

**AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF WYOMING, MINNESOTA
APRIL 23, 2024
7:00 PM**

CALL TO ORDER:

CALL OF ROLL:

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

OPEN FORUM:

An opportunity for members of the public to address the Planning Commission on items not on the current Agenda. Items requiring Planning Commission action may be deferred to staff for research and future Planning Commission Agendas if appropriate. You will be limited to two (2) minutes and we ask that you conduct yourself in a professional, courteous manner, and refrain from the use of profanity. Failure to abide by this policy may result in the loss of your privilege to speak.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- 1. Consider approving the minutes of the “Regular Meeting” of the Wyoming, Minnesota Planning Commission for April 9, 2024.**

SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 2. Rezone: Z-24-001 Rural Residential II (R-2) to Commercial (C) District**
Location: Hamlet Avenue at Highway 8, northeast corner.
Applicant / Owner: Stephen Witzel
Property ID Number: 21.10674.02

NEW BUSINESS:

OLD BUSINESS:

- 3. Planning Commission Appointment Recommendation to the City Council - Chris Ortwerth.**
- 4. Rezoning of undeveloped parcels to match the Comprehensive Plan.**

COMMUNICATIONS:

UPDATES:

ADJOURN

UPCOMING:

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF WYOMING, MINNESOTA
APRIL 9, 2024
7:00PM**

CALL TO ORDER:

Planning Commission Chairman Lobermeier called the Regular Meeting of the Wyoming Planning Commission for April 9, 2024 to order at 7:00 PM

CALL OF ROLL:

*On a Call of the Roll the following members of the Wyoming Planning Commission were present:
Mark Lobermeier, Dan Iverson, and Mark Holl*

ABSENT: Commissioner Katie West

Also Present: Fred Weck Zoning Administrator and Council Liaison Lisa Iverson

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

OPEN FORUM: NONE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. **Consider approving the minutes of the “Regular Meeting” of the Wyoming, Minnesota Planning Commission for February 28, 2024**

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER IVERSON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE “REGULAR MEETING” OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION FOR FEBRUARY 28, 2024 AS SUBMITTED.

<i>Voting Aye:</i>	<i>Holl, Iverson, and Lobermeier</i>
<i>Voting Nay:</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Abstain:</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Absent:</i>	<i>West</i>

SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS: NONE

NEW BUSINESS

2. **Rezoning up Undeveloped Parcels to Match the Comprehensive Plan**

Zoning Administrator Weck reviewed the current zoning designations and areas of non-conformity when compared to the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that there are currently about 3,365 individual parcels in the City and of those, 997 will need to be rezoned in order to match the Comprehensive Plan map.

Chair Lobermeier asked if the Commission should spend a bit more time on the legal non-conforming aspect of this issue before they move on to other areas. He noted that comments from Mayor Iverson from their last meeting echo some of what he was thinking about that before the City takes any step beyond tonight is that they should communicate with the Council about what they are talking about doing and their reasoning. He asked for a primer on what that would mean for projects, such as, Summerfield.

Zoning Administrator Weck referenced Chair Lobermeier's lot which is zoned R2 and is shoreland, and gave the example of that changing to R3. He explained that in that scenario, if he came to the City for a building permit, anything inside the house would be okay and anything outside the house would be okay, as long as they still met the setbacks. He stated that where it will become tight is on the smaller lots where they cannot meet the setbacks and would need a variance. He stated that in R1, R2, and R3, a single-family dwelling is a permitted use.

Commissioner Holl gave the example of someone who had an R1 parcel and the City rezoned it to R2 and the owner wanted to put an addition on their garage. He explained that the property owner did not create the hardship, the City did by rezoning it and asked if the City would automatically give that individual a variance, since the hardship was not created by the property owner.

Zoning Administrator Weck explained that it would be one of the things that the City would look at within the standards of granting a variance and would be something outside of his control. He moved the discussion on to the other areas to be rezoned and the creation, in some instances, of legal non-conformities.

Chair Lobermeier noted that the number of parcels that need to be rezoned are about one-third of the total parcels, which seems like a lot. He stated that in looking through the list, one thing he thought was interesting was the 'Makes Use Nonconforming' column which would be 197 of the 997 parcels to be rezoned.

