

**AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF WYOMING, MINNESOTA
MAY 15, 2025
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 22, 2025

SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Sketch Plan D-25-002 - Von Wald Property
Location: 24981 Field Ave
Applicant: Theresa Von Wald
Owner: Theresa Von Wald
Property ID Numbers: 21.10646.00
3. Re-Zoning Open House Feedback Review

OLD BUSINESS:

COMMUNICATIONS:

UPDATES:

ADJOURN

UPCOMING:

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF WYOMING, MINNESOTA
APRIL 22, 2025
7:00 PM**

CALL TO ORDER:

Planning Commission Chairman Lobermeier called the Regular Meeting of the Wyoming Planning Commission for April 22, 2025, 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: Chris Ortwerth and Katie West

Also Present: Fred Weck, Zoning Administrator, Kim Lindquist, City Planner, 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 April 8, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IVERSON, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE “REGULAR MEETING” OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION FOR APRIL 8, 2025, 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>Ortwerth and West</i>

SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS: NONE

NEW BUSINESS

2. Sketch Plan D-24-001 – Carlos Avery Preserve Estates
Location: East Viking Boulevard, Greenwood Golf Course Site
Applicant: Wyoming MN Property, LLC
Owner: Land Development Company of Wyoming, LLC, Richard Morris
Property ID Number: 21.00302.32

City Planner Lindquist reviewed details of the Carlos Avery Preserve Estates sketch plan and noted that this would be for Lot 2, Block 1, of the Sunrise Riverbank and was one piece of the

potential larger development. She noted that the City had looked at this parcel on several occasions with other proposals. She explained that this sketch plans for a mixed residential subdivision on the piece that was immediately next to Viking Boulevard. She noted that the site was zoned for R-1 and should be rezoned to a mixed-use district, and was also guided for mixed use and wetlands within the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the Sunrise Riverbank portion to the east will involve some commercial businesses, but they do not have much information about it yet. She stated that the Sketch Plan has 140 units and was a bit different than what had been presented in 2022, and now, in addition to single-family residential, there were also a 6-plex row townhome, six 4-plex row townhomes, and three 12-plex buildings. She noted that this had about the same density as their previous plans, but it was a different configuration with different building styles. She stated that it was clarified at the Joint Park Planning Board meeting earlier today that the 12-plex building would also be owner-occupied and not rental units under a CIC or condominium plat. She explained that the site would have 2 primary access points from Viking Boulevard and to the southeast that would connect to the next property, and noted that, as it was currently laid out, it complied with the 60-foot right-of-way requirements. She pointed out that there was a study being done regarding the Viking Boulevard corridor, which may have some impact on this site, and explained that they expect, at the very least, turn lanes associated with this project. She noted that the site was designated for public utilities, but they were not at the immediate site yet and would be coming from the east through the commercial site, but explained that the City understood what needed to eventually be done and felt it could be accommodated. She stated that a quick review had been done of the proposed stormwater plans, and comments had been made by their water resources people on things they felt needed to be addressed for future submittals. She outlined the recommendation from the Joint Park Planning Board related to park dedication for 2 acres of land within this development, and the remainder being addressed with cash in lieu of land. She stated that staff had noted that the cul-de-sacs do not meet the 60-foot width at the right-of-way and stated that the developer was interested in having a slightly narrowed width there and was planning to show the City things like the driveway locations at the Preliminary Plan level. She explained that it was important to show that there would be plenty of room for snow storage, curb stops, and a more complete and easier access point. She stated that the developer plans to come forward with a PUD process and outline the setbacks as well as the utility easements. She explained that staff had called out a few areas that needed additional review and that additional detail would also be needed for a completed application, which would come forward with the next phases.

Commissioner Holl asked about the rezoning and the upcoming changes to the Comprehensive Plan, and if this had to be done or if it was a timing issue.

Zoning Administrator Weck explained that if they were to rezone it before the changes to the Comprehensive Plan, they would not have to do anything.

