

## CITY OF CHEYENNE

### PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 17, 2026

6:00 P.M.

**MEMBERS' PRESENT:** Boyd Wiggam, Tony Laird, Bob Mathia, Lonnie Olson, Amy Hernandez, Meghan Connor

**MEMBERS' ABSENT:** Darrell Hibbens

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Charles Bloom, Planning & Development Director; Connor White, Planner II; Morgan Dennis, Planner I; Gisele Pacheco, Office Manager

**OTHERS' PRESENT:** Erin Gates, David Kniseley, Tommie Kniseley, Chelsea McCort

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

Tony Laird, 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 AGENDA AND MINUTES**

Tony Laird, Chair, asked if there were any modifications to the Planning Commission Agenda. Hearing none.

#### **ITEM 3: DISCLOSURES**

#### **ITEM 4: PLANNING PROJECTS**

**ITEM A:** Unified Development Code (UDC) Annual Review

Case Planner: Charles Bloom, Planning and Development Director

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

Charles Bloom, Planning and Development Director, presented the item into the record.

Mr. Bloom noted that the Unified Development Code (UDC) Annual Review has been organized based on comments received from the public, elected governing bodies and other boards or commissions, recurring development patterns, and staff-recommended reviews.

Mr. Bloom discussed public comments received regarding Multifamily Permissibility.

Tony Laird, Chair, asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Laird inquired about affordable housing and attainable housing and whether the terms are interchangeable.

Mr. Bloom noted that the terms address similar concepts but have different definitions. Affordable housing units are defined as housing for individuals earning 80% or less of the area median income. Attainable housing units are defined as housing an individual or typical family can afford, with no more than one-third of income spent on housing payments.

*\* 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. Laird asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission.

Bob Mathia inquired whether there were any comments regarding parking.

Mr. Bloom noted that parking has been a concern for multifamily developments and that onsite parking is preferred over distant parking.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed additional public comments received regarding Landscaping Enforcement and Regulations, Technical Specifications, and Tree Requirements.

Mr. White noted that Dan Dorsch, Habitat for Humanity Director, submitted the request regarding Landscaping Enforcement and Regulations and was unable to attend due to other work obligations and meetings.

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

Mr. Laird asked whether rock landscaping is considered pervious or impervious.

Mr. Bloom noted that under the current stormwater fee, rock or hardscape landscaping is considered impervious and would require an associated stormwater fee. Based on engineering standards, a rock or gravel area is typically rated as 80–90% impervious. One concern with rock landscaping is its tendency to collect dirt and dust, which can promote weed growth.

Mr. Mathia inquired about deteriorating trees and the process for replacement.

Mr. Bloom explained that, as stated in the Municipal Code, a right-of-way tree or a tree that qualifies as a street tree cannot be removed without the permission of the City of Cheyenne Forester. If the City Forester removes a deteriorating tree, the forester may require the landowner to replace the tree or may replace it at the landowner's expense.

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

Mr. Laird inquired about grass and comments regarding various grass species, particularly in nonfunctional areas, or limiting grass to only functional areas.

Mr. White noted that the grass concern is being addressed in the updated Landscaping Enforcement and Regulations Code. The UDC currently specifies promoting native seed rather than turf, which is assigned a lower point value than native seed. Under the updated Landscaping Enforcement and Regulations Code, turf will be permitted only in functional areas, while turf grass will be prohibited in nonfunctional areas, with native seed required elsewhere. Mr. White also identified the personnel responsible for sponsoring the revisions regarding grass and functional areas. The goal is to present the proposal in June 2026.

Mr. Mathia asked for a definition of a functional area.

Mr. White explained that functional areas are being reviewed and will be defined in the amendment; both functional and nonfunctional areas are currently included in the UDC.

Mr. Laird referenced the Board of Public Utilities (BOPU) Water Summit, noting how various cities have implemented water conservation measures and expressed interest in limiting turf grass.

Boyd Wiggam commented on the descriptiveness of the updated UDC, suggesting alternatives to the language. He recommended that if certain grass species are restricted, options should remain permissive, allowing landowners a choice between grass species.

Mr. White clarified that the proposed regulations under the Landscaping Enforcement and Regulations Code apply to commercial properties and multifamily developments, not residential homes. Landscape requirements for single-family homes, duplexes, and townhomes are not regulated and would not be restricted.

Mr. Wiggam emphasized that landowner choice should be considered and that alternatives should be provided.

Mr. Laird noted that information on specific grass species should be included in the landscape revision and inquired about the difference between native grass that is seeded rather than sodded.

Mr. White explained that further review is needed to define native grasses. Native seed mixtures, such as prairie grass, are available and require less water and maintenance. The revised Landscaping Enforcement and Regulations Code will include updated definitions for grasses, but the section is still under review. Mr. White also referenced the landscape point system in the UDC.

