

**CITY OF CHEYENNE
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
August 5, 2024
6:00 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob Mathia, Chair; Boyd Wiggam, Vice-Chair; Meghan Connor, Secretary, Tony Laird, Amy Hernandez, Darrell Hibbins

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bryan Thomas,

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Connor White, Planner II, Athen Mores, Planner I,

OTHERS PRESENT: Bradkin Atkinson, Kelly Hafner, Cassie Pickett, Brooke Bulgrin, Carlos Machado, William Lewis, Jim Barnes, Nancy Loomis, Christina Hayes, Victoria Pike, Katie Bradfield, Mike Eisenhauer, Thomas Twitchell,

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 Seth Lloyd Senior Planner. There was a quorum with 5 members present, one online.

ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Ms. Connor made a motion to approve the July 1st meeting minutes. Tony Laird second the motion and asked to correct a small correction of 5 members being present as opposed to the four listed. Mr. Lloyd asked for a motion to amend the minutes. Ms. Connor made a motion to amend the July 1 minutes. Mr. Laird second the motion. The motion passed with all members of the board voting unanimously.

ITEM 3: DISCLOSURES

None

ITEM 4: PLANNING PROJECTS

ITEM A: PUDC-24-96 / Ridge View Apartments – Phase 2, Assigned Zoning

Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. Lloyd read Item A into the record.

Mr. Lloyd presented the project to the commission to designate the zone to AG.

There were no questions from commissioners.

Public comment was opened, there was none.

Mr. Laird made a motion to approve the assigned zone.

Mr. Wiggam second the motion.

The motion passed with all members voting unanimously.

ITEM B: PUDC-24-97 / Ridge View Apartments – Phase 2, Zoning Map Amendment

Agent: Kelly Hafner, CivilWorx Engineering Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. Lloyd read Item B into the record.

Mr. Atkinson the applicant presented the project to the commission transferring the zoning to NR3.

There were no questions from the commission.

Mr. Lloyd presented the staff report to the commission.
Mr. Wiggam asked if we are satisfied with our future road net work to accommodate the density of the project.
Mr. Lloyd answered that discussion between the applicant and the owners have been in contact to create connections in the area.
Mr. Wiggam asked if this was the appropriate stage to be asking questions about impacts off sight.
Mr. Lloyd answered we will be reviewing the traffic site plan study once we know the amount of units the project proposes.
Ms. Connor asked if it was more prudent to seek a lesser density than to go through the highest one we have
Mr. Lloyd answered that it will be high density development, we just don't know the exact units of the property.
Public comment was open and there was none
Ms. Hernandez stated she was online and to be included in roll call.
Mr. Wiggam made a motion to approve the zoning map amendment
Mr. Laird second the motion.
Mr. Wiggam commented he is in support of multi family housing close to employment centers.
Roll call was taken with all members voting unanimously, the motion passes.

ITEM C: PUDC-24-107 / Ridge View Apartments – Phase 2, Expedited Plat
Agent: Kelly Hafner, CivilWorx Engineering Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. Lloyd read item C into the record
Mr. Atkinson. Presented the project to the commission
Mr. Laird asked how many units phase 1 is
Mr. Atkinson was unsure but believed it was 130 units with phase 2 being in the same range. They need to see what more aligns and what would fit.
Mr. Lloyd presented the staff report presentation to the commission with requested conditions.
Mr. Wiggam asked if this would be a plat that would be more appropriate than expedited for holding off on finding out what they will have as a transportation network connection and that it is properly platted.
Mr. Lloyd stated the decision to go expedited or not is the commission's decision, and what plat they would like to use. Engineers, landowners and MPO have been in contact on reaching a transportation study in the area.
Mr. Wiggam asked if the absence of BOPU easements he questions if this would be an issue that could be resolved by next month if they postpone the project.
Mr. Lloyd can speak for BOPU or the applicant for how close the conversations are. It is faster to postpone a plat than approve.
There were no further questions to staff
Mr. Atkinson answered the questions regarding the phase and connectivity, discussing sidewalk connections, pedestrians, and this will all be handled internally through the development process. He spoke on where road net works should go and have been meeting with engineering, connecting to the future road map so that no existing roadway is a burden. Is comfortable with connectivity and would not be dangerous to the public or a burden to the city.
Mr. Laird discussed internal connectivity but is thinking ahead that development occurs to the north, would the pedestrians be able to traverse through this property or go elsewhere.
Mr. Atkinson stated that it will determine based on if development occurs below them. In previous cities he has gone through similar issues designating roadways in the future.
Mr. Wiggam asked if he could talk about through access east to west as opposed to north to south

Mr. Atkinson answered there would be nothing but Carlson and Converse as the access points, and Rue Tere would go another direction, he is limited, but assures there will be connectivity.