Chair Lobermeier clarified for the developer that the City was currently moving through a rezoning process for the community and would be looking at rezoning several parcels in the City, including this one. He explained that, depending on the timing of their application, they may not need to go through the formal process of rezoning this parcel. He noted that an EAW had been done with the original development proposal and stated that his understanding was that it had only applied to that specific development.

City Planner Lindquist stated that, as it currently stood, a new EAW would not be needed.

Chair Lobermeier stated that City Planner Lindquist had referred to the commercial property in her report and asked if the east/west road on the south side of the property aligned with the existing East Viking Lane. He explained that traffic had been a concern in the area, but was interested to see where the intersection lined up with the existing roadways in the area.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that the tree line shown on the drawing was basically the south line.

Chair Lobermeier stated that it looked like that intersection would kind of line up with the new 270th.

Jason Rud, E.G. Rud and Sons, noted that they had also been involved with the prior application a few years ago and were back before the City working with a new applicant. He explained that this proposal modified some of the proposed housing, but the road alignments were identical to the last plan. He stated that the applicant intended to have the Preliminary Plat application at the May 19, 2025, meeting and asked if they would be able to piggyback on the rezoning actions that were just mentioned.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that it would end up being a timing issue and explained that the City was looking at rezoning some parcels to match the Comprehensive Plan maps. He stated that if the applicant was looking to do the Preliminary Plat on May 19, 2025, he would suggest that they go ahead and also do the rezoning at the same time.

Chair Lobermeier stated that he felt it was helpful for the applicant to have used much of the same team as the previous iteration because they knew some of the potential issues. He stated that he felt that traffic was going to be a major deal and felt the staff report did a good job talking about utility extensions because he did not believe that had been part of the previous development plan.

Mr. Rud noted that the owner of the adjacent commercial area was also the owner of this parcel and was aware of the need to run utilities and provide an easement to serve this property.

Commissioner Iverson asked if he had any additional information that could be shared about the 12-plex, 6-plex, and 4-plex units.

Mr. Rud referenced the proposed 12-plex and explained that the developer had recently decided to go with another 6-plex following the earlier discussion and stated that they appreciated the input because they were looking to offer a variety of housing options.

Commissioner Iverson stated that out east, such as the Philadelphia area, there are rowhouses that were built in the 1800s, which meant they were brick and were very distinctive looking. He stated that he assumed that when they were talking about rowhouses in this instance, that would not be the same kind of structures as those.

Mr. Rud gave a brief explanation of what the 6-plex buildings would look like and noted that he believed that they would most likely be 2 stories.

OLD BUSINESS:

3. Comprehensive Plan Rezoning Open House – Posters and Organization

Zoning Administrator Weck noted that at the last meeting, Commissioner Iverson had brought up setbacks and uses on the properties and stated that he had attempted to put together some information to make those things clear. He reviewed some of the slide posters he had put together that can answer those types of questions.

Chair Lobermeier asked if the slide information would be available in handout form in addition to the presentation materials.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that he felt that was a good idea and he would have this information available in handout form as well. He reviewed how he had planned to display the maps for the Open House to get people to move around a bit. He noted that he had also spoken with City Administrator Linwood about their possible technology needs, depending on how big a

crowd came. He gave a brief demonstration on how they would be able to use the mapping tool to look at lot specifics during the Open House.

Chair Lobermeier noted that people could also use this mapping tool at home through the City website.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that he had received about 6 phone calls from residents with basic questions since the newsletter was sent out.

Mayor Iverson noted that she had received an e-mail from a resident and believed that many of the questions would be around people not really understanding that this rezoning would not change their land use all of a sudden, and things would happen right away.

The Commission discussed some of the questions they expected people may have and how they could be answered.