Mr. Bloom noted tap sizes and specific development tap requirements.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed additional public comments received regarding Carports in Front Yards and Parking Minimums for Non-Residential Uses.

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

Mr. Laird noted the risk of developers determining the minimum parking for non-residential uses, explaining that developers or businesses could under build parking, which could lead to on-street parking or the use of neighboring parking lots not associated with the business.

Mr. Bloom acknowledged the observation and mentioned that, in the past, the majority of the council has not supported changes. However, he noted that if parking creates significant inconveniences, adjustments could be anticipated.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed additional public comments received regarding Special Uses: Betting Facilities and Sexually Oriented Businesses.

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

Mr. Laird noted information obtained from the legislature regarding Special Uses: Betting Facilities, including comments on local input and local control over the placement of the facilities. He inquired why Betting Facilities were not addressed more extensively in the zoning regulations.

Mr. Bloom explained that Special Uses: Betting Facilities require conditional use approval, which is reviewed by the Board of Adjustment. He added that it is surprising the board does not receive more public comment on applications for Betting Facilities.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed additional public comments received regarding Parking Lot Surfacing and Attached Sidewalks.

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

Mr. Laird referenced the KOA Campground and the proposed expansion without paving the internal roadway network.

Mr. Bloom confirmed that the KOA Campground, located south of Venture Drive and east of Campstool Road, wanted to expand while keeping the drive aisles gravel. The campground applied for a variance, which was denied, requiring the drive aisles to be paved.

Mr. White noted that the new Campground Regulations in the UDC, approved and adopted by the Governing Body, require drive aisles to be paved.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed additional public comments received regarding Temporary Construction Uses.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed Planning Commission concerns regarding Block Length Exceptions and requested guidance.

Mr. Laird noted that the process for addressing the issue is unclear, but the concern involves development north of the Walmart Supercenter. Certain developments currently limit access to public and active transportation connections. As additional projects, such as single-family homes, are built to the north, restricted connectivity could impede residents' access to nearby services. Property owners have also raised concerns about public rights-of-way within apartment complexes, noting that allowing public access through private residential areas creates challenges in controlling non-resident use while still providing connectivity between surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Bloom added that, in response to these concerns, the Planning and Development Department is reviewing the process to determine the most appropriate timeframe for establishing connections, particularly in the Section 20 area where many large tracts of land are under development with uncertain futures. A transportation network plan is available for review with preliminary plats; however, it provides only a general overview. The department is working to clarify the process, so developers are not required to over-engineer the concept plan at the preliminary stage.

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

Mr. Wiggam inquired whether pedestrian transportation could be designated as part of the transportation network, rather than only being adjacent to streets, to allow consideration of options for obtaining a block size exception.

Mr. Bloom noted that the idea will be considered and that further discussion will need to occur.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed Planning and Development staff concerns regarding the Zoning Enforcement process.

Mr. White noted that Seth Lloyd has been reviewing all sections of the code that would need to be updated, including the Municipal Code. The proposed changes have resulted in a fifty-page ordinance for

the Zoning Enforcement process, as many sections need to be revised from criminal to civil enforcement.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed additional Planning and Development staff concerns regarding Lot Types.

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

Mr. Bloom discussed additional Planning and Development staff concerns regarding the proposed deletion of Article 7: Form-Based Codes.

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

Mr. Laird inquired whether Article 7: Form-Based Codes is differentiated from (PUDs) Planned Unit Developments.

Mr. Bloom confirmed that Form-Based Codes are distinct from PUDs, as the codes address different types of transects and include regulations clearly based on forms and regulating plans.

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

Amy Hernandez asked for clarification on whether Article 7: Form-Based Codes was used in 2012.

Mr. Bloom noted that Article 7: Form-Based Codes was implemented in 2012 and first introduced with the updated Unified Development Code, but it has not been applied.

Lonnie Olson inquired whether Form-Based Codes are more commonly used in larger communities.

Mr. Bloom confirmed that Form-Based Codes are typically applied in dense or heavily urbanized communities.

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

Mr. Laird referenced a request to the Board of Adjustment for the multifamily housing development that was denied and inquired about the reason for the denial.

Mr. White explained that the denial was due to opposition from various neighbors.

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

Mr. Laird opened the meeting for public comment.

Chelsea McCort noted the vagueness of the (AG) Agricultural Zone designation and suggested the city create a separate definition for holding zones, as well as incorporate an urban agricultural definition into the zone designation. She also inquired about the Unified Development Code (UDC) and the (AG) Agricultural Zone designations for the purpose of land being held and for agricultural use.

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

Mr. White noted that the (AG) Agricultural Zone includes agricultural uses and has often been used as a holding zone because it is easier to rezone than other designations. In the past, when land was zoned agricultural as a holding zone, fees were not collected until a building permit was issued, which made it a practical option for holding land until development.

