

## Scenarios Workshop Summary

Thursday, March 20, 2008  
Sheridan College, 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

### Attendance

**Public:** 54 people signed in for the meeting, estimated over 60 in attendance.

**Planning Team:** Robert Briggs, (City Planner), Mark Reid (County Planner), Lesli Ellis and Ben Herman (Clarion).

### Agenda

1. Welcome and Update
2. Brief Presentation of Issues and Existing Conditions
3. Scenarios Discussion and Group Work
4. Wrap-up

### Summary

#### ***Presentation and Results***

---

The Mayor and Commissioner welcomed those in attendance and the planning team provided a brief PowerPoint presentation covering the existing conditions, planning process, and an overview of the Scenarios.

Groups then provided comments on the scenarios, with nine of eleven groups finding aspects of Scenario B that they preferred and a few groups preferring a combination of Scenarios B and C. Results by group are on the following pages.

A few individuals provided comments via written comment forms. Those comments are at the end of this document.

## **Group 1**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - No major changes necessary to achieve
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Low levels of protection for resources areas
  - Assumes affordable and workforce housing
  - Strip commercial development
  - Difficult to coordinate a transportation system
  - Inefficient utility services

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Maximize utility services
  - No high density to the west
  - Redevelop and/or infill development
  - Preserve and improve current city limits
  - Industrial development to the east
  - Conserves outlying agricultural landscape resource protection
  - Commercial development is not spread therefore allows for walkable compact development
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Dense population, traffic, and impacts to open space

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Most realistic
  - 2 acre and larger lots
  - Manage and preserve open space
  - Protect with environmental standards and resources
  - Establish standards for developments
  - Cluster developments
  - No high density to the west

## **Group 2**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Fragmented
  - Higher costs

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Good use of resources – more economical – don't have to extend infrastructure so far
  - Keeps agriculture land and habitat
  - Already have quite a lot of rural residential development
  - Best Scenario
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Not sure commercial centers as set make sense
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Restrict development in riparian areas and floodplain development
  - Restrict – building above 100-yr floodplain
  - Add corridor for future Hwy 87 west of city

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Commercial area to south doesn't make sense
  - Don't like so much rural residential
  - Too spread out

## **Group 3**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Path-of-least resistance for current landowner
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Expensive/ elevated service costs
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Use plan B

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Concentrated commercial centers. Anchor stores/ like grocery stores
  - Cohesive aesthetics
  - Common sense, practical, will help keep county taxes down, better use of taxpayer dollars for services
  - Better traffic patterns
  - Keeps agricultural areas
  - Conserves what we like
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Takes away from downtown a bit

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Provide a few more options for rural residential housing
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Surface and groundwater issues
  - Commercial spread
  - Too much rural residential
  - Prefer concentration of housing and more open Agriculture land

## **Group 4**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Not the future. Need more planning and control of our future
  - Too disjointed
  - In the long term, this is too expensive and we will pay the price in the future
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Planning board for all planning within the JPA
  - Utility board (Ownership) for water and sewer

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Most efficient – most cost effective to serve with utilities, roads, etc.
  - Most protection of natural resources in areas around the core center
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - This appears to be difficult to implement
  - It is not what many may want (want more rural residential)
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Need to establish regional planning board

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - This provides what most people move here for
  - A good blend (some open space/ larger lots, but also planned
  - Can fill in more in the future – like 20-50 years out, so allows some flexibility of rural residential
  - Now (for those that want it), lots can maybe filled in more at that future time
  - Commercial/industrial areas are in locations where water and sewer are generally available (very important)
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Services – water and sewer – becomes more costly
  - Groundwater is threatened to be contaminated
  - Need to plan way into the future (for the potential buildout) of water and sewer locations and sizes, so eventually there can be central water (and other utilities) throughout this area
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Don't fragment services – develop water and sewer in the JPA
  - Need a regional planning board – board to handle all planning

- Need to have good enforcement of policies and regulations
- Maybe have cluster developments in rural residential areas so there are smaller lots with lots of open space around. This will make it easier to effectively serve water and sewer.
- Require central water from the start.

