

CITY OF CHEYENNE

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES December 01, 2025 6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS' PRESENT: Bob Mathia, Boyd Wiggam, Tony Laird, Lonnie Olson, Darrell Hibbens, Amy Hernandez

MEMBERS' ABSENT: Meghan Connor

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Charles Boom, Planning & Development Director; Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner; Connor White, Planner II; Morgan Dennis, Planner I; Gisele Pacheco, Office Manager

OTHERS' PRESENT: Erin Gates, Brandon Swain, Kelly Hafner, Jayden Smith, Mark Rinne

ITEM 1: CALL MEETING TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

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

Roll Call: Done by Connor White, Planner II. There was a quorum with one member absent.

ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Lonnie Olson made the motion to approve the meeting minutes from November 03, 2025. Tony Laird seconded the motion.

Bob Mathia, Chair, asked if there was any discussion regarding the minutes from November 03, 2025.

No further discussion of the November 03, 2025 meeting minutes, and all approved at 6:02 PM.

ITEM 3: DISCLOSURES

ITEM 4: PLANNING PROJECTS

ITEM A: PUDC-25-226: Expedited Plat – Airport View

Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

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

Brandon Swain, Real Estate Agent, presented the item into the record.

Bob Mathia, Chair, asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Boyd Wiggam asked about access and whether the residential lot would have frontage on Dell Range Boulevard.

Mr. Swain explained that the property currently has two frontages on Dell Range Boulevard. However, the lot will be reassigned an address off Grandpre Circle, and it will have access from Grandpre Circle. He also noted that an easement will be established through the new lot created off Dell Range Boulevard. This easement is a service line easement extending through the Dell Range lot, and the easement has already been provided.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

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

Connor White, Planner II, presented the staff report into the record.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Mathia inquired about the speed limit in the area.

Mr. White noted that the speed limit is 40 miles per hour.

Mr. Wiggam noted the residential property located west of the proposed development.

Darrell Hibbens noted that access should be carefully considered due to congestion in the area.

Mr. White noted that there is currently a preexisting access, and depending on the proposed use, the city may or may not require the access to be closed or restricted.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Mr. Mathia opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, public comment was closed.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Tony Laird made the motion to approve the Airport View Preliminary Plat, advancing the Final Plat to the Governing Body with staff recommended exception, acknowledgements, and conditions. Boyd Wiggam seconded the motion.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously.

ITEM B: PUDC-25-227: Expedited Plat – Golden Meadows 2nd Filing

Case Planner: Morgan Dennis, Planner I

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

Brandon Swain, Real Estate Agent, presented the item into the record.

Bob Mathia, Chair, asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Tony Laird referenced the staff report and noted that the city recommends an additional 10 feet of right-of-way along Dell Range Boulevard. He observed that the Final Plat appears to account for this 10-foot right-of-way and asked whether the recommendation would pose any issues for the development.

Mr. Swain noted that incorporating the 10-foot right-of-way is not an issue. It does not impact the development, as there is already a 20-foot utility easement along the south side of the property, and the Dell Range easement has been incorporated into the process.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the commission.

Boyd Wiggam asked whether Lot 8 will have direct access to Dell Range Boulevard.

Mr. Swain noted that access from Dell Range Boulevard is not an option for the parcel; all access will be from Connie Drive. He added that an access waiver may be required due to the proximity of the Connie Drive driveway to the Dell Range intersection. While the Plat does not comment on this, the access issue should be addressed prior to the Public Service Committee. The plan is for access to be from Connie Drive.

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

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the commission. Hearing none.

Morgan Dennis, Planner I, presented the staff report into the record.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Laird noted the 10-foot setback exception and asked if staff could approve it administratively.

Seth Lloyd commented that staff can administratively adjust a 20-foot rear setback and the 10-foot setback. Any adjustment reducing the setback to less than 10 feet would require a variance through the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Darrell Hibbens referenced the west side of the lot and the existing structures, asking how the new structures would differ from those to the west.

Mr. Swain noted that the development to the west consists of ranch-style twin homes, while the proposed development will be two-story. He added that it is uncertain whether the clients will utilize the 10-foot rear setback, but it is recommended to allow for potential adjustment. The development is also seeking a greater front setback from Connie Drive.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Wiggam asked about the proposed lot widths and whether staff had any concerns.