Mr. Hafner approached the podium and expanded on the BOPU easements and road network discussion.

Mr. Wiggam then interjected stated he had a question for staff, he stated they do not see site plans, and he is trying to figure out what to do at this stage, because he is concerned with pedestrian connectivity. Is there something we can do or is this how it is?

Mr. Lloyd stated the master plan tried to identify connections for the community, due to this have avoided super blocks in the past. This location does have a street extending north from cut off road to the west edge of the plat, and wants to revisit the transportation network, based on discussion no landowner or applicant or engineer is on disagreement that we need connections cross the land as far as Carlson to Rue Terre, but will have connections adopted by the MPO.

Mr. Wiggam asked staff if it were possible to require a dedicated easement is more concerned about pedestrians and were dropping the ball on that.

Mr. Lloyd stated we could add a condition as a pedestrian easement.

Mr. Wiggam asked what the sense of the rest of the commission looks like and wants to postpone reviewing further.

Ms. Connor stated she agrees with Mr. Wiggam and wants more time.

Mr. Laird shared the same concerns.

Mr. Lloyd answered that Cassie Pickett is online from engineering and can provide some input.

Cassie Pickett got online and answered that MPO shows Carlson going in to where the applicant has Carlson built out, some peoples preference Carlson be moved North and tie into converse a bit higher. It provides better access spacing and possibly better connectivity to the East. It is a collector discussion. They are waiting on more information for the network layout. Otherwise, most of other road network is agreed upon.

Mr. Laird asked Ms. Pickett if she heard our conversation about pedestrian connections for the future.

Ms. Pickett claimed she had but didn't provide much input other than a right of way sidewalk.

Mr. Wiggam stated he's on the MPO advisory committee and asked if Ms. Pickett remembers adopting a Cordier plan for Converse.

Ms. Pickett did not understand

Mr. Wiggam asked again and recalls adopting a Cordier plan to rebuild a portion of converse. Did the plan increase traffic generated by these apartments?

Ms. Pickett did not recall increasing Converse to the North.

Mr. Wiggam asked if the redesign included planning for additional traffic demand

Ms. Pickett claimed she would have to review the TIS and believes the MPO study goes that far North she is referring to Dell Range converse intersection, not to this development, but is not familiar. She asked Mr. Wiggam if his concerns were Converse could not hold the volumes of the development

Mr. Wiggam wanted confirmation of planning for development, and an alternative for a way out. He thinks this is adequately not prepared for.

Ms. Pickett said she will check the TIS to get exact answers and that it is reviewed by a traffic engineer.

Ms. Connor commented that this was piece mail planning to her. She does not see efficiency with this plan.

Public comment was open there was none.

Mr. Atkinson stated he understands if the project is postponed. This is a city Parcel, and he must develop the property as it sits. He has no control of anything outside of that.

Wants it to be zoned and platted based on what the current road network is. Agrees with a sidewalk network but must respect the decision of the property owner.

Mr. Wiggam motioned to postpone for a month until September 3rd.

Ms. Connor second the motion
Mr. Wiggam explained in more detail why he wanted to postpone.
The motion to postpone passes with all members voting unanimously

ITEM D: PUDC-24-102 / 4614 E Pershing Blvd., Assigned Zoning
Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. Lloyd read item D into the record.
Mr. Lloyd presented the project to the commission for assigned zoning
No questions were asked by commissioners
Public comment was opened there was none, and it closed
Ms. Connor motioned to approve the assigned zoning
Mr. Laird second the motion
Roll call was taken and the motion passes with all members voting unanimously.

ITEM E: PUDC-24-106 / Edgar Subdivision, Expedited Plat
Agent: Brooke Bulgrin, Inberg Miller Case Planner: Athen Mores, Planner I