Zoning Administrator Weck explained that, technically, they would all become non-conforming, but could still have conforming use, but may not conform with things like setbacks.

Commissioner Holl noted that from being up at Chisago with their Planning Commission, every house on all the lakes in the area, ended up being legal non-conforming lots and were grandfathered in.

Chair Lobermeier stated that about 20% of the overall 30% will become non-conforming, but one-third of those are located in R6, which would be the biggest single change. He noted that many of the other categories don't have as many parcels that will be significantly impacted.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that he was looking for input from the Commission on what they would want to do with the situation in the R3 that have recently been subdivided, such as the Moxness property, and how they want to address the R1 and R2 districts. He asked if they want to just create one district or create a new district that meshes R1 and R2 together. He noted that he thinks creating a new district that meshes them together may be the easiest way to handle it and explained that the only real change would be the horse ownership portion. He stated that he can work on a better synopsis in order to explain to the City Council what the Commission is trying to do in implementing the Comprehensive Plan and have it ready for discussion by the next Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Lobermeier stated that he would recommend that approach and explained that he felt the communication with the Council will be completely necessary. He referenced page 2 under the rezoning process and the sentence that says that individual mailings and notices will not be sent

to affected and neighboring properties. He noted that he was fairly certain he understood why this was the recommendation, but asked how people would be able to find out about the changes.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that it will be posted on the City website, newspaper, and could also go on Facebook or into the weekly e-mail. He explained the different ways he had considered dividing the City into sections for hearings and discussions, but found that would be a lengthy and difficult process with the mailings.

Chair Lobermeier suggested that they try an alternate approach and focus on the middle portion of the chart where there is the least amount of non-conforming properties that will be created and see how it goes and then decide whether there needs to be multiple phases after that initial group or if it can be lumped together. He stated that he does believe that there are a lot of properties included on the list where there will not be a lot of controversy. He stated that would also give the City time to do things on the website or find other methods of communication and noted that it is difficult when they are not notifying individual property owners.

Commissioner Iverson stated that he liked Chair Lobermeier's proposal of taking it in bite sized chunks.

Chair Lobermeier noted that the Commission did not need to make that decision tonight and explained that he saw tonight as more about the Commission getting a full appreciation of what they were talking about doing, understanding what the process will look like, and working to make a good educated decision moving forward. He noted that he believes there may be some angst in the process of rezoning to match the Comprehensive Plan and would like the City to be mindful in their approach.

Commissioner Iverson referenced the R6 lots that this change would make non-conforming and asked what would make them non-conforming because it is all the lots within that district.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that basically, the City does allow a single family dwelling in the R6 district, but not really. He stated that the description used is 'a building with one dwelling unit in it', but the intent is that all of these would be multi-family. He stated that the setbacks in R6 are a bit different too and gave the example of the setback being half the height of the building.

Chair Lobermeier stated that he felt that Commissioner Iverson asked a great question because he thinks that may be one of the pieces of information that would be helpful for the Commission to have in order to more fully understand it.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that he will get started on the comparison between the different combinations that are possible and also information on what a zoning change would mean to individual property owners.

Chair Lobermeier asked Mayor Iverson how she felt the Commission could most effectively communicate with the City Council on this issue.

Mayor Iverson stated that she would like to see Chair Lobermeier come and address the Council to explain it. She noted that she would like the City to go back to a representative of the Committees appearing before the Council once or twice a year.

Chair Lobermeier stated that he could come present the information to the Council and noted that this is a big bite that the City is taking, but he felt it was necessary.

Mayor Iverson stated that she felt that transparency was also key.

OLD BUSINESS:

COMMUNICATIONS:

3. Planning Commission Member Interviews: Chris Ortwerth 25720 Gramford Avenue and Jeff Allen 5747 261st Street

Chair Lobermeier thanked Mr. Ortwerth and Mr. Allen for their interest in serving on the Planning Commission. He explained the interview process and noted that the Planning Commission would make a decision at their next meeting.

Chris Ortwerth introduced himself and shared some details about his background and experience. He stated that he has lived in Wyoming for 4 years and outlined his desire to get more involved in his community. He noted that he has 30 years of experience in the construction industry including working as a union carpenter for 20 years and now has been in utilities for 13 years.

Commissioner Iverson asked what Mr. Ortwerth would not change about Wyoming.