Chair Lobermeier stated that it may be helpful to have a few copies of the Comprehensive Plan available so they could show people things like information on the different phases for the sanitary sewer. He reminded the Commission that once they hold the Open House on the rezoning, this process would not be done because they would come back at their next meeting and talk about what they had heard from residents. He stated that he felt it would be helpful for staff and the Commission to have name tags, have comment cards available, and also sign-in sheets.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Zoning Administrator Weck explained that he and City Administrator Linwood just found out yesterday that on May 13, 2025, the Chisago Lakes School District was having a special election, which was also the date for the next Planning Commission meeting. He explained that the Commission could not meet during the election and would need to either meet on a different day or at a different time on May 13, 2025.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IVERSON, TO MOVE THE MAY 13, 2025, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO MAY 15, 2025, AT 7:00 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>Ortwerth and West</i>

UPDATES:

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER IVERSON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 22, 2025 "REGULAR MEETING" OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION AT 7:38 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>Ortwerth and West</i>

CITY OF WYOMING PLANNING AND ZONING

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Kim Lindquist, City Planner
Fred Weck
MEETING DATE: May 13th, 2025
RE: Sketch Plan Review
APPLICANT/OWNER: Theresa Von Wald
PROPERTY: PID R21.10646.00
FILE NO.: D-25-002

General Staff Review

Theresa Von Wald (the “Applicant”) is proposing to subdivide one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels, to create another lot for future residential development. The property, 24981 Field Ave, is located at the intersection of Field Avenue and 250th Street and has a combined area of approximately 2.3 acres. The parcel is proposed to be subdivided east to west, with the northern lot containing the existing residence and accessory buildings and estimated to be one (1) acre. The southern lot, which is currently undeveloped, is approximately 1.36 acres.

The property is currently zoned as R2 – Rural Residential II and the present use of the property is residential. While the sketch plan need not be to scale, the applicant should note that the required lot area minimum in the R-2 – Rural Residential II District is two acres. For this reason, the applicant should explore rezoning of the property to R-1 Rural Residential where the lot size requirement is one (1) acre. Both R-1 and R-2 districts have the same lot width and lot depth requirements. The northern lot will require an additional 15’ in width because it is a corner lot. Based upon the submitted sketch plan, it appears that the lot can meet the corner width requirement. The northern and southern lots may need variances for depth which is required to be 200 feet. Preliminary measurements, using the County’s GIS software, show that the lots meet the 200’ width and depth requirements, a certificate of survey with the division application will verify the dimensions of both lots. If the lots are undersized, variances would be needed and should be applied for.

Upon review, the primary issues associated with the resulting lot split would be rezoning and the current ordinance dimensional requirements that would require variances.

Direction	Adjacent Land Uses
North	Rural Residential
West	Rural Residential
South	Rural Residential

East	Rural Residential
------	-------------------

In preparation for the preliminary and final plats, the applicant should ensure that plans adhere to the following sections of the City of Wyoming’s municipal ordinances:

Section 32-98 of the Subdivision Ordinance indicates lot requirements for any subdivision.

Section 40-120 provides guidance for variance request procedures.

Section 40-141 provides guidance for zoning amendment procedures.

Section 40-185 of the Zoning Ordinance indicates dimensional requirements for properties located within the R1 District.

Section 40 – 315 provides guidance on permits required for shoreland overlay district

As of the writing of this report, no additional comments have been received from the other reviewers. Potential issues include, but may not be limited to:

The applicant should verify there are no wetlands on the site. The applicant must verify dimensions of lots.

General Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance Review

Article III of Chapter 32 in the City of Wyoming Subdivision Ordinance sets forth the platting procedure with the first requirement being the sketch plan. The purpose of the sketch plan is to ensure that the applicants for subdivision are informed of the procedures and requirements of all adopted ordinances. The plan does not need to be to scale but does need to show the proposed subdivision of the property, significant topographical and physical features, and adjacent land use.

Comprehensive Plan Designation

The subject property is guided Semi-Rural Neighborhoods in the City’s Comprehensive Plan. This land use category is described as follows:

The Semi-Rural Neighborhood designation include locations that are presently subdivided into parcels of approximately one to ten acres. This may include the present Agricultural, Rural Residential I and Rural Residential II zoning districts. Most of those locations cannot easily be subdivided further into smaller parcels that could economically accommodate public or shared private wastewater systems. The majority of the Semi-Rural Housing Area will continue to be unsewered – that is, continue to be served with individual on-site wastewater treatment systems.

