

CITY OF CHEYENNE
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 15, 2024
6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob Mathia, Chair; Boyd Wiggam, Vice-Chair; Meghan Connor, Secretary; Tony Laird, Darrell Hibbens, Bryan Thomas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Amy Hernandez

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Valerie Pickard, Planning & Development Office Manager; Sophia Maes, Planner I; Connor White, Planner II; AJ Swain, Planner I, Jeffrey Noffsinger, MPO Director; Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: Jerry & Naomi Young, Susan Graham, Fred Schlachter, Rod Mers, Kay Sheehan, Gary Russell, Glen Connor, Mark Briggs, Milt Briggs, Linda Coatney, Bob Bailey, Scott Larson, Eileen Obsuth, George Obsuth, Mark and Vicki Sopr, Rick Lara, David Barker, Doris Garcia, Meri Garcia

ITEM 1: CALL MEETING TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Bob Mathia, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM

Roll Call was done by Connor White, Planner II. There was a quorum with 6 members present.

ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Mr. Wiggam made a motion to approve the March 18th meeting minutes. Mr. Hibbens seconded the motion.

Ms. Connor wished to amend the minutes, referring to the section of when Mr. Noffsinger stated the long-range plan for 20 years had shown this as a major corridor. She stated she'd like this to be clarified in terms of which road (Southwest Drive or Broken Arrow). She also would like her comment regarding the rural feel of Broken Arrow to be included in the minutes.

Mr. Wiggam made a motion to amend the minutes to reflect the correction proposed by Ms. Connor. Ms. Connor seconded.

The minutes were approved as amended unanimously.

ITEM 3: DISCLOSURES

ITEM 4: PLANNING PROJECTS

ITEM A: Southwest Drive Corridor Plan

1. Memo
2. Final Plan
3. Resolution

Case Planner: Jeffrey Noffsinger, MPO Director

Connor White, Planner II, read the item into the record.

Jeffery Noffsinger, MPO Director, presented the final Southwest Drive Corridor Study. He stated several updates were made to the document and graphics per comments at the previous mid-month Planning Commission.

Ms. Connor asked if the WYDOT study was available. Mr. Noffsinger stated he would provide it if needed, to which Ms. Connor agreed it was vital to be able to review. He stated there was a proposal

** Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please request a recording from the Planning & Development Staff.*

south of College Dr that would use the Broken Arrow right of way for an RV storage area and the driveway would need to eventually align with north side of Broken Arrow for the traffic signal. He stated there would be significant right of way costs on at least four homes for right of way requirements. He clarified the cost difference between the plan and fixing Southwest Drive. He also found a record of variations of this plan since 2015.

Ms. Connor asked if the 71 letters sent included Broken Arrow. Mr. Noffsinger confirmed they were. Ms. Connor asked for the WYDOT study to be provided. Mr. Noffsinger stated he did not have the study but would provide it.

Mr. Laird asked why the CFD Park and Ride wasn't included in the plan. Mr. Noffsinger stated it wasn't considered in the study, as it seems it will go away in the long term.

Ms. Connor asked Mr. Noffsinger to clarify how the costs on the cost matrix were determined. Mr. Noffsinger stated the costs were broken down in the Appendix. Ms. Connor asked if this Appendix was included in the agenda documents. Mr. Laird stated since the documents were not included for this meeting, he assumed they had not been updated since the March 20th meeting.

Seth Lloyd stated Mr. Noffsinger has confirmed the Appendices from last month were indeed unchanged.

Mr. Mathia asked if there was a staff report. Mr. White stated there was no staff report, and public comment could continue with a three-minute time limit per person.

Susan Graham attended the June meeting after receiving a postcard. She stated she did not receive a post card for the November meeting, nor was there a sign posted. She is concerned the Southwest Drive Corridor Plan does not mitigate the congestion of the railroad crossing.

Fred Schlachter stated he felt this plan was created to benefit a specific developer at the expense of the landowners on Broken Arrow, and a government official was potentially also benefiting from a backdoor partnership. He did not agree that Southwest Drive should be closed and would prefer \$7.1 million to be spent upgrading Southwest Drive vs \$13 million on Broken Arrow.