Mr. Ortwerth stated that he loves the small community aspect and explained that they had moved here from Hastings right before Covid hit. He explained that when they moved to Wyoming, he loved that they were able to meet all their neighbors when they settled in the old township area of the City. He explained that he was originally a country farm boy from Wisconsin which is why he likes the small community aspect of Wyoming and likes the more rural areas.

Commissioner Iverson asked Mr. Ortwerth what changes he would like to see in Wyoming.

Mr. Ortwerth stated that he would like to see wisdom used in some of the things the City does and gave the example of the road work patching on Gramford Avenue that only lasted two days because it wasn't tamped prior to the snow plows coming through. He stated that, to him, that work was foolish and a waste of money.

Jeff Allen introduced himself and shared some of his background and experience. He stated that he has lived in Wyoming for about 25 years and was looking to be part of the Planning Commission because, as an empty nester, he has started to have the time to see how he may be able to be part of something. He stated that he would like to be involved in the community rather than just taking the community for granted. He noted that he has been doing landscape design for the past 26-27 years. He noted that he likes people, so involvement in the Planning Commission would be another way for him to utilize that personality trait.

Commissioner Iverson asked Mr. Allen what he would not change about the City.

Mr. Allen stated that he would start with what he likes about Wyoming. He stated that it is a small community but sometimes it is like a church. He gave the example of a church having things go well and needing to make a decision on whether they want the church to grow or if they should just keep it to themselves. He stated that there is always a balance and shared that he felt that Wyoming was a great community, but the question needed to be asked on whether they should grow, expand, and invite people in. He stated that he would say the answer is 'yes' and that they should not keep the City hidden, but should manage things with zoning and try to keep the small community feel while also expanding and bringing in more businesses. He stated that the question of what he would change about the City is difficult, because he honestly does not know too much about what the Commission is doing. He noted that he and his wife are very active and

just had a new sidewalk put in near them, which they love and it has been well used by people in the neighborhood so one thing he would love to see is more sidewalks or some time of loop trail that people can use as well as more restaurants.

Chair Lobermeier asked if Mr. Allen had served on the Park Board in the past.

Mr. Allen confirmed that he was on the Park Board quite a few years ago and one of the things they accomplished was bringing in the skateboard park. He stated that he enjoyed his time serving but noted that looking back he probably could have been a bit more vocal and asked a lot more questions during the meetings rather than just going with the flow.

Chair Lobermeier expressed his appreciation to Mr. Ortwerth and Mr. Allen for their interest and reiterated that the Commission would make a decision at their next meeting. He noted that he thinks they are two of the most qualified candidates that have expressed an interest in the Commission.

UPDATES:

Gravelle Home Occupation Interim Use Permit and the Rosenbauer Variance were approved.

Mayor Iverson updated the Commission on what was currently happening with HF #4009. She stated that the high-density portion appears to be dead on the table. She noted that for anyone who is on Facebook, she would recommend going to Senator Pratt's page because he has a really good informational video on how important it is that this does not go through. She stated that right now they are talking about keeping mixed use in and being able to use this for high density, which she finds very scary. She stated that they are still fighting and believes the thought is that much of this will not happen this year, but many of the senators that want it say that it will just keep coming back again next year and in subsequent years.

Chair Lobermeier asked what the League of Minnesota Cities position was on this bill.

Mayor Iverson stated that the League of Minnesota Cities has been really great and also many other cities have also spoken out about how bad this is. She stated that contractors have also spoken up and said that this is not good and have questioned what would happen to the infrastructure if this is approved.

Chair Lobermeier stated that he was shocked when he first heard about this bill and wrote Senator Koran a letter which basically told him that he thought it was the most ridiculous thing, however, he did not get any response.

Mayor Iverson stated that Senator Koran was the one who had started all of this, so she was not surprised that he didn't get a response.

Chair Lobermeier stated that it truly unbelievable and noted that the City does not have any transit services or a transit station other than a park-n-ride lot. He stated that if you think about the infrastructure that would be necessary to try to serve this, no one has that, and explained that he felt it was truly an overreach with the legislature.