Zoning

The lot is currently zoned R-2 Rural Residential II, but it is recommended that applicant apply to rezone the property to R-1 Rural Residential I. The purpose of the R-1 district is intended to provide an area for very low-density housing with on-site wastewater systems in locations that are already predominately developed in a pattern similarly.

The property is located within the Shoreland Management Overlay District. The current sketch does not include plans for new construction, however, the owner should note that the Shoreland District requirements found in Division 16 of the city code would apply to any new construction.

Conforming lots in R1 and R2 Districts are required to have the following minimum dimensional standards:

District	R1 – Rural Residential I	R2 – Rural Residential II (current zoning)
Minimum Lot Area	One (1) acre, at least one (1) acre of which must be buildable	Two (2) acres, at least one (1) acre of which must be buildable
Lot Width	200 feet; corner lots must be 215 feet	200 feet, corner lots must be 215 feet
Lot Depth	200 feet; must be less than four (4) times the lot width	200 feet; must be less than four (4) times the lot width

Any future building within the R-1 or R-2 Districts shall conform to the following setback standards:

1. Front Yard Setback:
 - a. 73 feet from the centerline of all city streets or 40 feet from the road right-of-way, whichever is more restrictive
2. Side Yard Setback:
 - a. 10 feet for principal buildings
 - b. 3 feet for accessory buildings
 - c. 5 feet for driveways
3. Rear Yard Setback:
 - a. 35 feet for principal buildings
 - b. 3 feet for accessory buildings
4. Height
 - a. 35 feet (three stories) maximum height for principal building
 - b. 25 feet (one story) maximum height for accessory building

In addition, upon future application, the applicant will need to obtain soil borings for the new lot to ensure that at least one acre of buildable area is present.

Park Dedication

Article IV of the Subdivision Ordinance sets forth the park dedication requirements. The policy for minor subdivisions is that when three or fewer lots are being created that the minimum park and trail fees will be collected without the need for the Joint Park Planning Board to meet unless

the development is in an area where the City is looking to acquire park land. This policy was reaffirmed at a Joint Park Planning Board held on October 28, 2014.

The area of the proposed subdivision is not an area that the City is looking to acquire land and as such the City will require park and trail dedication funds. The minimum park dedication for the proposed subdivision equals \$1,500.00 plus the minimum trail dedication of \$300.00. The fees are to be collected prior to final plat approval.

Access

Currently the subdivision will be split along Field Avenue. The northern lot will retain access from Field Avenue and a new access will be created from Field Avenue for the southern lot.

Utilities

Municipal sanitary sewer and watermain are not available to the site. The sketch plan does not include details about wastewater plans. The owner should note the requirements of R-1 and Shoreland Management Overlay Districts when planning any future development on the properties.

Drainage

Stormwater management is not triggered for this site since the parcel is proposed to be split into two lots. The site is located within the Shoreland Management Overlay District and within the Comfort Lake Forest Lake Watershed District so there may be some watershed-related permits required depending upon the amount of grading work anticipated for the ultimate development of the site, or if there are any wetland impacts. Additional information will be needed to assess whether watershed permitting is required.

Next Steps

In the preparation of the preliminary plat, the applicant and their consultants are required to pay careful attention to the Subdivision Ordinance requirements. The applicant should ensure that district standards and regulations are met and, if they are not, then the appropriate variances and/or zoning amendments should be requested.

In this case it is anticipated that future applications would include a rezoning request to R-1 for the site. Depending on the official measurements of the survey, the southern lot may require a variance for lot depth. Prior to formal acceptance of an application for preliminary plat consideration, all requirements contained in Article III, Division 2, and Articles V and VI of the Subdivision Ordinance, as well as applicable zoning regulations, must be complied with and included on the plans.