## **Group 5**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Zoning important to drive development location
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Dislike string development

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Efficiency
  - Seems like utilities will naturally grow out from the center
  - Therefore I like building a transportation and utility grid out from this center incentive development
  - Drainages should have easements for pathways and some open park space
  - Zone – West side (south of Loucks) residential (or rural residential only)
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Commercial center at Big Horn Y (Big Horn Avenue and Hwy 87 and 335) is wrong
  - Move west roadway – further west
  - Could add a commercial star area on N. Main St., S. Coffeen, and Brundage— South to the college
  - Commercial center on Midland road is too far north and should be at 5<sup>th</sup> St
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Locations of Commercial centers – change to 5<sup>th</sup> St – further west, and eliminate south of Hwy 335/87
  - We are in favor of riparian setbacks along natural drainage areas – deep draws and streams
  - Move the railroad out of town
  - Cluster business parks for professional parks

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- Describe “Rural Residential” to allow cluster development

## **Group 6**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Commercial center east of 5<sup>th</sup> St. (Wingate/ Info Center)
  - No septic systems in floodplain areas
  - Add cluster in RR zone
  - Continuous bike path from town to Bighorn, and town to North along creek
  - Mixed use district to enhance redevelopment
  - Protect riparian areas

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Commercial centers
  - Enlarged industrial zones
  - Encourages redevelopment in Downtown
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - No commercial on Fort Road and Dana Ave, Downer Area
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Commercial center east of 5<sup>th</sup> St. (Wingate/ Info Center)
  - No septic systems in floodplain areas
  - Add cluster in RR zone
  - Continuous bike path from town to Bighorn, and town to North along creek
  - Mixed-use district to enhance redevelopment
  - Protect riparian areas

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Large blocks of Rural Residential
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - No commercial strips
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Add commercial centers
  - Grandfather Urban Residential and transition into Rural Residential
  - Make sure that city/county boundary zones are complimentary
  - Combine the commercial centers in Scenario B with this Scenario
  - Commercial center east of 5<sup>th</sup> St. (Wingate/ Info Center)
  - No septic systems in floodplain areas
  - Add cluster in Rural Residential zone
  - Continuous bike path from town to Bighorn, and town to North along creek

- Mixed use district to enhance redevelopment
- Protect riparian areas

## **Group 7**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Group that doesn't like change will not be aggravated
  - No ghettos
  - No definite Urban Edge – some people like this
  - Nice town center
  - Some like to have Agriculture/ activities (animals) and still have city water
  - Allows people large lots/ buffer from neighbors
  - "Not one damn thing is good about this"
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Very difficult to administer / no plan
  - Lots of conditional use permits/ uses not matching zones
  - Lots of variance requests
  - Agriculture land is getting chopped up
  - Infringing on riparian areas
  - Leap frog development is occurring
  - Incompatible uses adjacent to each other
  - Not enough commercially or industrial development
  - Difficult to provide services
  - Lots of septic tanks located where they could contaminate groundwater

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Less costly to provide city services
  - Clear line between city and county
  - People can access county easier when leaving city / quick to get to it
  - Cluster development makes it easier to provide services
  - Preserves open space and agricultural integrity
  - Encourages infill
  - Makes you plan ahead more → less conflicts between incompatible uses
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Will piss-off developers/landowners further out who are hoping to make a high profit
  - Needs to help revitalize N. Main
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Make stricter development regulations for flood plains
  - Buffer creeks from development
  - Allow for some cluster development

- “Pre-approve” cluster developments
- Space out residential from railroad → buffer
- Extend pathways to all areas (but make sure people clean up after dogs)
- Buffer the roadway
- Need equestrian trails/paths
- Identify areas for open space
- Need to incorporate city’s parks and recreational plans with master plan

## Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Big profits for landowners
  - Brings in rich people who build “McMansions”
  - Helps N. Main Street
  
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Urban sprawl
  - Ugly strip developments
  - More costly to extend infrastructure
  - Taxes will go up
  - Will make forced zoning changes which many landowners won’t like
  
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Doesn’t preserve irrigated agriculture land
  - Develop agriculture land west of town first

## **Group 8**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Very flexible
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Business strip mall south of the college will lead to sprawl and unacceptable traffic on Coffeen

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Limits sprawl
  - Conserves agricultural lands
  - Keeps a vibrant downtown by people living near/in downtown area
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Higher cost of housing?
  - Limit surface owner options
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Limit number of commercial centers
  - Put commercial/industrial on west side of airport
  - Potentially add on option of cluster development