Mayor Iverson agreed and stated that the infrastructure is a big part of this. She stated that she and City Administrator Linwood have been talking about the fact that the stakeholders have not come to the cities, for example, Housing First. She stated that she believes cities are really good at looking at problems and fixing them. She noted that she also thinks that they all believe that there needs to be more housing/affordable housing but would like to be able to sit down at the table with them and let them know that they are all trying to accomplish the same thing, but the

cities feel their approach is going at it the wrong way. She stated that she thinks that may end up being the next step but encouraged people to keep up the pressure with Senator Koran and others. She reiterated her suggestion to look at Senator Pratt's Facebook page and the video he made explaining why this bill is really bad for cities.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that for the next meeting he will hopefully have a draft of the Comprehensive Plan rezoning that they discussed earlier and rezoning for a parcel on Highway 8.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IVERSON, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 9, 2024 "REGULAR MEETING" OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION AT 7:55 PM.

<i>Voting Aye:</i>	<i>Holl, Iverson, and Lobermeier</i>
<i>Voting Nay:</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Abstain:</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Absent:</i>	<i>West</i>

**CITY OF WYOMING
PLANNING AND ZONING**

TO:	Planning Commission
DATE:	April 23, 2024
FROM:	Kim Lindquist, City Planner Fred Weck
RE:	Rezoning Amendment
OWNER:	Stephen Witzel
PROPERTY:	Hamlet Ave and Hwy 8 21.10674.02
FILE NOS.:	D-24-001

OVERVIEW

Stephen Witzel (the “Applicant”) has requested a Rezoning Amendment for a property on Hamlet Avenue off Highway 8 (“Property”). The applicant requests that the parcel (21.10674.02) be rezoned from R2 – Rural Residential II to C – Commercial to accommodate development of a manufactured home sales lot. The sales lot would require a separate site plan review and approval process. The request for rezoning does not require an amendment to the Land Use Plan as the property is designated Commercial in the most recently adopted Comprehensive Plan.

In 2006 the property was located in Wyoming Township and Stephen Witzel subdivided the property into two lots, (the current parcel, and the property immediately to the north) and had the subject property rezoned to Highway Business. The rezoning was approved by the Town of Wyoming, but the owner was required to also have the County approve the rezoning since Wyoming was a Township. The applicant did not follow up with Chisago County to receive County approval of the rezoning and therefore the parcel zoning was never changed. The property was annexed by the City of Wyoming in December of 2008. There has been no work done on this property since the original rezoning application in 2006.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on staff’s analysis of the request and the standards for rezoning approval, staff recommends approval of the rezoning from R2 – Rural Residential II to C –Commercial for the property at 21.10674.02.

STAFF REVIEW

The Property is 5.47 acres and currently undeveloped. It is primarily a wooded lot and appears to contain some designated wetlands, based upon the application materials. Surrounding properties are primarily low-density rural residential, however, the intention is that commercial will occur along Lake Blvd.

	Comprehensive Plan Designation	Current Zoning
North	Single Family Residential Neighborhood	R2-Rural Residential II & R1 Rural Residential I
West	Commercial	R2-Rural Residential II
South	Commercial	Agriculture and Commercial
East	Commercial	R2-Rural Residential II

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The proposed development is within the Commercial land use designation along Highway 8 in the Comprehensive Plan, which is described as, “The Commercial Areas will allow a wide range of businesses that serve the individual consumer, whether for goods or services.”

According to the Comprehensive Plan, all parcel accesses for Commercial uses must be via City streets. It is assumed that the property will be served off a local street, Hamlet Avenue, directly off of Highway 8.

ZONING ORDINANCE

As noted, the property is currently zoned for Rural Residential, and the applicant is requesting a rezoning to Commercial. The property is also located within the Solar Energy Systems Overlay, Shoreland Management Overlay, and Highway 8 Overlay (H8O) Districts. Additional development standards will need to be addressed when the applicant makes a site plan application.

City of Wyoming ordinance requires that all lots within the Commercial District have at least one acre of buildable land which is defined as - *An area of land excluding surface waters, wetlands or floodplains; and when the property is served by a subsurface sewage treatment system where the depth to mottled soils is at least one (1) foot.* The buildable area can include areas that are protected by an easement. The current application indicates there are wetlands and also showed potential septic locations which means there is buildable area on the site. Because the site is well over 1 acre, staff is comfortable that the site is buildable, although the final site plans will need to provide more detail about soil conditions.