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

SUBDIVISION APPLICATION: SKETCH PLAN

A sketch plan application initiates the procedure for developing and subdividing property. The Sketch Plan is reviewed by individuals of the City Plat Review Committee and then is placed on the Planning Commission agenda.

Applicant(s): Name(s) THERESA LOUISE VON WALD
Address 24981 FIELD AVE.
City FOREST LAKE State MN. Zip 55025
Phone Number (61) 485-2674 Email THERESA.VONWALD2674@gmail.com

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

Name(s) _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
Phone Number _____ Email _____

Owner(s) Signature(s) Theresa VonWald Date 4/15/25

Legal description of property: _____

Property Identification Number: R.21. 10646.00
Present use of property: single family home
Proposed use of property: " "
Present zoning of property: RZ - R1

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

Total size of property: 2.36 Total acreage in wetlands or floodplain: 0
Number of proposed lots: 2
☒ 4 full size copies of the Sketch Plan
☒ 2 reduced copies (no larger than 11 X 17).
☒ The application fee and escrow must be paid at the time of application.

Applicant(s) Signature: Theresa VonWald Date: 4/15/25

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.

The meeting can be scheduled only after a complete application is received.

Applicants that submit Sketch plans with four or more proposed lots will meet with the Joint Park Planning Board in order to determine the developments Park and Trail Dedication. The Joint Park Planning Board meets on the 2nd Tuesday of each month at 6:00 pm. Developments creating three or fewer lots will dedicate the minimum Park and Trail Dedication (\$1500.00 Park + \$300.00 Trail, per lot) without needing to meet with the Joint Park Planning Board. Park and Trail Dedications are submitted to the City with the Final Plat application.

OFFICE USE ONLY

Application # 0-25-002
Date Complete Application Received 4/15/25

Date Application Received 4/15/25
120 Days 8/13/25
Date Paid 4/15/25

By: LEWIS Official
Check # 7074

Fee: \$100.00 + Escrow \$500.00
Revised 11/15/22



Date: 4/14/2025
Time: 8:36:35 AM



These data are provided on as "AS-IS" basis, without warranty of any type, expressed or implied, including but not limited to any warranty as to their performance, merchantability, or fitness for any particular purpose.





Planning Commission Memo

Date: May 8, 2025

Presented to: Chair Lobermeier and Planning Commission Members

Presented by: Robb Linwood, City Administrator

Department: Administration

Reference: Rezone Open House Feedback

Method: New Business

Background Information:

As part of the City's efforts to align zoning districts with the 2022 Comprehensive Plan, an open house was held to engage residents and property owners regarding the proposed changes. Feedback was collected through written comment cards, in-person discussions during the event, and subsequent phone calls, emails, and visits to City Hall.

The purpose of this memo is to provide an overview of the public input received to date. While this feedback has been thoughtful and constructive, it is important to note that it reflects the views of those who have chosen to participate and may not represent the community as a whole.

From the feedback collected, several common themes emerged:

1. Concerns About Property Value and Financial Impact

Many residents expressed concern that rezoning their properties—especially from Agricultural or Residential to Commercial or Industrial—would negatively affect resale value, limit the pool of eligible buyers, and create challenges in securing insurance or financing due to non-conforming status.

2. Loss of Existing or Anticipated Property Rights

Property owners voiced concerns about becoming non-conforming under new zoning and how that could restrict their ability to make additions, operate home-based businesses (such as daycares), keep animals, or divide property for future use.

3. Perceived Lack of Benefit and Poor Fit for Location

Residents questioned how the proposed zoning changes—particularly to R-2 or Industrial—would serve the city's future, especially when applied to rural or agriculturally oriented areas not near key infrastructure or commercial nodes.

4. Communication and Process Concerns

Several residents commented on confusion caused by mapping inconsistencies (e.g., discrepancies between GIS and printed maps), general communication about the impacts of rezoning, and how decisions were being made. Some expressed a desire for more clarity on the long-term implications.