Ms. Dennis noted that the lots are buildable within the (MR) Medium Density Residential Zone. She added that the lots will be smaller, which will limit the size of the structures.

Mr. Swain noted that the structures will be twin homes, with a total of eight dwellings, four pairs sharing a center lot line. There will be no side setbacks, and although the lots are narrow, the units will have a shared wall. He added that there are various similarly constructed structures in the area.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Mr. Lloyd noted that the lot types were not listed in the staff report and commented that the development meets the frontage requirements for the SD2 Lot Type, which requires a minimum of 35 feet of lot frontage. He added that in the (MR) Medium Density Residential Zone, the minimum lot frontage for a duplex can be 30 feet. Staff are not concerned that the structures are unbuildable, as the development meets the minimum frontage requirements for duplex development in the (MR) Medium Density Residential Zone.

Mr. Mathia opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, public comment was closed.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Boyd Wiggam made the motion to approve the Golden Meadows 2nd Filing Preliminary Plat, advancing the Final Plat to the Governing Body with staff recommended conditions. Darrell Hibbens seconded the motion.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously.

ITEM C: PUDC-25-244: Expedited Plat – Scenic Development 7th Filing

Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

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

Kelly Hafner, CivilWorx LLC Agent, presented the item into the record.

Jayden Smith, Wasatch Development, presented additional information on the item for the record.

Bob Mathia, Chair, asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Tony Laird referenced the street network, specifically East Carlson Street and Rue Terre, and asked whether the streets function as collectors.

Mr. Hafner noted that the streets are anticipated to be major collectors. The Metropolitan Planning Organization is evaluating the status of the streets, and it is uncertain whether the area will be considered minor or major collectors, but it is certain that the streets will not be arterials. Traffic patterns will continue to be monitored and developed. The development is providing 80 feet of right-of-way consistent with a major collector.

Mr. Laird asked whether the item recommends approval for both the Preliminary Plat and the Final Plat.

Mr. Hafner noted that the item is recommended for approval for both the Preliminary Plat and the Final Plat, and that no difference exists between the two in this case.

Mr. Laird asked about the remainder lot, inquiring why a portion of the area was annexed while the focus was on Lot 1 and Lot 2, with the developer retaining the remainder lot and the right-of-way dedication not included.

Mr. Hafner noted that certain portions of the area fall under city or county jurisdiction.

Seth Lloyd noted that issues arise when the city annexes part of a county parcel and creates a new parcel, as this does not meet county development standards. City policy is to annex an entire county parcel, which must be legally created in the county before annexation. In this scenario, more land had to be annexed than originally planned due to county processes, and the developer must divide off land not intended for development. The city is also consolidating a previously annexed parcel at the intersection of Carlson Street and Converse Avenue to comply with the full-parcel annexation requirement. The purpose of the plat is to clean up and adjust the lots to the developer's proposed size and scope. Normally, platting actions follow Unified Development Code block size standards, but the proposed campus-style development requires an exception. Additional coordination with the county and administrative plats may be needed to finalize access and utility easements. The city remains on schedule to annex the entire section to resolve city-county parcel issues.

Mr. White noted that the remainder lot allows the developer to avoid platting an additional street, but it creates a lot that is undevelopable and unsellable until replatted.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Laird asked whether all of Section 20 will be annexed.

Mr. White noted that the proposed annexation of Section 20 is scheduled for January 2026.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Boyd Wiggam noted concern for pedestrian access and asked whether access could be provided in a manner that complies with block size requirements.

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

Mr. Hafner noted that connections are required on all sides for utilities and drainage, which results in an interconnected sidewalk network. He explained that additional access to the greenway is planned from the north and east sides of the development, allowing pedestrian connections to the existing greenway. While a theoretical connection exists to the south, the greenway coordinator indicated that greenway access would not be encouraged within the campus. Instead, a corridor to the school and an 8-foot shared-use path on Carlson Street will allow pedestrian movement. Other perimeter connections are also planned, as greenway traffic is not anticipated within the campus residential units. Mr. Hafner also noted the pedestrian easement.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Laird asked about the school boundary and whether children in the complex would attend the Central Triad or East Triad.

