

CITY OF CHEYENNE
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
September 3, 2024
6:00 P.M.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:, Vice-Chair, Darrell Hibbins

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Kelly Hafner, Brooke Bulgrin, Carlos Machado, Brad Emmons, James O'Connor

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 4 members present.

ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Ms. Connor made a motion to approve the August 5th meeting minutes and 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: Postponed PUDC-24-107 / Ridge View Apartments – Phase 2, Expedited Plat
Agent: Kelly Hafner, CivilWorx Engineering Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. White read Item A into the record.

Mr. Hafner gave an update on this project and the history of it as well as some research he has done. He presented a slideshow for the Commission

Mr. Laird asked if the land immediately west of Sams was still part of the Cole family

Mr. Hafner answered yes it was

Mr. Laird asked some questions about the streets on the PowerPoint.

Mr. Hafner confirmed the street names on the PowerPoint

Mr. Laird asked if the cutoff road would be extended

Mr. Hafner answered the Cole family has no interest in expanding cutoff rd.

Mr. Laird asked about the new rd. will it be open to the public or only the complex

Mr. Hafner answered it was for the residents, but to clarify with staff

Mr. Laird asked about the other North South rd. and wanted to know what rd. it is.

Mr. Hafner answered that is Fort Laramie Trail he does not know if it goes through as a collector but if it goes through, it will be a local rd.

Mr. Mathia asked for any more questions

Mr. Bloom answered the previous statements asked by Mr. Laird and went into detail about having no easements in place for the walkway. He also went in to talk about the fire house and the details of its structure.

Mr. White read the staff report into the record and went over the details and findings.

Staff is recommending the same motion from August 5th taking out the BOPU condition.

Mr. Laird asked about the block size and block perimeter.

Mr. White answered it would be the entire face being the block size.
Mr. Laird said he is worried about future development to the North
Mr. Mathia opened up public comment there was none.
Mr. Wiggam joined the meeting and has been online for the record.
Mr. Wiggam was also concerned about the block size.
Mr. Mathia re read the two options to Mr. Wiggam
Mr. White re read the options into the record and clarified the process for the two options.
Mr. Laird asked that he would like to see some sort of recommendation for the pedestrian easement for the new property and the new plat.
Mr. Lloyd answered that the commission has the authority to add or take away conditions. If they would like to add one, then to please do so.
Mr. Wiggam asked if this was advanced as a prelim plat how much delay is estimated.
Mr. Lloyd answered and explained the steps and stated it would be roughly 2 to 2 and a half months, rounded up to 3 months.
Ms. Conner made a motion that carries the stipulations.
Mr. Laird moved to approve as expedited plat but add a pedestrian easement as a condition.
Mr. Lloyd asked if the motion included the staff recommended conditions
Mr. Laird answered yes but to add the easement.
Mr. Wiggam asked if we were working from staffs' motion or another motion
Mr. Lloyd answered to Mr. Wiggam and explained the options and what he would like to include.
Mr. Wiggam answered to update or dedicate a street is what he would prefer.
Mr. Laird agreed.
Mr. Lloyd rephrased the motion for clarity
Mr. Wiggam second the motion
A vote was taken with all members voting unanimously, the motion passes.

ITEM B: PUDC-24-106 / Edgar Subdivision, Expedited Plat
Case Planner: Athen Mores, Planner I

Mr. White read item B into the record.
Ms. Bulgrin explained the details, history, and changes made to the project.
Mr. Mores read toe staff report into the record.
Mr. Laird asked about the engineering plans and green stamp plans, he is wondering if this is for finalizing site plan and construction.
Mr. Lloyd answered the review is to run concurrently with the plant and that sometimes it runs after.
Mr. Laird asked if any design or review would take place?
Mr. Lloyd answered correct the next step would be for the building permit itself
Mr. Wiggam asked if there was any way to import the conditions and concerns in the engineering memo onto the face of the pat and make the lots subject to those concerns.
Mr. White answered that Cassie Picket our engineer is online and would like to fill in.
Ms. Pickett answered the comments and concerns that were made about the plat. The addressed these concerns and talked about the engineering study.
Mr. Mathia asked if this would be a survey for the whole area?
Ms. Pickett answered that she was not seeing the proposed grading of the site but would need to, to get the green stamped plans.
Mr. Laird asked if over lot meant some bigger portion of the site?
Ms. Pickett answered yes
Public comment was opened.
Mr. Arnold approached the podium and stated his concerns about the project.
Mr. Machado approached the podium and voiced his concerns about the project and the topography.
Public comment was then closed