ZONING COMPARISON TABLE

The following lists the ordinance performance standards for the existing zoning and the proposed commercial designation.

Zoning District	Lot Width	Lot Depth	Lot Size	Front Yard Setback	Side Yard Setback	Rear Yard Setback
R-2	215 feet on corner lots	200 feet (not more than 4x the width)	Min. 2-acres with Min. 1 acre buildable	73 feet from centerline or 40 feet from road ROW (whichever is more restrictive)	10 feet (principal building)	35 feet (principal building)
C	115 feet on corner lots	200 feet (not more than 4x the width)	20,000 square feet	135 feet from state highways and 150 feet from the right-of-way of Trunk Highway 8	20 feet (principal buildings adjacent to a residential district)	20 feet (principal buildings)
H8O	300 feet	The same as the underlying zoning district	The same as the underlying zoning district	150 feet	The same as the underlying zoning district	The same as the underlying zoning district

FUTURE ENGINEERING ISSUES

The City Engineer has reviewed the development plans and provided the following comments:

1. The Highway 8 corridor study has identified that the Hamlet access will no longer exist in the future and will be routed through a backage road to access Highway 8.
2. The site is within the Comfort Lake Forest Lake Watershed District and will therefore require the applicant to meet their rules as well as the City's ordinance for any future development.

STANDARDS FOR REZONING


Rezoning Request

Section 40 - 141 (4) (a) outlines the standards for a rezoning. The City may adopt amendments to the zoning ordinance and zoning map in relation both to land uses within a particular district or to the location of the district lines. Such an amendment shall not be issued indiscriminately but should only be used to reflect changes in the goals and policies of the community as reflected in the Comprehensive Plan or changes in conditions in the City. The following factors should be considered:


- (1) **Whether the amendment will create an excessive demand on existing parks, schools, streets and other public facilities and utilities which serve or are proposed to serve the area.** *The proposed development will not create an excessive demand on existing city facilities, utilities, parks, utilities and schools serving the area.*
- (2) **Whether the amendment is sufficiently compatible so that existing development will not be depreciated in value and there will be no deterrence to development of vacant land.** *Surrounding properties along Highway 8 are developed with commercial uses or anticipated to be developed for commercial use in the future, as envisioned by the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan. The rezoning is consistent with the future land uses in the area as portrayed by the Comprehensive Plan.*
- (3) **The amendment in the opinion of the City is reasonably related to the overall needs of the City.** *The proposed rezoning enables the applicant to develop a commercial property. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the Highway 8 corridor as one of four possible locations for commercial development outside of Downtown Wyoming.*
- (4) **The amendment is consistent with the intent and purposes of the zoning ordinance.** *The purpose of the Rural Residential II district is to provide an area for low-density housing with on-site wastewater systems. Hwy 8 is not an appropriate location to encourage additional low density rural residential development. Rather, the City has indicated that commercial uses would be more appropriate along the Hwy 8 corridor. Rezoning the property to a Commercial designation would allow for the development of a*
- (5) **The amendment will not cause traffic hazard or congestion.** *The proposed rezoning is not likely to cause any traffic hazards or congestion as Hwy 8 is being reconstructed to recognize future commercial land uses.*

Next Steps

The City Council will review the Planning Commission's rezoning recommendation at the next regularly scheduled meeting. A future site plan review will be needed prior to any development occurring on the site.




- Single Family Residential Neighborhood
- Multi-Family Suburban Neighborhood
- High Density Residential Neighborhood
- Commercial
- Downtown Core



Zoning Districts

- A -- Agriculture
- R1 -- Rural Residential I
- R2 -- Rural Residential II
- R3 -- Single Family Residential



City Of Wyoming
26885 Forest Blvd, PO Box 188
Wyoming, MN 55092
Phone (651) 462-4947
permits@wyomingmn.org

LAND USE APPLICATION: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

This application initiates a request to change the text of a city ordinance or to change the boundaries of a zoning district (rezoning). Any person owning real estate within the city may initiate an ordinance amendment request.

Property Address: N/A (nearest property is behind at 24639 Hamlet)

Applicant(s): Name(s) Stephen Witzel

Address 505 N.E. Fircrest St.

