



# City of Laramie

Community Development Department  
P.O. Box C  
Laramie, WY 82073

Planning: (307) 721-5207  
Code Administration: (307) 721-5271  
Fax: (307) 721-5248  
Engineering: (307) 721-5291  
Fax: (307) 721- 5216  
TTD: (307) 721-5295

## MINUTES

### Laramie Planning Commission

Wednesday, June 17, 2009 4:30 PM

City Council Chambers  
406 Iverson, Laramie, WY  
(City Hall)

---

*The Planning Commission meetings are open to the public. Requests from person with disabilities must be made to the Community Development Department 24 hours in advance of the meeting.*

---

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Meeting convened at 4:34p.m.

Members present: David Paulekas, Tim Nyquist, Stephanie Malcolm, and Vicki Henry

Members absent: Kaye Willis, Dean Smith, and John Hester

There was a quorum present at all times.

Council Liaison: Erik Molvar (absent)

Staff Present: Peter Wysocki, Randy Hunt, Charles Bloom, Derek Teini, and Sara Davis

Citizen Speakers: Dean Mercil, Grant Lindstrom, Nate Cross, Jim McGrath, and Cliff Asay

#### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

No items.

#### 3. CITIZEN COMMENTS - Non-Agenda Related Topics – No Action Can Be Taken

No items.

#### 4. PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS AND COMMENTS

No items.

#### 5. DISCLOSURES

No items.

#### 6. CURRENT PLANNING PROJECTS

##### NEW BUSINESS:

No items.

##### OLD BUSINESS:

No items.

#### 7. VARIANCES

No items.

#### 8. LONG RANGE PLANNING PROJECTS

##### 8-A. Recommendation to the City Council of the Unified Development Code

Paulekas asked if any members of the public wished to ask questions regarding the draft unified development code.

Dean Mercil asked if apartment building will have to provide 50% of their parking with garage spaces. Wysocki stated that if approved as currently written that is true.

Mercil asked if there are certain porch requirements for apartments. Bloom responded that the porches need to have the dimensions of 4' x 10'.

Mercil asked what is the purpose of the design standards for multifamily. Paulekas responded that they are design standards.

Mercil asked if storage for apartments is necessary. Bloom responded that it would be a requirement if passed as currently written.

Mercil asked what the required square footage for storage is. Wysocki responded that it is a minimum of 32 sq ft.

Grant Lindstrom asked about the 10 ft height maximum on retaining walls. Wysocki responded that it would apply as a 5 ft vertical, 3 ft horizontal, and 5 ft vertical stair-step, as shown in the subsections diagram.

Lindstrom asked if the requirement pertaining to 40 ft between driveways is practical. Wysocki stated that it is practical.

Mercil stated that he is not sure what the City is trying to accomplish by adding design standards to multifamily, in particular requiring carports and garages for 50% of the required parking, other than increasing rental prices. Mercil stated that there are storage units available in town if a renter needs extra storage space and garages should remain a luxury. Additionally, Mercil stated that if there is going to be a requirement for porches that staff should consider implementing the design standards of the Turner Tract instead of those drafted. Mercil stated that balconies are not a good idea because everyone will want to put their gas grill on their balcony and there are sprinkler requirements.

Nate Cross stated that he would like staff to prepare a detailed outline of the code requirements that is easy for the general public to read and understand. Additionally, Cross stated that he would like detail checklist for building permits. Cross stated that he would like to see a set of standards for both sides: developer and City. Also, Cross stated that he would like to know who is in charge of specific elements of the building process.

Jim McGrath stated concern with the new code and his neighborhood on south 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, which is a mixture of business and residences in B2 and B1 not conforming. McGrath stated that he is worried that he will not be able to re-build his house if it burns down. McGrath stated that he would like to see a mixed use neighborhood like the one he currently lives in, and he has seen these types of neighborhoods in other parts of the county.

Cliff Asay stated that as a developer he would do the bare minimal landscaping requirements because he would have to hire an outside professional to install. It will be money that he will not see a profit on and likely the homeowner will change it to his personal preferences. Asay suggested giving incentives to the homeowners to finish landscaping within one year and perhaps make the homeowners bond the money for landscaping. Asay

stated that he feels that the City is overstepping their boundaries on this code design requirement.

Lindstrom stated that he is concerned about the maintenance of trees and bushes. Lindstrom asked why there is a requirement of 30% turf grass for landscaping. Lindstrom stated that the property owners should bond for \$500 for landscaping. Lindstrom stated that he likes the idea of the garage offering variety, but he is concerned about the front yard setbacks and there will no longer be a purpose for reverse corner lots. Lindstrom also stated that 6 ft retaining walls will not work on a 20% grade. Additionally, Lindstrom stated that the street connectivity will not work because it will conflict with the snow plows. Lindstrom stated that the 600 ft maximum block length should be changed to 900 ft as is written in current code.