George Obsuth stated he agreed blocking off Southwest Dr would not be good, rather a partial block to allow "local traffic only." He was concerned that developing Broken Arrow would attract more traffic and wouldn't even mitigate the railroad crossing issue. He would prefer to see a corridor developed on the east side of I-25 with a railroad overpass.

Dr. Kay Sheehan stated her property would see the most detriment from this plan. She stated the June 2021 meeting was presented as asking for ideas and therefore she and others did not fill out the questionnaire. She did not believe the stakeholders at the June 2021 meeting were good representatives of people to be affected. She stated the three people who lived on Broken Arrow were vocal about the road *not* being developed.

Rick Lara was concerned about his property value and who would be liable for paying the road development fees.

Glenn Connor believes Southwest Drive would be perfect for a feeder street to the City, but had other concerns, such as the UP Railroad Congestion. His concern was the railroad would stay and would put more households at risk if Broken Arrow were to be developed with housing (because UP carries a lot of hazardous waste). He stated there were no surveys or specific road specifications in terms of right of way for the homeowners and wanted the City to communicate those ROW specifications to the homeowners. He stated he wanted something in writing that a county homeowner would not be liable to pay back developer reimbursement if involuntarily annexed into the City at some point.

Jerry Young stated concern about the railroad. He also stated he did not receive any notification about plans for Broken Arrow (only for Southwest Dr) even though he lives on Broken Arrow.

** Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please request a recording from the Planning & Development Staff.*

Chris Papas Onares stated he was informed but didn't realize it was relevant because the notice described the plan as Southwest Drive Corridor (not Broken Arrow). He was frustrated because no municipality had made updates to the infrastructure around his house, but also recommended the repair of Southwest Drive instead of the development of Broken Arrow, as well as mitigating the railroad congestion.

Linda Coatney was nervous about the traffic impact. She does not believe the plan had enough research and study and does not believe this is the best option. She is concerned the plan favors developers that may get tax credits (especially for low-income housing) versus the landowners in the area. She also voiced concern that all low-income housing seems to go on the southside.

Mr. Mathia stated Commissioners could ask the public questions during public comment.

Mr. Laird addressed the comments that there was no reason to move traffic from SW Drive to Broken Arrow, stating that the report states the main reason is traffic operation problems at the College Dr and SW Dr intersections, both now and for future volumes expected. This intersection is too close to business access to the west, and the analysis states moving operations to the east would improve these issues and likely would warrant a traffic signal at some point. He asked the public to consider this as the main reason for the plan, not the railroad congestion.

Vicki Sopr stated she did not receive any notice, even though her property touches both Southwest Drive and Broken Arrow. She stated that if either of these roads are blocked off, they will not be able to access their property. She would like to have someone assess her property value and any costs associated with this plan.

Gary Russell asked if the Planning Commission was appointed or elected. Mr. Mathia stated they are volunteer appointees via the Mayor. Mr. Russell asked who completed the study and when it was completed. He asked what happened with the traffic light that was proposed years ago. Mr. Laird believes the traffic signal was going to be temporary for Cheyenne Frontier Days via WYDOT.

Mary Garcia stated her concern with the railroad traffic congestion and emergency services. She is also concerned about the speed limits, particularly in poor weather.

Eileen Kennedy stated that she is against taking private property to expand Broken Arrow. She also stated she never received a postcard. She does not want to see the Southwest Corridor area annexed into the City.

Dr. Sheehan requested the Commission read her summary of reasons why Broken Arrow should not be developed and alternative suggestions (see attached letter).

Doris Garcia had concerns about the gas pipeline that runs under Southwest Drive. She was also concerned about the semi-trucks on Broken Arrow during the wintertime with inclement weather. She would prefer to see a bridge over the railroad instead.

David Barker does not want the traffic and congestion to come to his side of town. He yielded his remaining time to Dr. Sheehan.

Dr. Sheehan continued explaining her summary of reasons why Broken Arrow should not be developed and alternative suggestions.