City Fridley State MN Zip 55432

Phone Number (763) 284-7710 / 763-947-2011 Email Steve.mmi@co.mn.us

Owner(s) - If other than Applicant(s):

Name(s) _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone Number _____ Email _____

Owners(s) Signature(s) _____ Date _____

Legal description of property (if rezoning) OR proposed text amendment (attach additional pages if necessary):

Section 33 Township 0.33 Lot 2, B1K 1, Witzel Estates Lot 002 B1K00, Subdivision C0110900

Present use of property: 2000

Property Identification Number(s): R.21.10674.02

Present Zoning District: R-2 Rural Residential 11 Proposed Zoning District: Commercial

This application and the following attachments must be submitted to be considered a complete application:

1. Stated reason for requested change
2. Statement of compatibility to the City Comprehensive Plan
3. Text of the portion of the existing ordinance to be amended (If applicable)
4. Proposed amended text and statements outlining any other effects that the amendment may have on other areas of this ordinance
5. Additional information as may be requested by the Planning Commission - Rezoning requests will require a map of the area to be rezoned
6. The application fee and escrow must be paid at the time of application.

A public hearing can be scheduled only after a complete application has been received.

Applicant(s) Signature(s) [Signature] Date 3/29/2024

As the applicant for this request, I agree to reimburse the City for all expenses incurred by the City in employing planning, engineering, legal, and other professional consultants in reviewing this application. This may include the replenishment of any escrow funds as required as part of this application. Such costs shall be paid by me, the applicant, regardless of the outcome of the review and prior to commencing any work on the project. Article V, Division 9, Zoning Amendments, is attached to this application. By signing this application, the applicant acknowledges that it has been read and understood.

OFFICE USE ONLY

Application # 2-24-001

Date Complete Application Received 3/29/24

Fee: \$220.00 + Escrow \$750.00

Revised 01/24/23

Date Application Received 3/29/24

60 Days 5/28/24

Date Paid 3/29/24

By: [Signature]
Official

Check # 5307701436

Land Use Application

Applicant: Stephen Witzel

Section 33, Township 033, Lot 2 BLK1, Witzel Estates, Lot 002 BLK001, Subdivision Cd10900

Property ID R21.10674.02

- 1) Land use to be for commercial use / sales center housing
- 2) It has been suggested by local building official that this area has been slated for commercial development and will be commercial in the new comprehensive plan.

Chris Ortwerth

25730 Gramford Avenue, Wyoming, MN 55092
651-829-7567- cell *cmcortwerth@gmail.com*

March 18, 2024

City of Wyoming
Attn: City Administrator
26885 City Boulevard
Wyoming, MN 55092

Dear Mr. Robb Linwood,

A few months ago, I had a conversation with Mayor Iverson after a city council meeting. I asked how I could get more involved in the community. She informed me about openings in the Planning Commission. With my years in the construction & utility industries, she recommended this path as a starting point.

Please accept this letter as my official interest in a position on the City Planning Commission.

Being in the construction field for 20+ years I'm familiar with many aspects of construction & development. I've worked with townhome developments, and civil construction through the utility company (including zoning, grading, and wastewater runoff). I had to resolve many landowner complaints and was previously certified in Stormwater Pollution & Protection (SWPP) through the state of MN.

This would be a wonderful opportunity to serve & contribute to ensure the cost-effective and proactive planning for our city. I am very interested in the future of Wyoming and look forward to helping shape & develop our community together.

Sincerely,

Christopher Ortwerth

Current Zoning											
	A	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	C	CB	I	
R1	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
R2	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R3	53	138	40	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	237
R3 Subd	5	198	81	0	50	0	15	1	0	0	350
R4	7	1	8	16	0	0	25	0	0	0	57
R6	6	1	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
C	16	8	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	64
CB	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	24	0	5	49
I	30	5	7	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	48
MXD	9	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	20
OHC	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9
	223	357	213	17	50	3	63	34	3	34	997

Zoning Ordinance	Comprehensive Plan	
Residential Districts		
Agricultural (A)	Agricultural	5 acre min. lot size
Rural Residential I (R1)	Semi-Rural Neighborhood	R1 one acre min. lot size.
Rural Residential II (R2)		R2 two acre min. lot size; 5 or more acres horses are allowed.
Single Family Residential (R3)	Single Family Residential Neighborhood	
One & Two Family Residential (R4)	Multi-Family Suburban Neighborhood	
Manufactured Home District (R5)	N/A	The city's two manufactured home parks.
Medium & High Density Housing (R6)	High Density Residential Neighborhood	
Business Districts		
Central Business (CBD)	Downtown Core	
Commercial District (C)	Commercial	
Office & Health Care (OHC)	Office & Health Care Business	
Mixed Use (MXD)	Mixed Use	
Industrial (I)	Industrial	
Closed Landfill Restricted (CLR)	N/A	

In the A & R1 – R6 districts Single-Family Dwellings are a permitted use.