*\* 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. Bloom added that the (AG) Agricultural Zone functioned as a holding zone in part because impact fees for parks and public safety were assessed at the time of platting rather than at the time of zoning.

Mr. Laird asked whether zoning affects property tax assessments or if the county assessor determines land use independently.

Mr. Bloom noted that the process is not entirely clear, but zoning is only one factor considered by the assessor. Agricultural land, however, may qualify for a reduced assessment if it meets the county assessor's criteria. He referenced the Cole property as an example, which received an agricultural exemption based on the land's use and the income derived from agricultural activities.

Mr. Laird asked if there were any additional public comments.

Tommie Kniseley requested the inclusion of urban agricultural definitions.

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

Mr. Bloom noted that the Planning and Development Department is in the process of creating an Urban Farm definition, which will lead to further discussions on urban agricultural operations and the development of an ordinance to be included in the Unified Development Code (UDC).

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

Mr. Laird asked if there were any additional public comments. Hearing none, public comment was closed.

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

Mr. Wiggam expressed concerns about agricultural zones being considered holding zones and the connotations this creates.

Mr. Laird reiterated Mr. Wiggam's concern and emphasized the priority of allowing multifamily housing as a permitted use in zoning districts, as it relates to the City of Cheyenne's goal of increasing affordable and attainable housing.

Mr. Wiggam added that the items requiring prioritization are those that align urban areas with typical urban expectations, specifically Multifamily Permissibility and Block Size Exceptions to protect pedestrian access.

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

Mr. Mathia expressed concerns about parking and inquired whether requirements account for both employee and customer parking, or only customer parking.

Mr. White noted that parking requirements depend on the use. Some businesses are required to provide spaces for employees, while uses such as general offices have parking requirements based on building square footage.

Mr. Mathia referenced a general office with limited parking spaces for employees and customers, emphasizing that parking should be prioritized.

Ms. Hernandez stated that prioritization should focus on Multifamily Permissibility and creating clear definitions for Urban (AG) Agricultural Zone designations.

Mr. Olson asked whether City Council had provided directives and if any of the concerns could be aligned.

*\* 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. Bloom responded that City Council's primary focus is on Multifamily Permissibility, including design standards and public outreach on landscape requirements, while continuing work on the in-house Landscape Enforcement and Regulations Code. He noted the following priorities. High priorities include Special Use Facilities, Temporary Construction Uses, and changes related to agricultural uses. Medium priorities include Block Length Exceptions and Lot Types. Low priorities include Attached Sidewalks and Zoning Enforcement. The Parking Minimums for Non-Residential Use Code was split in priority.

Mr. White replied that staff would need to review all references to Article 7 throughout the UDC. Once that review is complete, an ordinance could be drafted to delete Article 7 and all references; however, the UDC requires further review prior to formal deletion and presentation.

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

Lonnie Olson made the motion to acknowledge receipt of the Unified Development Code (UDC) Annual Review Report, noting the priorities of Multifamily Permissibility, Block Size Exceptions, Urban (AG) Agricultural Zone Definitions, and Parking Minimums for Non-Residential Uses. Bob Mathia seconded the motion.

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

Roll Call: Motion to acknowledge receipt of the item was passed unanimously.

#### **ITEM 5: OTHER BUSINESS/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

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

- Connor White presented the following updates:
  - Next Meeting: March 2, 2026
  - Email Notice: Updated Unified Development Code – Text Amendment: (ADU) Accessory Dwelling Units.

#### **ITEM 6: PLANNING COMMISSION 101 TRAINING**

Charles Bloom, Planning and Development Director, presented the Planning Commission 101 Training into the record.

Tony Laird inquired whether staff could monitor the public comment time limit.

Mr. Bloom noted that staff could monitor the time limit.

Connor White, Planner II, added that, based on the number of individuals providing public comment, a time limit could be considered, with three minutes suggested as a reasonable limit.

Bob Mathia asked whether the time limit needed to be set at the beginning of public comment or if it could be set during the comment period.

Mr. White noted that the time limit must be set prior to the start of public comment.

Mr. Laird asked about the public hearing process and whether there was an opportunity after the hearing is closed that would allow the applicant to provide additional comments prompted by public input.

Mr. Bloom stated that the applicant could return to the podium to address additional comments, as has been done in the past, but it is not required.

Mr. Laird inquired about disclosures and conflict of interest procedures.

*\* 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. Bloom explained that a commissioner with a conflict of interest should disclose it during the Disclosure item on the agenda, leave the room until the item is presented, and return only after a motion has been made and a vote has been established.

Mr. Laird asked about public information and the reason ownership details are withheld.

Mr. Bloom noted that anyone could request the assessor to withhold ownership information, but the Planning and Development Department typically has access to the information.

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

**ITEM 7: MEETING ADJOURNED: 8:12 PM**

  
Staff Signature

  
Board Officer