CITY OF WYOMING

P.O. Box 188, 26885 Forest Blvd., Wyoming, MN 55092
Phone: 651-462-0575 Fax: 651-462-0576

5. Desire to “Opt Out” or Be Treated Consistently with Neighbors

Some residents requested that their properties remain under their current zoning or be treated the same as nearby or adjacent parcels that were not proposed for rezoning. This was especially common in areas along Comfort Lake and 263rd Street.

6. Specific Geographic Areas of Concern

Feedback was concentrated in a few specific geographic areas:

- **West side of Comfort Lake:** Strong opposition to changing from R-1 to R-3, particularly related to future municipal utilities and neighborhood character.
- **Forest Boulevard Corridor:** Several parcels proposed for Industrial zoning raised concerns due to existing residential use, adjacent wetlands, and uncertainty around compatibility with industrial development.
- **Agricultural parcels proposed for R-2:** Property owners expressed concerns about reduced flexibility and questioned the rationale for the change, especially in more rural sections of the city.

Staff would like to begin discussions with Planning Commission members about the feedback received at the open house, as well as the conversations staff had both prior to and following the event with community members. This discussion will help identify areas of concern, clarify intent, and determine whether adjustments are needed as the rezoning process continues.



CITY OF WYOMING

P.O. Box 188, 26885 Forest Blvd., Wyoming, MN 55092
Phone: 651-462-0575 Fax: 651-462-0576

7733 E Viking Blvd

My property is currently zoned Agriculture, which is a significant reason we bought the home/property in 2018. We, as well as our immediate neighbors, are strongly opposed to being zoned out of Agriculture, especially to R3 or any form of Residential. I will work on compiling a group letter to express our zoning feedback, which I expect will cover 5-6 existing homes.

5662 287th St.

We currently own 11 acres – adjacent to a 5 acre lot (Pineda Woods) which we sold to family – 8 years ago. North of Pineda Woods is Stacy. Our plan was to sub-divide our remaining 11 acres into 6 for my current home and leave 5 for another residence. This 5 acre plot will be almost worthless \$ wise with a home on each side of it. Hope to split property (11 acres with 6 for my own home and leave remaining 5 acres for another home).

28284 Forest Blvd.

Our property is being rezoned into industrial and we have major concerns about our property value being lowered once this happens. Most conventional loans will not be approved for a non-conforming house, which would make reselling as a house difficult. Our land is half swamp/may not be much value to a business, so we have the potential to lose a lot of value. The rules/regulations that industrial lands have (not being able to do additions, etc.) are also turn offs to potential home buyers.

28265 Forest Blvd.

I am concerned about the loss of property value, difficulty remaining insured, and the inability to add an addition to my existing property. I feel the communication in this case was very poor and it feels as though the rug is being pulled out from under us homeowners.

7650 Hillside Ct.

I do not agree with the rezoning on the west side off Comfort Lake. Our neighbors also do not agree. I understand the sewer and water is “not supposed to be done” for 20-30 years but not guaranteed. Donote change from R1 to R3.

28400 Forest Blvd.

Rezone from Agriculture to Industrial. I am concerned about the resale value of my home. I feel I will lose a large sum of equity when I sell my home. I understand that I can sell it to someone who can use it as a residence, however, the property will be non-conforming and likely not to get a convention mortgage to purchase it. Buyers will be turned off by that and turned off by the fact that at any time their neighbors could sell to industry. No one wants to live next to industry. If industry moved in while I still own the home, the value will decrease substantially. I am counting on my home equity to purchase a future home and to retire one day. I could lose hundreds of thousands of dollars in home equity. This is unfair. My property is also on wetland, so absolutely useless to any industry.

28400 Forest Blvd.

I worry that the change from A to I will make it harder to sell the house in the future. From what I've read, it can make it harder to get house insurance, which may impact us and would impact potential buyers. I do not feel our property will be desirable to industrial use companies because we have an unusable wet marshy area that makes for a great backyard view, but lowers the buildable property. Will this affect amenities or utility expansion (ex. Sewer, difference cable or internet providers)? Is there a way to ensure our property value remains what it would be if it were still zoned to allow residence?