Ms. Bulgrin approached the podium and discussed the concerns that were brought up. The property has been shrunken to 11 homes instead of 12 now. Had a surveyor look at the property for drainage and topography.
Mr. Laird made a motion to approve the project
Ms. Connor second the motion
Mr. Wiggam discussed his concerns about topography, the bad doings of the owner, and stated the public knows more about the professionalism of the project as opposed to the commission. He will vote against this
Ms. Connor stated her second was for discussion, and she will be voting against the project.
Motion to approve was called for roll call
The motion failed with members voting no 3-1
Mr. Wiggam made a motion to recommend denial based on review criteria.
Ms. Connor believes the project does not meet review criteria 2 and 8
Ms. Connor made a motion to deny based on review criteria 2 and 8
Mr. Wiggam second the motion
Mr. Laird asked for clarification
Mr. Lloyd answered and clarified the steps for appeal and how the process works.
Roll call was taken for denial and passed members voting 3-1.

ITEM C: PUDC-24-124 / Andiamo Subdivision, Expedited Plat
Agent: AVI, PC. Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. White read item C into the record
Mr. Christensen described the project to the commission.
Mr. Wiggam asked what kind of elevation he was talking about, as well as density and population.
Mr. Christensen answered it would be 101 residential units.
Mr. Wiggam asked about parking due to this growth
Mr. Christensen answered there will be 78 parking spaces
Mr. Bloom stated that a block in a half away is a public parking garage that can aid in overflow parking.
Mr. White read the staff report to the commission.
Public comment and commissioner comment was open, there was none.
Mr. Laird made a motion to approve
Mr. Wiggam second the motion
Roll call was taken with all members voting unanimously.

Item D: PUDC-24-145 / 4614 E Pershing Blvd., 201 Exception
Agent: James O'Connor Case Planner: Connor White, Planner II

Mr. White read Item D into the record.
Mr. O'Connor went into detail about the project to the commission of annexing for water services.
Mr. Mathia asked if he was connected to the water systems
Mr. O'Connor answered no they will need to connect and also stated the cost.
Mr. White read the staff report into the record for the commission.
Mr. Wiggam asked how is readily available defined from a city sewer standpoint.
Mr. White answered if it was adjacent to the property in the alley behind the property or along east Pershing
Ms. Connor asked if a cost would be involved.
Mr. White answered cost depends on who installs it.
Public comment was opened
Mr. Studley approached the podium and commented that the annexation he is doing everything reasonable to apply safe water to himself and his family.

Mr. Wiggam asked if approved is a county pocket going to be created.
Mr. White answered that it will not create a county pocket.
Mr. Matia asked if any private wells were near his leach field proposition.
Mr. Lloyd answered that it had a bunch of wells and septic systems.
Mr. Bloom added that they have contacted several people from this neighborhood in the past to help with sewer impacts resulting in them trying to find individual solutions.
Ms. Hernandez made a motion to approve
Ms. Connor second the motion
Roll call was taken with all members voting yes unanimously.