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Feathered edge concept is a good idea – provides buffer for wildlife
  - Provides wider variety of lifestyles closer to town
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Commercial strip on S. Coffeen not a good idea as big as it is
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Limit commercial areas size on the outskirts of town

## **Group 9**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - West bypass
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Not enough Airport Safe area
  - Too scattered
  - Land waste
  - West side Urban Residential – especially west of airport
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - See option B

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Energy efficient
  - More compact
  - Less agriculture land used
  - West bypass
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - North commercial center +/-
  - Location of I-90 interchange on west bypass? Where??
  - Protect the best agriculture land leave the irrigated land in place
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Cluster development in railroad areas on the B scenario
  - More airport clear area
  - Low energy approach in all planning
  - Get into Ranchester, Dayton, Clearmont plan

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Cluster good
  - West bypass
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Too much Agriculture land covered
  - Strip mall areas on Big Horn Hwy 87, South woodland park
  - Not compact enough
  - Provides for greater population than projected growth

## **Group 10**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Not much
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Unplanned scatter
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - See option B

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Makes good use of existing development areas
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Pressure on transportation and parking in commercial centers
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Move commercial center from 17<sup>th</sup> St. to 5<sup>th</sup> St. and new west side of corridor

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Tries to concentrate commercial
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Brings "sprawl" to more people/areas
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - See option B
  - Airport – keep more land for safety zone

## **Group 11**

### **Scenario A: Status Quo Patchwork**

- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Randomness of development
  - Not well-orchestrated growth
  - Unclear guidelines
  - Overdone independence – personal property rights trump public good
  - Commercial developments can go just about anywhere
  - Loss of pastures
  
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - All of the above
  - Adopt rules with teeth and follow through/ enforcement without exception
  - Open space requirements with the developments in the residential areas
  - More development to the north of town
  - Revitalization of N. Main St with the Old Part of Entry and beyond

### **Scenario B: Compact City with Centers**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Keeping growth centralized
  - Growth centers so traffic isn't congested in any one area
  - Allows for efficiency by restoring rather than abandoning areas
  - Better use of infrastructure and public funds
  - Reduce or eliminate commercial sprawl
  - Safeguards open space and natural resources and aesthetic values
  
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Would concentrated growth diminish the downtown vistas? (i.e., Will we eventually have to lose the view?)
  
- **Proposed Changes:**
  - Open space requirements with the developments in the residential areas
  - Adopt rules with teeth and follow through/ enforcement without exception
  - More development to the north of town
  - Revitalization of N. Main St with the Old Part of Entry and beyond

### **Scenario C: Feathered Rural Residential Edge**

- **Scenario Likes:**
  - Developments to the north
  
- **Scenario Dislikes:**
  - Too easy to compromise – its what we have with Scenario A, only expanded (Scenario A on steroids)

- **Proposed Changes:**
  - More development to the north of town
  - Revitalization of N. Main St with the Old Part of Entry and beyond
  - Adopt rules with teeth and follow through/ enforcement without exception
  - Open space requirements with the developments in the residential areas

## **Individual Comments**

### **Comment 1:**

#### **1. The issues that we need to address:**

- If we went with Option "B", what provisions will there be for allowing "out of compliance" buildings and parking?
- Put sewer processing plant at strategic location to capture septic systems that are in the most sensitive environmental area.

#### **2. Three land use scenarios:**

- I like "b" for the efficient use of existing development. However, this option puts the most pressure on making transportation and parking available. If we ask people to go to the "clusters" for their work, play, and entertainment, then parking and roads must be up to the task. This may cost more in this option than the others.

#### **3. General planning process:**

- Great cooperation from city and county. Good job!

### **Comment 2:**

#### **General:**

- I would suggest a recreation corridor between Soldier Creek and Big Goose along the Alliance Ditches. This is consistent with the city future Pathways Plan.
- Also, a recreational corridor along or near the Colorado Colony Ditch would be good to link Big Horn with Sheridan and future subdivisions.
- Plan these corridors before development begins!
- We should create extensive residential along the East Ridge – limit industrial. Leave industrial to the outskirts. East Ridge residential will benefit the downtown.
- Integrate the east and west sides of town with an underpass.
- We must support our existing city center with more and denser development. Grow north and east of Main Street. Control growth west and south.
- Grow concentric around the city center to benefit the existing downtown.