With the exception of the Central Business District, which has no setback requirements, all of the districts have a 135' setback from county and state highways, and 150' from the Highway 8 right-of-way.

Unless otherwise noted, all of the parcels to be rezoned are assumed to be conforming to the standards of their current zoning.

Agricultural District (A) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Rural Residential (R1 or R2) [97 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Private
Single Family Residential(R3) [53 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
1 & 2 Family Residential(R4) [7 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
Medium & High Density Residential (R6) [6 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
Commercial (C) [16 parcels]	SFD Nonconforming	Conforming		Private & public
Industrial (I) [30 parcels]	SFD Nonconforming	Conforming		Private & public
Mixed Use (MXD) [9 parcels]	Existing uses, vacant or SFD, conform. Lot size & setbacks are established with the CUP			Public

Rural Residential I (R1) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Single Family Residential(R3) [336 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
1 & 2 Family Residential(R4) [1 parcel]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
Medium & High Density Residential (R6) [1 parcel]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
Commercial (C) [8 parcels]	SFD Nonconforming	Conforming if public utility		Private & public
Industrial (I) [5 parcels]	SFD Nonconforming	Conforming if public utility		Private & public
Mixed Use (MXD) [4 parcels]	Existing uses, vacant or SFD, conform. Lot size & setbacks are established with the CUP			Public
Office & Health Care (OHC) [2 parcels]	Parcels are vacant			Public

Rural Residential II (R2) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Single Family Residential(R3) [121 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
1 & 2 Family Residential(R4) [8 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
Medium & High Density Residential (R6) [59 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming		Public
Commercial (C) [15 parcels]	SFD Nonconforming	Conforming if public utility		Private & public
Industrial (I) [7 parcels]	SFD Nonconforming	Conforming if public utility		Private & public
Mixed Use (MXD) [3 parcels]	Existing uses, vacant or SFD, conform. Lot size & setbacks are established with the CUP			Public

Single Family Residential (R3) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
1 & 2 Family Residential(R4) [16 parcels]		Conforming		Public
Industrial (I) [1 parcel]	The one parcel is a part of the SRC facility. Rezoning to (I) will make the parcel conforming.	Conforming	Conforming	Public

One & Two Family Residential (R4) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Single Family Residential(R3) [50 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming	Conforming	Public

Manufactured Home (R5) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Single Family Residential(R3) [3 parcels]	Individual homes in the parks	Conforming per MN Statute 462.357, Subd 1a	Conforming per MN Statute 462.357, Subd 1a	Public

Medium & High Density Residential (R6) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Single Family Residential(R3) [18 parcels]	Conforming			Public
1 & 2 Family Residential(R4) [25 parcels]	Conforming			Public
Central Business (CBD) [20 parcels]	SFD Nonconforming			Public

Commercial (C) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Single Family Residential(R3) [1 parcel]	Nonconforming	Conforming	Conforming	Public
Central Business (CBD) [24 parcels]	Similar uses to (C)	Conforming	Conforming	Public
Commercial (C) [1 parcel]	Conforming	Conforming	Conforming	Public
Industrial (I) [4 parcels]	Conforming	Conforming if public utility	Conforming	Public
Mixed Use (MXD) [4 parcels]	Existing uses, vacant or SFD, conform. Lot size & setbacks are established with the CUP			Public

Central Business (CBD) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Commercial (C) [3 parcels]	Vacant or conforming	Conforming	Conforming	Public

Industrial (I) is the current zoning district.

Rezone to:	Uses	Lot size	Setbacks	Utilities
Central Business (CBD) [5 parcels]		Conforming	Conforming	
Commercial (C) [21 parcels]		Conforming		
Office & Health Care (OHC) [7 parcels]		Conforming		