that the County zone permitted more intense development. He stated he would be voting no on the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed by a vote of 5-1.

**ITEM H:**            **POSTPONED FROM 04/03/2023**  
[PLN-23-00003 / Protest Petition, Text Amendment](#)  
Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record.

Connor White, Planner II, gave the staff report.

Bob Mathia asked where the public would be able to participate under Option C.

Mr. White stated the public can participate at Planning Commission during the zone change process.

Mr. Mathia asked if the public could participate when the owner wanted to change the zone.

Mr. White stated the developer can submit a zoning map amendment. He stated the text amendment does not change the process. He stated the next text amendment will require an assigned zone. He stated when the developer submits a zone change the public can participate at the public meetings. He stated the text amendment will mirror state statute and clean up the UDC.

Boyd Wiggam asked if they could combine the text amendments and still have a form that defines the protest petition.

Mr. White stated the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to include the language from Option B to include a form. He stated he recommended they recommend approval of Option C with the addition of Option B.

Mr. Griggs asked if  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the majority is of the quorum or the complete Council.

Mr. White stated it was the majority of the complete Council.

Mr. Mathia stated he didn't see how Option C was different than what they currently have for regulations.

Mr. Lloyd stated the original proposal took away the ability to use the protest petition from land being annexed to the City. He stated Option C would reduce the redundancy of regulations.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment.

Michael White stated he would like to see the original text compared to the new regulations. He stated he did not want the Planning Commission to go with the staff recommendation.

Jon Cecil stated in Option C the language is stricken and the super majority is removed. He stated the City can be more restrictive and doesn't have to match the state statute. He stated the community should have a voice. He stated Option A makes everything stay the same. He stated Option B gives the people a form to protest. He stated Option A should be approved.

Peggy Escamilla asked if they are removing the protest petition when an annexation and zone change are being done at the same time.

Mr. Connor stated no they were not removing protest petitions when there is a zone change.

Ms. Escamilla stated in Option C it states obstacles are removed and wanted to know what obstacles.

Mr. Lloyd stated there are two items on the agenda due to the way legal notices work. He stated if Item H is adopted without Item I it would remove the option for a protest petition for a zone change when an annexation occurs. He stated all other zone changes would still have a protest petition. He stated if Item I and H are both adopted, then Item H would just remove redundancies from the UDC and make it align with state statute. He stated the assigned zoning would assign a City zone which is most closely related to the current County zone. He stated if the applicant then wants to change the zone, the surrounding property owners have the option for a protest petition. He stated if Items H and I are adopted together there is an option for the citizens to submit a protest petition.

Mr. Mathia stated with Item I, a zone would automatically be assigned as the same zone that is currently in the County and if the owner wanted to change the zone it would be a separate action. He stated if that zone change fails then there would still be a zone associated with the property.

Mr. Lloyd stated that was correct. He stated the assigned zoning would still go through a public process and neighbors, Planning Commission and Council will be able to review and comment on the assigned zoning.

Mr. White asked if they could discuss Item I before voting on Item H.

Stefanie Boster, City Attorney, stated they could consolidate the two items, but they would need to vote on the items separately.

Charles Bloom, AICP, Planning & Development Director stated they would read the item into the record and vote on the items separately.

Mr. White stated Item I and Item H could be discussed together and voted on separately.

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

Mr. Wiggam stated he would like to consider Item H before moving to Item I.

Mr. Griggs stated paragraphs 5 & 6 are crossed out because they are doing away with the language and referring directly to state statute. He stated they would finish public comment after they discussed Item I.

Mr. Lloyd stated there is a staff report for Item I and they could take public comment for Item H and I. He stated the items need to be voted on separately.

**ITEM I:**        [PLN-23-00003-01 / Assigned Zoning, Text Amendment](#)  
Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. Lloyd read Item I into the record.

Mr. White gave the staff report.

Mr. Wiggam stated he was concerned about down zoning and not allowing the same permitted uses that were allowed in the previous County zone. He asked what would happen if the zoning application caused an existing condition to have a nonconforming use. He stated a property owner should not lose uses by right with the assigned zoning process.