Mr. Lloyd read item E into the record
Ms. Bulgrin presented the project for an expedited plat to the commission.
There were no questions from the commission.
Mr. Mores presented the staff report to the commission with conditions.
Mr. Wiggam to discuss the block size requirement.
Mr. Lloyd answered due to the existing layouts of the lot it is hard to make connections of any nature and has a topography issues.
Mr. Hibbins asked Ms. Bulgrin if she had a chance to talk to any residents for input on the area.
Ms. Bulgrin answered that it was posted for public comment.
Mr. Hibbins asked how the plan will develop the area addressing the soil erosion and run off of the property in the wintertime.
Ms. Bulgrin answered studies have taken place to address these issues.
Mr. Hibbins asked what the drainage study entailed.
Ms. Bulgrin answered it would not take any drainage from its historic path developing those units.
Mr. Lloyd stated he has not received emails or calls on the project.
Public comment was then opened.
Mr. Machado spoke out against the project due to the topography issues, fractures in the slope, and drainage.
Mr. Wiggam asked Mr. Machado assuming approval occurred what would he like to see the city do to mitigate his concerns.
Mr. Machado answered he would like to see the area plan that shows how much set back they have and what kind of retaining wall goes into the project.
There were no more questions
Public comment was then closed
Mr. Laird asked what the role specifically is that the concerns the landowner has of the feasibility of building the homes, hydrology, and topography.
Mr. Lloyd answered buildability of the lot is a concern of a platting action, and a concern for the planning commission.
Ms. Pickett addressed the questions regarding street slope, drainage and soils. There is an engineering plan review in review. Is currently waiting on a resubmittal from the engineering plan review.
Mr. Wiggam asked if there is anything that could occur in these reports that are still outstanding that could give concern to the density of development. This strikes him as being a very interesting location. Is there anything we can discover that would give us hesitation.
Ms. Pickett did not have much input and couldn't say 100% hesitation is contours and swell data. Capacity of pond is biggest concern.

If pond is adequate to drainage she has no concerns, this is a good project for infill. Mr. Wiggam stated he doesn't like to reduce density in proposals. Could we make fewer larger lots instead.

Ms. Pickett answered that she didn't know.

Mr. Wiggam asked if the pond is not large enough would the plat map have to be redesigned.

Ms. Pickett answered there would be a few options and that would be acceptable. If the pond could not hold the runoff they will build another detention pond.

Mr. Laird stated the blue lines on the map show that a majority of the lots won't drain into the pond and instead onto the street. He is concerned were not on all solid ground right now due to the studies provided. He is inclined and would like to postpone.

Mr. Laird made a motion to postpone until September 3 Planning Commission.

Mr. Wiggam second the motion.

Roll call was taken, and the motion passed to postpone with all members voting unanimously.

Item F: PUDC-24-119 / 3501 Forest Drive, Zone Change

Agent: William Lewis Case Planner: Athen Mores, Planner I

Mr. Lloyd read Item F into the record.

Mr. Lewis read presented the project to the commission. They are wanting to change the signage to an LED, and due to current zoning could only use 40% of total signage. They would have better luck changing their zoning.

Mr. Mathia asked the current dimension of the sign.

Mr. Lewis answered that it is 5ft 2 inches high and 9ft 7 inches in width and passed out current pictures of the sign.

Mr. Hibbins asked how the sign change affects the dimensions to the current sign.

Mr. Lewis answered nothing would change, they just want an LED light, that's the only change.

Mr. Laird asked if the sign was only the panel and not the brick.

Mr. Lewis answered yes.

Mr. Mathia asked staff if changing the zone would affect the size of the sign.

Mr. Lloyd answered our sign is different for each zone, this instance would be 48 SF, by switching to the CB zone your total EMC area will go up. Mr. Lloyd continued answering any signage questions.

Mr. Mores presented the staff report to the commission.

Mr. Lloyds said to note we have received multiple items from the public in the forms of emails and calls. Mr. Lloyd brought up the concerns for the site from the public which included brightness, light meters will be used if light are too bright. There were also conversations about notices in the city. Mailing did occur in compliance within the 15-day mailer. Other uses other than a church could become another concern for the public.

Mr. Lloyd also noted that the commission is not the deciding factor, and that it will go to city council.

Public comment was opened

Jim Barnes approached the podium and voiced his concerns about the repetitiveness of developments occurring in the area. He sees an issue with making this zoned business, and he does not want a gas station or something similar in the neighborhood. Is concerned about the traffic, and the distractions for drivers with the sign.

Nancy Loomis voiced her frustrations about the project and is against it due to greater runoff that could occur in the future due to development. She is also concerned about the safety aspects, and believes it is very dangerous.

Mr. Laird made a comment that the sign at the little theatre is too big and a distraction, so he understands the frustration.

Christina Hayes voiced her concerns about the project due to what will happen in the future. She is also concerned with traffic and safety for the youth.

Victoria Pike voiced her concerns regarding the zone change and does not want the area to be a commercial zone change, and traffic. Also upset that staff is inappropriate for denying variances and wants to see staffs job descriptions.

Katie Bradfield voiced her concerns about the project due to the zone change and what will occur in the future to their home value. They feel it des not meet the characteristics of the neighborhood and would want the signs lights metered before and after if accepted.