Mr. Wiggam stated that the most cost-effective option would be to fix Southwest Drive, but there is a stakeholder group not at the meeting that is trying to gain local access from the interstate and into the local road network that are currently using Southwest Drive. He asked if there was a way to get traffic east of Southwest Drive that could be established as the primary intersection north of College Drive and south of UP Railroad, without imposing on private property.

** Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please request a recording from the Planning & Development Staff.*

Dr. Sheehan stated that developing Broken Arrow would not be best because of how it lines up with College Drive, stating it would be too slippery for heavier vehicles during poor weather conditions. She stated neighbors would protest high density development in the area. She stated there has been no input from the neighborhood about this plan.

Ms. Connor asked what type of traffic was being accounted for in the plan.

Mr. Noffsinger stated the MPO would hold another community workshop to get more feedback. He asserted the plan was to find the best solution for the next 25 years. He stated the Key Stakeholders that were involved in the plan were on page two (2). He also proposed the item be postponed until after the community workshop was held.

Mr. White clarified that Mr. Noffsinger was requesting postponement. Mr. Wiggam asked if it could be postponed by more than one month. Mr. White stated postponement happens one month at a time.

Mr. Mathia asked when the workshop would be. Mr. Noffsinger stated the item should be ready by early May.

Dr. Sheehan asked again about the stakeholders involved.

Mr. Obsuth stated again that he believes the Commission should vote no on the plan.

Mr. Young stated that the 80-acre parcel in the area does currently have plans to develop within the next year.

Ms. Coatney stated the semi-trucks typically don't need to be accounted for with traffic since they stay at the truck stops then return to the interstate.

Mr. Mathia closed public comment.

Scott Larsen with Benchmark Engineers stated FHU in Denver did the traffic study. He stated the original goal was address concerns with growing traffic at the intersection at College Drive and I-25 from WYDOT, the City, and the County. He stated it was not feasible to build an overpass over the railroad and tie back into Lincolnway. He stated the key concerns for people along Southwest Drive has been speeding, traffic, the railroad, transient people, and more. Broken Arrow was seen as an alternative because its location meets WYDOT standards. He stated the current plan takes the least amount of private property for right of way. He stated there would be no cost to the adjacent property owners to build the road, and there would be an increase in property values based on comparable situations. He stated the developer is looking at an urban development.

Ms. Connor asked if the scenario of building Broken Arrow yet leaving Southwest Corridor as the major road was considered. Mr. Larsen stated the traffic study did not state the ultimate destination of the traffic being measured, only the volume on a certain roadway. He stated the scope of work did not include a cost estimate for Southwest Drive because it would not solve the intersection issue, and the Steering Committee wanted the traffic moved to a more urban area.

Ms. Connor would like to see a plan that doesn't bring financial harm to anyone.

Mr. Mathia opened a public question period per Mr. Lloyd's recommendation.

Mr. Laird asked Mr. Noffsinger to address the questions pertaining to who was doing the study and why. Mr. Noffsinger stated the MPO is an autonomous organization that represents the City, the County, and WYDOT. He stated that this project was listed as a priority for FY 23 (or FY 22) and the MPO was allowed to use federal funding to do the study.

Dr. Sheehan asked if the letter addressed to the Planning Commission would be inserted into the minutes and if the attendees could be part of the MPO Steering Committee.

** Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please request a recording from the Planning & Development Staff.*

Mr. Onares asked if the Planning Commission knew what would be developed on the nearby 80-acre parcel. Mr. Lloyd stated the 80-acres directly east of Broken Arrow was annexed to the City in 2010, is zoned MUB Mixed-use Business. He stated there have been no formal applications regarding this area. He reaffirmed that the plan was purposefully done before any development to get ahead of potential issues that may occur with development.

Mr. Onares stated property values would be impacted. He asked if the people of Southwest Drive truly said there was too much traffic on Southwest Drive, and they wanted to shift it to Broken arrow.

Mr. Mathia stated that there needs to be a new discussion with as many people involved regarding this plan, as the workshops may not have been clear on the proposed development of Broken Arrow. He suggested using certified mailing.