Mercil stated that he does not think that metal roof should be limited to standing seam because there are other nice looking metal roofs such as stamped metal and metal roofs are durable.

Asay agreed with Mercil that limiting the use of metal roofs is unwise because it will prohibit the use of new quality materials. Further, Asay stated that he does not like the wording of "at the discretion of the director" for variances from the code. He believes that the rules should be made general.

Wysocki stated that the Planning Division has flow charts outlining procedures. Wysocki clarified that the "director" references really mean administrative approval. Wysocki stated that the language references to the director will likely change.

MOTION BY HENRY, seconded by Nyquist, to reword:

- Sec. 15.14.080.B.2 as follows: "Section 15.14.010.B.2.b (Applicability – Redevelopment and Infill Development) provides information about how these provisions apply to redevelopment and infill development. In the case of exterior enlargement of an existing development (Section 15.14.010.B.2.a) or interior changes (Section 15.14.010.B.3), residential design standards shall not be mandatory for existing detached and attached one-and two-family dwellings, and townhouses."
- Sec. 15.14.010.B.2.a as follows: "Except in the case of residential design standards for detached and attached one-and two-family dwellings, these development standards shall apply in their entirety to applications for building permits for construction that...." [the remainder of the subsection to remain as drafted]
- Sec. 15.14.010.B.3 as follows: "Except in the case of residential design standards for detached and attached one-and two-family dwellings: Where development changes are wholly internal to the existing structure...." [the remainder of the subsection to remain as drafted]

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY PAULEKAS, seconded by Nyquist, to eliminate landscaping requirements for all single-family detached and single-family attached lots/structures.

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY HENRY, seconded by Nyquist, to amend Sec. 15.14.050.B as follows:

Renumber text in Section 15.14.050.B to 15.14.050.B.1, and add the following new Section 15.14.050.B.2:

2. The Alternative Equivalent Compliance provisions in Section 15.06.060.K shall be available to satisfy landscaping standard requirements, provided that in addition to the requirements and criteria of Section 15.06.060.K, the following specific procedures are followed:

- (a) Any and all plans and documents submitted shall be approved by a professional specialist with demonstrable expertise in landscaping, such as a landscape architect or landscape contractor. Such approval shall be in written form and shall state that the specialist has reviewed the specific plans and documents presented.
- (b) In order to grant a request for alternative equivalent compliance, the decision-making entity shall find, in addition to the criteria in Section 15.06.060.K.6, that the following criteria are met:
  - (i) The proposed alternative landscape design will conserve water and/or reduce long-term maintenance costs.
  - (ii) The proposed alternative landscape design is compatible with the character and ambiance of vegetation and environmental design traditional to Wyoming and interior Western communities.

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY MALCOLM, seconded by Nyquist, to strike references prohibiting metal roofs in section 15.14.080 (in residential zones only).

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY HENRY, seconded by Malcolm, to strike any reference to prohibition of metal roofs use in all other zones.

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY HENRY, seconded by Nyquist, to amend Section 15.14.020.C.3, by adding the following sentence as new subsection 15.14.020.C.3.c, and renumbering following subsections accordingly:

“This requirement shall not apply to any lot of record in existence as of the effective date of this Code, provided the lot area is ½-acre or more.”

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, and Nyquist. NAYS: Malcolm. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester.  
MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY HENRY, seconded by Nyquist, to delete #4 from section 15.14.080.d (covered parking).

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY MALCOLM, seconded by Nyquist, to strike #5 from 15.14.080.d (extra storage space for multi-family units).

AYES: Paulekas, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: Henry. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY HENRY, seconded by Nyquist, to strike from #d under #2 of section 15.14.080.d that the word "all" and be replaced with "at least 50% of" and on the second sentence to strike that "all" and replace with "at least 50% of."

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY NYQUIST, seconded by Henry, in section 15.14.080.d.2.a strike the 40 linear feet and replace with 30 linear feet in the first paragraph.

AYES: Paulekas, Henry, Malcolm, and Nyquist. NAYS: None. Absent: Smith, Willis, and Hester. MOTION CARRIED.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Paulekas adjourned the meeting at 7:45p.m.

VALIDATED:

---

David Paulekas, Planning Commission Chair Date

---

Heather Earl, Interim Planning Commission Secretary and Clerk Date

Minutes prepared by:  
Sara Davis, Administrative Assistant  
Community Development Department