No Address Provided

Ne of my favorite amenities offered by Chisago County is the Sunrise Prairie Trail. Has this amenity been considered at all when rezoning from A & R-2 to industrial? The addition of Hallberg RV Storage adjacent to the trail has already impacted the beauty and serenity of the trail in that zone. If all of the property along the trail becomes industry it will destroy this beautiful amenity for all who follow.

No Address Provided

I am very concerned that my property which was previously zoned A and will be rezoned to Industry will no longer be insurable as a residence. Will this substantially increase my home insurance cost? I am concerned that we will have issues renewing our insurance.

No Address Provided

I am very upset at the use of the property. Now we are "non-conforming". Now I can't add an addition to my home. I can no longer open a licensed daycare on the property even though my home and yard and location are perfect for it. I no longer have the option of any animals, again property is perfect for it. We might not even be approved to add a shed in our yard. The amount of options on my property have majorly been limited.

No Address Provided

The "Importance of Rezoning" on the board states that it's important to "Protect property values". This is not the case for my property. Instead being rezoning from A to Industry will destroy my property value. My property is part wetland. This is not ideal for any type of industry. Industry in the adjacent properties will significantly reduce my property value as a residence. This will cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars in home equity.

28710 Forest Blvd.

Going from residential to industrial bull****. I was planning on selling in the next couple of years. Now property value is going down! And if someone buys the home they have to have a certain loan. Not a conventional?

24626 Hamlet Ave.

I wish there would be some consideration for certain property to remain it's existing based on how far it is from the road frontage. Why take the whole neighborhood instead of just road frontage?

24640 Fallbrook Ave.

At what point would these changes truly go into effect? Like, if I wanted to have a greenhouse in the future, when would I need to build it by? Also, I asked the mayor and the answer was a little vague – we are wondering how rezoning our neighborhood of 6x agriculture houses and changing them to R-2 actually helps growing future of the city? We are not near downtown or other growing businesses.

24640 Fallbrook Ave.

I'm looking for more information regarding the re-zoning of agricultural plots in general; to R-2 specifically. This change would significantly limit the potential uses of our property, seemingly without benefit to us or our neighbors. This would also reduce the appeal of our property to potential buyers. What is the benefit of limiting land use by re-zoning to something more restrictive versus allowing new uses for current zoning?

7261 Wyoming Trail

I would like to opt out of rezoning my property. There is no benefit and only detriments in the “what ifs”. I never want city water and would not appreciate a possible requirement to. I have plenty of acreage to continue my well and septic. It is quite a slap to have to be on the defensive to property I own. How do I opt out?

7186 263rd St.

I am officially asking for it to remain R-2. Houses across the street are remaining R-2. I believe my mom @ Lendt Pumpkin Patch would like the same, along with my sister Cassandra who own 2 lots adjacent to Lendt's Patch.

7734 250th St.

The letter sent out to residents announcing the rezoning open house included a statement: “Future Development Guidance – If you plan to sell, expand, or change...zoning will determine what is allowed”

This amounts to a taking and may require compensation in the same way as putting a road through our property. I hear different statements from the officials present about what this means and what might happen in the future. Please add further clarification about this bullet point.

24776 Heath Ave. N.

Thank you for all of the work that has been put into this so far. Can we get an explanation as to why this property is being re-zoned from Ag. to Commercial. We don't see the potential benefit.

7686 Hillside Ct.

I do not agree with re-zoning the west side of Comfort Lake the East side remains the same and several other neighbors will also remain R2. I respectfully submit that West side Comfort Lake remain R1. We do not want City water – ever.

No Address Provided

Doesn't make sense to me - - - to many homes on Old 61.

7717 250th St

Website map vs map on the wall

7717 250th St is it going to be single family or commercial

Rezoned to "C" or 2022 Plan Residential