Mr. Wiggam stated the MPO has a need for volunteers, and there are opportunities for people to be advocates for the southern portion of Cheyenne.

Mr. Wiggam made a motion to postpone this item to the May 20th Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Hibbens seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Mathia called a five-minute recess at 7:59 PM.

Mr. Mathia called the meeting back to order at 8:05 PM.

ITEM B: PLTA-24-1 / Residential Height, Text Amendment
Case Planner: Sophia Maes, Planner I

Connor White, Planner II, read the item into the record.

Sophia Maes, Planner I, presented the staff report. The UDC text amendment proposes allowing low-density residential lots to have up to three stories for both principal and accessory buildings.

Ms. Connor asked if the accessory building would still have to be the same height or lower than the principal building. Ms. Maes confirmed this.

No public comment.

Mr. Wiggam asked about the unintended consequences of increased heights, particularly obstruction of the mountains. He also asked if the Fire Department was equipped with the ability to handle three-story residential buildings. Mr. White confirmed the Fire Department was consulted and had no objections.

Ms. Connor made a motion to recommend the Governing Body approve text amendments to the Unified Development Code Section 5.1.5 as outlined in this staff report and recommended by staff, noting the requests meet the review criteria of UDC 2.4.1.d. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

ITEM C: PLTA-24-2 / Building, Detached Definition, Text Amendment
Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Connor White, Planner II, read the item into the record and presented the staff report. The text amendment is two-pronged, first revising the definition of "detached building," second proposing additional requirements for accessory buildings (specifically regarding structural attachments). He stated

** Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please request a recording from the Planning & Development Staff.*

the current code was not clear on detached accessory buildings and there have been issues with enforcement.

Ms. Connor asked if the revision would change any definitions for property owner insurance or tax base. Mr. White stated he did not know, but it would likely be dependent on how the assessor assesses it. Mr. Lloyd stated that the definition for detached shed is different for assessors vs. the zoning or building code.

Mr. Wiggam asked if one foot was enough space to increase public health and safety. Mr. White clarified that the one-foot distance would be between buildings on the same property, not a setback from neighboring buildings. The one-foot distance would also be between eaves, not walls, which would create more of a three-foot distance at the ground level.

Mr. Wiggam was concerned about fire safety and distance buffering between buildings. Mr. Lloyd stated it depended on the fire rating of the buildings. Mr. Wiggam asked if there would be any concern about wind tunneling effects of such a small distance. Mr. Lloyd stated that was not reviewed.

No public comment.

Mr. Wiggam asked for the best way to amend the motion to have a five-foot minimum distance between principal and accessory buildings. Mr. Lloyd advised making the motion as is and adding the amendment as a clause.

Mr. Laird asked if the building inspectors would determine if a structure met the fire code (for structures that require a permit). Mr. Lloyd stated the building code does not regulate fire code between buildings on the same parcel. Mr. White stated that building inspectors typically only enforce fire rating for buildings on adjacent property lines. He stated the building department reviewed the text amendment and had no comments.

Mr. Wiggam made a motion to recommend the Governing Body approve text amendments to the Unified Development Code Sections 1.4.3 and 5.8.8 as outlined in this staff report and recommended by staff, with the modification to increase the required setback to five (5) feet between the detached structure and the main structure on a property, noting the requests meets the review criteria of UDC 2.4.1.d. Mr. Hibbens seconded the motion.

Mr. Wiggam stated that five feet seemed to be the minimum requirement to gain safety benefits other than aesthetics.

Mr. Laird asked if this would be suitable for a landowner to seek a variance. Mr. White confirmed it would be.

The motion was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

ITEM D: [PLTA-24-3 / Sign Code Incentives, Text Amendment](#)

Case Planner: Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

Connor White, Planner II, read the item into the record.

Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. The text amendment addresses incentives and bonuses in relation to the sign codes of near-interstate signs, master signs, and creative sign approval. It also addresses clarification to the UDC in relation to billboards in different zone districts (including residential) and on-premises signs.