Mr. Hafner commented that the school boundary was uncertain but could be defined by Converse Avenue.

Lonnie Olson confirmed that Converse Avenue is the separating line for the school boundary.

Mr. Wiggam noted the limited involvement of Laramie County School District #1 and asked whether staff had considered additional pedestrian points of ingress and egress.

Mr. Lloyd explained that the Unified Development Code (UDC) sets a maximum urban residential block perimeter of 2,200 feet (approximately 550 feet per side for a square block) and a maximum block face of 800 linear feet. Streets running north-south and east-west would be needed to meet these standards. However, the extra land north of the proposed streets may meet intersection spacing but not the access spacing for the existing apartment complex along Converse. Options for street connections have been discussed.

Mr. Wiggam emphasized the importance of ensuring pedestrian connections meet the intent of the UDC, even if full streets are not provided.

Mr. Lloyd noted that the UDC includes exceptions for block sizes, such as oversized parcels for campus development and low-density residential areas, as long as pedestrian connections are maintained. Pedestrian connectivity is prioritized over vehicle connectivity under these exceptions.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Connor White, Planner II, presented the staff report into the record.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Wiggam noted Condition 3.a, stating that prior to signing the plat, a note shall be added to the face of the plat indicating that, due to these parcels being considered oversized parcels for the purpose of block size, internal access easements will be provided with future development. He asked whether the condition could be extended to require not only internal pedestrian easements but also external pedestrian easements connecting to surrounding areas or developments to the north, south, and west.

Mr. Lloyd noted that providing access easements inherently includes connections outside the parcel; otherwise, the sidewalks would be internal. To clarify the condition, it could specify that access points will be provided on all sides of the parcel or development boundary to ensure connections to the north, east, south, and west.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Laird noted uncertainty about the Preliminary Plat and Final Plat processes and asked whether replating would be required to fill in details or if those details would be addressed during the Site Plan process. He also inquired whether the project would return to the Planning Commission.

Mr. White explained that Preliminary Plats and Final Plats are typically presented to the Planning Commission concurrently. Preliminary Plats may be reviewed first for more complex projects, with the Final Plat submitted after additional design work. Replating can be handled administratively for minor adjustments and does not require Planning Commission or City Council review. After approval of the plat, the developer could present an Administrative Plat to adjust lot lines or add easements during the Site Plan process, without returning to the Planning Commission. However, if additional lots are added or further subdivisions are proposed, the project would need to return to the Planning Commission for review.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Mr. Mathia opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, public comment was closed.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Wiggam asked about the process for amending the condition to ensure pedestrian access easements are provided in all directions.

Mr. White noted that the board should make a motion and include in Condition 3.a that pedestrian access connections must be provided in all directions with future development.

Boyd Wiggam made the motion to approve the Scenic Development 7th Filing Preliminary Plat, advancing the Final Plat to the Governing Body with staff recommended exception, acknowledgment, and conditions, including a modification to Condition 3.a. The modification states, prior to signing the plat, a note shall be added to the face of the plat indicating: due to these parcels being considered oversized parcels for the purpose of block size, internal and external access easements must be provided with future development in all compass directions to ensure adequate pedestrian access. Tony Laird seconded the motion.

Mr. Mathia asked if the applicant had any discussion.

Jayden Smith, Wasatch Development, noted concerns regarding pedestrian access and the challenges in campus environments where numerous sidewalks allow movement in various directions. While pedestrian circulation is encouraged, placing easements can be difficult as it limits flexibility on the property. Without an easement, private property allows removal of loitering or unlawful activity, but once an easement is established, unwanted behavior requires law enforcement intervention. Additionally, adding more easements increases project costs.

Mr. Hafner noted physical constraints to pedestrian connections due to the elevated parcel. Any condition must be feasible for construction, ensuring connections are buildable and usable, and he requested flexibility in the amendment.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Wiggam noted that the intent is not to designate specific access points, as access must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and be feasible. However, as the public body, it must be ensured that the development works for both the developer and the community. It would set a poor precedent to design a structure where pedestrians cannot move from one area to another unless an individual is a resident of the building.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Laird commented on pedestrian access and expressed concern about the public street network. He also noted the uncertainty regarding immediate development to the north, which could be hindered by the absence of north-south streets, restricting both pedestrian and vehicle movement.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Wiggam noted the limited streets in the area and the lack of development for traffic movement and asked whether any alternatives existed.