Mr. White stated the policy will be published and will be attached to the annexation application. He stated the applicants will know exactly what zone it will be assigned and therefore will know what uses will be allowed. He stated the document will not be in the UDC. He stated the zones are not exact, but they are close. He stated a nonconforming use can still continue its use. He stated the Planning Commission can still make recommendations of a different zone when they review the assigned zone, or the zone change request.

Mr. Wiggam stated zoning is a legislative act and asked how staff felt about assigning a zone.

Mr. Lloyd stated the Governing Body will have the text amendment and policy document. He stated the Governing Body has the legislative power to assign a more appropriate zone if they felt staff has assigned the wrong zone. He stated the assigned zoning is being established by the Governing Body.

Mr. Bloom stated they have several policy documents that have gone forward to the Governing Body that became regulatory documents. He stated the documents are available for City staff and residents to use.

Mr. Wiggam asked what would the implications be if the Council deviated the assigned zoning upward.

Mr. Bloom stated staff would strongly recommend disapproval of upzoning anything that had been advertised. He stated it would violate the public notice process. He stated they could still deviate down to a lesser zone for the applicant-initiated zone change.

Mr. Griggs asked for public comment for Items H and I.

Seth Schwartz asked where the protest petition would come in for when the staff assigns a zone that is not appropriate.

Peggy Escamilla asked if there was an answer to the previous question.

Mr. Lloyd stated any staff recommendation would go before the Planning Commission and City Council. He stated the public can make comments at the public meetings. He stated this would be the best way to ensure a property would have a zone.

Ms. Escamilla stated she didn't see how the form describes what is being protested.



Mr. White stated you are protesting a zone and not protesting a use. He stated the form will auto populate the allowed uses based on the zone that is selected.

Ms. Escamilla asked why the form wouldn't state why someone is opposing the zone.

Mr. Bloom stated the staff has done research to see what other states do for protest petitions. He stated most of the communities have standardized forms as to not spread misinformation.

Mr. Griggs stated the form will be filled out by the people that are protesting.

Mr. White stated the people who are protesting would fill out the 1<sup>st</sup> two lines on the form. He stated the next two boxes would be automatically generated.

Mr. Griggs stated the protesters would fill in the first two lines and then staff would fill in the rest.

Mr. White stated the blocks would be auto populated.

Ms. Escamilla stated you don't have to state why you are opposing the zone.

Mr. White stated it does not need to be on the protest petition. He stated people could state the reason at the public meetings.

Ms. Escamilla stated it would be confusing to try to get signatures if people didn't know the reason why someone was protesting.

Mr. Bloom stated the protest petition would be online and a protester would fill out the location and the zone. He stated once someone selected a zone the uses would be populated on the form. He stated it would also populate the intent of the zone. He stated the public could attend meetings to voice their concerns.

Ms. Escamilla stated it would be difficult to sign a document if the reasons for the protest are not indicated on the form.

Mr. Lloyd stated the protest petition indicates the zone change, the uses and the intent of the zone. He stated you would be protesting either the uses or the zone district. He stated they could add a field on the form as to what the reasons are for the petition.

Ms. Escamilla stated she would like a field added to the form.

Roger Alexander stated he would feel better if the process was explained better somewhere on paper or on the Planning Department website.

Mr. White stated it is written in the staff report and ordinance.

Mr. Alexander stated it is a lot to read and hard to understand.

Mr. White stated it is all in the staff report and there have been some revisions that will move forward to City Council that will make the staff report and ordinance easier to understand.

Mr. Alexander asked why they need Item H if Item I is approved.

Mr. White stated Item H is eliminating redundancy from the code and cleans things up. He stated Item H would make the code refer to the state statute.

Jon Cecil stated Item I is adding another step. He asked why a zone change and annexation don't go together at one time.

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

Michael White asked if there is an exception for when a requested zone change is in accordance with the UDC. He stated he would like to see Option A move forward.

Dr. Michelle Aldrich stated staff has really tried to work something out with everyone's best interests involved. She asked if a form would be available if Option C was chosen. She stated under Option A things would remain the same, Option B would include a form for protesters and Option C would remove the redundancy but would need to be approved with Item I. She asked if a form would not be included if Option C and Item I were approved.