Mr. Wiggam asked for the height of the Bish's RV along I-25 South. Mr. Lloyd stated it was twenty (20) feet high or less. Mr. Wiggam stated he understood the need for better signage visibility along

** Minutes are meant to provide a brief summary of the meeting's action items, discussions, and decisions made. For more detailed information, please request a recording from the Planning & Development Staff.*

interstates, stating the Bish's sign should have been allowed to be higher as well. He does not want to diminish the function of a sign for aesthetics.

Ms. Connor asked if these changes would reduce the amount of variance requests for signs. Mr. Lloyd confirmed.

Mr. Laird asked for clarification on the term EMC. Mr. Lloyd stated it means electronic message center, or a sign that can be updated electronically.

Mr. Laird was concerned about the signs along the interstate being defined as within 100' of the rights-of-way and would prefer the distance to be defined from the edge of the road itself. Mr. Lloyd agreed this may be a better way to define the distance, however the current amendment was written to be consistent with current UDC standards. He suggested it may be a part of a future comprehensive sign amendment.

Mr. Laird asked for clarification on the right-of-way boundaries. Mr. Lloyd stated the right-of-way is measured from the front of the property line to the interstate. Mr. Laird asked for clarification on 6.5.8.j "within 1,000 feet of the interstate." Mr. Lloyd clarified that Staff interprets that text as within the interstate right-of-way.

Mr. Wiggam asked if it would be appropriate to specify "interstate right-of-way" in the recommendation. Mr. Lloyd stated the proposed amendment could be amended to include right-of-way.

Mr. Wiggam asked about the maximum square feet (SF) area regarding the area of the Chick-fil-A sign vs Menard's sign in the report. Mr. Lloyd stated the overall sign is 400 SF, the Menard's sign is 100 SF, the Chick-fil-A sign is 100 SF. Mr. Wiggam believes 200 SF is adequate for a business.

No public comment.

Mr. Laird made a motion to recommend the Governing Body approve text amendments to the Unified Development Code subsections 6.5.4.b.3 and 6.5.8.j as outlined in this staff report and recommended by staff, noting the requests meet the review criteria of UDC 2.4.1.d. Ms. Connor seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

ITEM 5: OTHER BUSINESS/STAFF ANNOUCEMENTS

- Mr. White stated there will be a May 6th Planning Commission, and the mid-month Planning Commission on May 20th.
- Mr. White stated that at this time, there would not be a June 3rd meeting. If there is a meeting on this day, it will likely be held in Municipal Building Room 104 as the Council will be holding their budgetary session in Council Chambers.
- Mr. White will inform the Planning Commission when the Southwest Drive Corridor workshop will be held.

ITEM 6: MEETING ADJOURNED 9:04 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 request a recording from the Planning & Development Staff.*

To: Charles Bloom, Director of Cheyenne Planning Commission, Cheyenne Planning Commission members, Jeff Noffsinger, Director of MPO, and MPO members

Cheyenne Planning Commission Meeting, Monday, April 15, 2024, 6:00 P.M.

Background of the two meetings with Jeff Noffsinger, Director of MPO and Scott Larsen, Owner of Benchmark Engineering, June 21, 2023 and November 15, 2023.

Questions regarding the Southwest Drive Corridor 35% Design Plan that is based on the Benchmark's design:

- 1) Coordination and Public Involvement, page 26 of the Southwest Drive Corridor 35% Design Plan, it states, "On June 8, 2023, the MPO and design team, along with designated stakeholders, participated in a Steering Committee meeting to gather information, insight, and to offer feedback. The Steering Committee includes representatives from the City of Cheyenne the Cheyenne Board of Public Utilities, WYDOT, and Laramie County Planning and Public Works.

We want to know who these "designated shareholders" are because we who live on Southwest Drive, Broken Arrow Road, and the 100 acre Southcrest Heights Subdivision knew nothing of this meeting and were not involved. Who are these "designated shareholders" referenced?