Mr. Eisenhower voiced his frustration for the project due to the brightness of the sign. He also thinks the traffic will be a big concern and will be dangerous due to distraction. He also believes parking will be a big concern

Mr. Twitchell voiced his concerns regarding a neighbor who is violating city code.

Mr. Twitchell is against the zoning of the church reasons being would allow more businesses to encroach in the neighborhood. He was mainly concerned of neighboring properties and how unkept they are due to becoming rentals.

Mr. Twitchell is also concerned about the traffic, and the results that will come with too much traffic in the area.

Public comment was closed

Mr. Wiggam asked if staff had looked at traffic impacts at the intersection?

Mr. Lloyd answered that it is hard to see what the impact is until the site plan is in front of us. Also said that traffic studies are conducted.

Mr. Wiggam asked if CB zoning is the least intensive zoning purpose for the sign or if we could use an MUB?

Mr. Lloyd answered that there are other zones that will used the sign, however the future use is CB and MUB can hold the same things discussed in the CB zone?

Mr. Wiggam asked a question about the UDC.

Mr. Lloyd answered the allowance within the UDC is perpendicular with those if beyond the set back area.

Mr. Wiggam asked about the UDC code and the 40% sign area.

Mr. Lloyd answered it is the allowed area, is a permitted area not a total area.

Mr. Wiggam noted one of the letters came from someone he used to practice law with.

Mr. Wiggam commented that the status quo makes a nice buffer between the CB zone and existing residence.

Mr. Lloyd noted that staff always recommends the best options for projects that come in. This was a more likely option than other options. Staff could support the zone change not a variance

Ms. Connor commented that she shares many concerns with the public that was discussed.

Mr. Lewis commented he just wanted a sign change for their event, and that a variance would be shut down losing all money as opposed to the zone change that had a chance of passing. He does not want to sell the church but does not know what will happen in the future.

Mr. Wiggam made a motion to approve the zone change

Mr. Laird second the motion.

Mr. Wiggam commented how the CB makes perfect sense, but it strikes him as something that is ill-suited to be next to a low-density residential neighborhood. He blamed in on a failure of the UDC. Due to this he wants to leave it as is, no LED sign isn't the worst case.

Mr. Lloyd noted that denial should be related to the review criteria, and needs based upon these if denied.

Mr. Laird stated criteria 1 and 2 are not met.

Ms. Connor added review criteria 8 was not met.

Mr. Wiggam added kids will walk to restaurants and not be driving as much to affect traffic.

Mr. Mathia expressed we are stuck in between a rock and a hard place.

Mr. Lloyd re read the motion

Roll call was taken, and the motion failed with a 4-1 vote

Mr. Wiggam motioned to deny the zone change on the basis that it fails to meet review criteria 1,2,3,8

Mr. Laird asked why it didn't meet review criteria 3

Mr. Wiggam answered that it was stating how well it would mesh with the LR zoning districts surroundings.

Mr. Laird commented he agrees with staff more that criteria 3 is met.

Mr. Wiggam changed the motion to deny based on of review criteria 1,2, and 8.

Mr. Lloyd repeated the denial of the motion and the failure to meet 1, 2 and 8.

Roll call was taken with all members voting yes.

Item G: UDC-24-121 / Tractor Supply, Zone Change

Agent: Dawn Willhelm, Inberg Miller Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. Lloyd read item G into the record.

Ms. Bulgrin presented the project to the commission for a zone change.

Mr. Lloyd presented the staff report to the commission for a zone change LI to CB.

Mr. Laird asked if animal washing fell under a certain use.

Mr. Lloyd answered a kennel is boarding animals overnight which the applicant is not willing to do, and it would be another use.

Mr. Wiggam asked hat the zoning term was for building less intense developments in denser zones.

Mr. Lloyd answered it is pyramid zoning which we no longer use.

Mr. Wiggam asked if a dog wash is not a permitted use in an LI or if this was an error.

Mr. Lloyd answered under certain circumstances some of these businesses fall into the area, it was either an error or oversight, preferably an oversight. Must look at code as it is written.

Mr. Wiggam asked why is this not a spot zone?

Mr. Lloyd answered the future land use anticipates a mix of LI and CB uses.

Public comment was open there was none.

Ms. Connor made a motion to approve the zone change


Mr. Laird second the motion

Roll call was taken the motion passed with all members voting unanimously.

ITEM 5: OTHER BUSINESS/STAFF ANNOUCEMENTS

Introduced Brandon staff's newest planner.
Mid-month August planning commission will be taking place as well as mid-month in September.

ITEM 6: MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:00



Staff Signature



Board Officer