Mr. White stated they could still add a form to Option C and they could combine Option B and C. He stated Option C would go hand in hand with Item I. He stated Option A would leave everything the same.

Elizabeth Staple stated laws should not be ignored. She stated the laws should be followed and not changed.

Mr. Alexander said the state statute states there has to be 20% of the owners of 20% of the adjacent land. He stated the City language states 20% of the owners. He stated there could be a big difference in those numbers.

Mr. Bloom stated the UDC was created in 2012 and at the time they took the requirements from the state statute which was not completely clear. He stated they took the more restrictive route for the UDC. He stated when the petition was done for Ridge and Holland, staff made sure the requirements were met from the state statute and also the UDC. He stated there could be circumstances where both are not met. He stated they have decided to use the more restrictive approach.

Dr Aldrich stated we are not removing redundant language, but we could potentially have a different outcome based on statute instead of the ordinance.

Rebekah Murchie stated Option C says it removes obstacles for development. She stated it takes away from the neighbors' rights.

Mr. Griggs asked for further public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment.

Mr. Lloyd stated the City combined zone changes and annexations together in the past but it was determined by a previous City Attorney that zoning cannot be in an annexation ordinance and the processes were separated.

Mr. White stated the processes run at the same time and get approved at the same time.

Mr. Wiggam stated he would like to see a combination of Option C and B. He stated the state statute does not require a reason is needed to protest a rezoning. He stated the way to go forward is to adopt Option C and include the form. He stated he would vote no on Item I. He stated he liked the idea of City Council having to assign an initial zone during annexation.

Meghan Connor stated a form should not be required. She stated she is not against Item I.

Bob Mathia stated they need to approve Item I. He stated if they just approved Item H the surrounding property owners would not have a way to protest.

Mr. Wiggam stated public comment would be taken by neighbors for any zone change request at Planning Commission and City Council. He stated they still have a way to be involved even if there isn't a protest petition. He stated the protest petition would impose a super majority vote after a 3<sup>rd</sup> reading.

Mr. Wiggam made a motion to approve the proposed text amendment to the Unified Development Code Sections 2.2.1.c.5 and 2.2.2.c.6 in accordance with Option C as found in the Staff Report, noting that the

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*

request meets the review criteria of UDC 2.4.1.d and a formal protest may be filed by a form provided by the City. Brian Tyrrell seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed by a vote of 4-2.

Mr. Tyrrell made a motion to approve text amendments to the Unified Development Code Sections 2.4.2 and the creation of section 2.2.8 as outlined in this staff report and recommended by staff, noting the requests meets the review criteria of UDC 2.4.1.d. Robert Chamberlin seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed by a vote of 5-1.

**ITEM J:**        Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
Case Planner: Tom Mason – MPO Director

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, read the item into the record.

Tom Mason, MPO Director, gave the staff report.

Ryan Shields, WYDOT, reviewed the WYDOT projects.

Boyd Wiggam asked if the Highway 30, Pershing, Dell Range project would be done next year.

Mr. Shields stated Dell Range is not State.

Mr. Mason stated the project Mr. Wiggam was referring to was a County project. He reviewed the project.

Tom Cobb, City Engineer, reviewed the City projects.

Mr. Griggs asked if there would be a stop light in front of Coyote Ridge.

Mr. Cobb stated yes.

Mr. Wiggam asked if House Avenue was an MPO street or a City street.

Mr. Cobb stated it was a City road. He asked if he was referring to pavement maintenance.

Mr. Wiggam stated yes.

Mr. Cobb stated they are currently doing City Road inventory for their new pavement management upgrade.

Mr. Wiggam asked if it is an MPO street or a local street.

Mr. Cobb stated it is local.

Mr. Mason stated the MPO doesn't have any jurisdiction over streets. He reviewed Greenway Projects.

**ITEM 4:        OTHER BUSINESS/STAFF ANNOUCEMENTS:**

- Habitat for Humanity Fridays at Blue Raven in June
- There will be a mid-month Planning Commission meeting

**ITEM 5:        MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:20 PM**



---

Staff Signature



---

Board Officer

*\* Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please refer to the audio recording found on the City of Cheyenne's website.*