- 2) The minutes are missing of the MPO's meetings of August, 2023, and October, 2023, - between the first public meeting on June 21, 2023, and the second public meeting, November 15, 2023, (when only one person was notified, the one with the most to lose) that created this proposal of the Southwest Corridor Plan 35% Design Plan proposing closing the existing Southwest Drive Corridor/thoroughfare and shifting it to developing a dirt road creating far more problems and far greater cost.

These minutes are missing from the Southwest Corridor 35% Plan and are not in the Appendices. We would like to see the minutes of these meetings.

- 3) The minutes of the poorly attended public meeting November 15, 2023, because only one person (the one with the most to lose) received a notice, are missing and are not contained in the appendices.

We would like to see these minutes, also.

Correction/explanation for this 35% plan:

- 1) It is stated in the 35% Corridor Plan (page 32 of 48), that three residents (all the people at the meeting who were contacted by the one person notified of the meeting) who live and own property on Broken Arrow Road) were "very vocal about Broken Arrow being developed." but it skews the truth because we were all adamant that it NOT be developed!

2) It is stated in this 35% Design Plan that one of the reasons to shift the existing Southwest Drive Corridor to Broken Arrow Road, a dirt road, was to retain the "rural feel" for the people of Southwest Drive Corridor. However, we who live on Broken Arrow Road, a dirt road and who live and own property in the 100 acre Southcrest Heights Subdivision bordering Broken Arrow Road are the people who have been fighting for over 34 years to keep the "rural feel."

How many Cheyenne Planning Committee members have read the entirety of the 500-page Southwest Corridor 35% Plan that has been presented for your input and vote? Some of us who live on and near Broken Arrow Road have completed the excruciating task of reading it.

Major problems with the Southwest Corridor 35% Plan and why the Collector/thoroughfare should REMAIN Southwest Drive and why developing Broken Arrow Road, a dirt road, is not feasible:

Reasons to keep Southwest Drive the major thoroughfare:

- 1) Already has an 80 feet easement
- 2) Already has all utility easements in place and are being used.
- 3) Entrance to Southwest Drive and Southwest Drive itself is flat, not at the base of two hills.
- 4) It is a straight line from College Drive on Southwest Drive to Lincoln Way – no turns necessary.
- 5) All houses on Southwest Drive are set back from the easement and road. The houses were built knowing the road already was developed.
- 6) Traffic lights are already installed at the intersection of College Drive and Southwest Drive –they just need to be turned on.
- 7) Environmentally, it is better because Southwest Drive is not in a pocket, as is Broken Arrow and the pollution is blown away by the wind.
- 8) Confiscation of property is not involved
- 9) There is no heartache with one's property and landscaping being seized.
- 10) There is no heartache with one's life plans being stolen.
- 11) There is no monetary loss of property values because it is already built and used
- 12) Utility easements are already in place so no monetary outlay by property owners is needed.
- 13) Value of Southwest Drive homeowner's and property owner's value will increase with re-surfacing the the road and adding some improvements

Reasons NOT to develop Broken Arrow Road as a major Collector/thoroughfare and to leave Southwest Drive as the major Collector/thoroughfare:

- 1) The entrance to Broken Arrow from College Drive is at the base of two hills – making it very difficult for semis, other heavy vehicles and cars to negotiate in ice, snow and blowing dust/snow now, let alone turn into Broken Arrow Road – Southwest Drive is flat.

- 2) Slowing or stopping for semis and other heavy vehicles and cars for a potential stop sign or traffic light at the intersection of College Drive and Broken Arrow Road, makes it very difficult for the heavy vehicles to accelerate again, to go up a hill, especially in inclement weather.
- 3) Broken Arrow Road has only a 30' to 50' easement (page 32 of 48, Southwest Drive Corridor Plan, 35% Design Plan)
- 4) Has only one utility easement
- 5) Cost of adding needed easements would be borne by the residents
- 6) Cost of maintaining the utilities would be at the property owner's expense
- 7) Would require taking already landscaped property of current homeowners
- 8) If the current easements are increased, it would require the taking of our land, destruction of mature landscaping, trees and bushes as well as having current home's front doors ending up right next to the collector/thoroughfare
- 9) It would require taking already platted (since 1954) lots in Southcrest Heights Subdivision
- 10) It would place the burden of loss of property, already established landscaping of mature trees and bushes and loss of platted lots on one person, which is unethical and discriminatory.
- 11) It would require heartache and loss of enjoyment of our already established homes and property
- 12) Loss of property, especially to one resident, and loss of livelihood and retirement plans.
- 13) Studies show that having a collector/thoroughfare next to and near residential areas decreased property values (Email from Scott Larsen, owner of Benchmark Engineering to Kay Sheehan, April 12, 2024)