Mr. Laird noted that issues should be identified and resolved, suggesting postponement as listed in the staff-recommended alternatives. He also reiterated concerns regarding the street network.

Mr. Mathia asked whether the original motion should be withdrawn.

Mr. Lloyd noted that the original motion must be disposed of, and if a subsequent alternate motion is made, the current motion would need to be denied.

Mr. Wiggam asked for additional thoughts or discussion from other Commissioners.

Amy Hernandez noted that congestion and block size issues were not initially considered problematic, but after discussion, these issues appear to affect community mobility. She stated support for the development but was uncertain how to proceed. She added that the current motion addresses pedestrian access and easements, which could mitigate the issues.

Mr. Olson commented that the current motion, noting the pedestrian easement, addresses mobility concerns. He suggested clarifying compass directions, as multiple directions are involved. He also asked whether City Engineering or the Cheyenne Metropolitan Planning Organization provided comments regarding traffic.

Mr. White noted that neither City Engineering nor the Cheyenne Metropolitan Planning Organization provided comments on the plat. The applicant has coordinated with the Metropolitan Planning Organization regarding street networks for Section 20, but no comments were submitted for this proposed item, and traffic will be reviewed during the Site Plan process.

Mr. White noted the motion: Motion to approve the Scenic Development 7th Filing Preliminary Plat, advancing the Final Plat to the Governing Body with staff recommended exception, acknowledgment, and conditions, including a modification to Condition 3.a. The modification states, prior to signing the plat, a note shall be added to the face of the plat indicating: due to these parcels being considered oversized parcels for the purpose of block size, internal and external access easements must be provided with future development in all compass directions to ensure adequate pedestrian access. Tony Laird seconded the motion.

Charles Bloom, Planning and Development Director, provided additional information on the source of the initial recommendation.

Mr. Hafner noted the need for pedestrian access and clarified that internal roads do not eliminate congestion or traffic on the perimeter streets. He also explained the benefits of interconnected developments, which provide access for emergency personnel and allow residents to move efficiently. He acknowledged concerns about preserving the greenway but emphasized the need to minimize high volumes of cut-through traffic in residential areas.

Mr. Smith noted continued communication with the City Engineering Department and the Cheyenne Metropolitan Planning Organization to identify solutions for the street network and ensure community mobility. He added that adding roadways does not necessarily improve traffic but will create a more integrated development with access to Carlson Street and Converse Avenue. Increased pedestrian access throughout the project, whether via easements or not, will support active mobility within the area.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Wiggam asked if the motion could be revised to ensure pedestrian access is included.

Mr. White noted that the motion can be amended, and the Commissioner who seconded the motion must second the amended motion.

Mr. Laird stated he would be amenable to amending the motion to clarify pedestrian access. He also noted that, after discussion, he supports the initial motion without changes to the road network.

Boyd Wiggam offered an amendment to the initial motion specifying pedestrian access, including internal and external access, and clarifying that future development must provide access in all directions: north, east, south, and west. Tony Laird seconded the amended motion.

Mr. White clarified the motion: Motion to approve the Scenic Development 7th Filing Preliminary Plat, advancing the Final Plat to the Governing Body with staff recommended exception, acknowledgment, and conditions, including the amendment to Condition 3.a to state: Prior to signing the plat, a note shall be added to the face of the plat stating that, due to these parcels being considered oversized parcels for the purpose of block size, internal and external pedestrian access easements shall be provided with future development in the directions of north, south, east, and west. Tony Laird seconded the motion.

Mr. Mathia asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. Hearing none.

Roll Call: Motion to approve the item was passed unanimously.

ITEM 5: OTHER BUSINESS/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mr. Mathia opened the meeting to other business from staff or the Planning Commission.

- Connor White presented the following updates:
 - Next Meeting: January 05, 2026
 - Election of Planning Commission Officers
 - County Pocket Annexations
- Charles Bloom presented the following updates:
 - Annual Review Period: Unified Development Code (UDC)

ITEM 6: MEETING ADJOURNED: 7:50 PM


Staff Signature


Board Officer