Item E: PLTA-24-6 / Business Park Zone, Text Amendment

Case Planner: Seth Lloyd, Senior Planner

Mr. White read item E into the record.
Mr. Lloyd presented the project to the commission
Mr. Lloyd presented the staff report to the commission.
Mr. Laird asked about uses such as dog washes
Mr. Lloyd answered, yes, all services uses will be allowed in this use
Mr. laird asked if cryptocurrency mining would be allowed.
Mr. Lloyd answered they are considered as data centers in the code, but if after a certain sound study must go to industrial.
Mr. Wiggam asked what something is comparable in our community for the 20 ft sign allowance
Mr. Lloyd answered the Cheyenne Business Parkway sign itself is 15ft, also the Dell Range Star Bucks is 20 ft high. Also discussed pole sign allowance.
Mr. Bloom answered that also the Les Schwab is 20 feet tall.
Mr. Wiggam stated our business parks like to abut to our interstates, and he is pondering the Dell Range signs to the Highway. If service uses are allowed in business parks wants to make sure we are covered. Wants to know if interstate signs must math other signs.
Mr. Lloyd clarified these are exit and service signs, and the freeway code would not change. McDonalds can still have their big Freeway sign.
Mr. Wiggam asked what our SS zone is
Mr. Lloyd answered is stands for Support Services, primarily for the Air force Base to support a mission.
Mr. Wiggam asked if we could offer compliance with the fencing and offer vegetation as an alternative?
Mr. Lloyd answered we have not provided an alternative for outdoor storage. If planning commission would come up with an alternative, we can try to craft something.
Mr. Wiggam stated it sounds more like a global thing that applies to business parks.
Mr. Mathia asked how he came out the number of acres for a minimum standard.
Mr. Lloyd answered he studied other areas and wanted to make sure it was indeed a business park. Lots of properties are not this big so it would make a good use. If a better number is out there, they will listen to the commission. It is ultimately a half mile.
Mr. Mathia asked if we wanted it to go below the 320SF
Mr. Lloyd answered it could be a variance

Mr. Wiggam stated he is familiar with the process and gave some background information on the standards.

Mr. Lloyd stated we don't have a strong stance on acreage the whole point is so that its not too small but not too large to create issues.

Mr. Laird asked where the north Range Business Park is in reference to the Microsoft center. He also stated a Microsoft Parcel is going in on the southside. Will this be part of North Range business park,

Mr. Emmons answered that eventually it will join the business park.

Mr. Laird asked Microsoft also owns other properties are these going to be a business park.

Mr. Emmons answered it has already been annexed into the business park.

Public comment was opened

Mr. Emmons wanted to thank staff for bringing it forward as an idea.

Public comment was closed

Mr. Wiggam asked about the minimum acreage size doesn't know if we want to move issue first then make an amendment.

Ms. Connor claims she is support it as written but is concerned with anything smaller than the 320 acres.

Ms. Hernande agrees with Ms. Connor on the 320 acres

Ms. Wiggam explained why he supports a lower number.

Mr. Laird answered it would be proper to make the motion as written once second make a motion to amend the motion, discussion, and a vote, if fails original motion is still on table.

Mr. White stated that is reasonable.

Mr. Wiggam agreed.

Ms. Hernandez made a motion to approve to original text amendment.

Ms. Connor second the motion.

Mr. Wiggam asked to amend the main motion for the lot size to 160 acres

Mr. Laird second the motion.

Mr. Wiggam gave his reasons once again for why he wanted to change the total acreage.

Roll call was taken for the amendment of the 160 acres

Mr. Mathia then asked if this would affect our goal of having a large business park?

Mr. Lloyd answered that it gets riskier that property owners do this. The minimum acreage is trying to find a balance.

Roll call was taken with and failed members voting 3-1

Roll call was taken on the original amendment all members voted yes unanimously. The motion passes.

ITEM 5: OTHER BUSINESS/STAFF ANNOUCEMENTS

Mr. White stated new commission members will be selected and that one had resigned. Please let staff know how many are staying in their position.

Mr. Bloom listed off all of the terms that are expiring, those 2 would need to seek reappointment. Please give staff an answer no later than the first November meeting.


Mr. Wiggam stated he is seeking reappointment.

Mid-month will be taking place, it might be postponed but might not.

ITEM 6: MEETING ADJOURNED: 8:23pm



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.*