Developing Broken Arrow Road is many millions of dollars more than it is to leave Southwest Drive as the Corridor with improvements

The suggestions of what to do.

Our property values would decrease, as Mr. Scott Larsen said. Southwest property values remain the same or increased with a re-paved road and some additions.

The best placements for a collector/thoroughfare and to relieve traffic at the intersection of I-25 and College Drive is to:

1) Leaving the thoroughfare at Southwest Drive, where the road is already developed with ditches on either side and the homes are already set back from the road, not requiring confiscating people's land, and simply improving the road surface. This is by far the less expensive plan and best for the reasons listed above and would not take property from those of us on Broken Arrow Road as well as the platted lots in Southcrest Heights Subdivision,

and/or

2) Moving the thoroughfare to the west side of I-25 either in back of Mac Donalds or in front of Mac Donalds where there is already a road going to the Wyoming Department of Transportation Drivers Services and extending it to Lincoln. This is open land and would not disturb any homes - since there are none. Plus, this would keep the semis, trucks, campers and cars on the west side where the Flying J, Quality Inn, semi-truck wash, Mac Donalds, Industrial Park and High Plains Drive is, so they do not have to cross the overpass to access Lincoln. This would reduce congestion now, and in the future as the west side of I-25 is developed

It is stated in the Southwest Corridor 35% Design Plan that the railroad crossing at Southwest Drive and Lincoln Way does not have enough room to construct either an over or underpass. Moving the Collector Road/thoroughfare to the west side of I-25 allows room for either an overpass or underpass at the railroad crossing at Lincoln Way, alleviating wait times of over 30 minutes, as much as eight hours every day.

and/or

3) Another alternative is to have a separate entrance from I-25 going north to Love's truck stop and to have a separate entrance to I-25 from behind Sinclair truck stop for semi's and heavy load vehicles.

These proposals alleviate by far the majority of semi, heavy vehicles and cars in the I-25 and West College and the Southwest Drive thoroughfare and are proposals from those of us who live in this area not just those who see lines on a map.

These proposals not only reduce all traffic in this area but also, do not require seizure of any already established home property, landscaping of mature trees and bushes and already platted residential lots.

"Tom Mason of the MPO stressed that there is no funding for this project at this time." (Page 28 of the Southwest Drive Corridor Plan, 35% Design Plan)

We are pleading with the Cheyenne Planning Commission to VOTE NO on this Southwest Corridor 35% Plan and to go back to the drawing board with our proposals and include those of us who live and own property in this area on the MPO and other planning bodies.

Dr. Kay Sheehan

Dr. Kay Sheehan
2011 Broken Arrow Road
Cheyenne Wyoming 82007

Eileen + George Obssuth
1807 SOUTHWEST DR

Vicki Sopr
1703 Southwest Dr.

Rick Lapa
1606 Broken Arrow Rd

Mark Sopr
1703 Southwest Dr.

MARK BRIGGS
2214 STIRRUP RD,

Dr. Susan Graham
2008 Bar X Road

Paul Mess
2011 Broken Arrow Rd.

MILTON BRIGGS
2214 STIRRUP RD

Fred Schlechter
2008 BAR X Rd.

Naomi Young
1404 Broken Arrow Rd

Sam Con
1304 Broken Arrow Rd

Ray Russell
1753 SOUTHWEST

Jerry Young
1404 Broken Arrow Rd

Jinda CONTNEY
2211 Stirrup Rd.

Chris Pappas Kanaris
1815 STIRRUP RD

Bob Bailey
2211-STIRRUP Rd

