

**APPROVED MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF WYOMING, MINNESOTA
AUGUST 26, 2025
7:00 PM**

CALL TO ORDER:

Planning Commission Chairman Lobermeier called the Regular Meeting of the Wyoming Planning Commission for August 26, 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, Katie West, Dan Iverson, Mark Holl, and Chris Ortwerth

ABSENT: None

Also Present: Fred Weck, Zoning Administrator, Mayor Lisa Iverson, City Planner Kim Lindquist, City Engineer Mark Erichson, Public Safety Director Neil Bauer, and Assistant City Administrator Grant MacFarlane

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Chair Lobermeier stated that he would like to amend the agenda and move Communications item 'Rezoning Petitions' up to Old Business so the Commission could discuss the petitions and other rezoning issues.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER WEST, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, TO AMEND THE AGENDA AND MOVE COMMUNICATIONS REZONING PETITIONS UP TO OLD BUSINESS AS ITEM 4.

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

OPEN FORUM: NONE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- 1. Consider approving the minutes of the "Regular Meeting" of the Wyoming, Minnesota Planning Commission for August 12, 2025**

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ORTWERTH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IVERSON, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE "REGULAR MEETING" OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION FOR AUGUST 12, 2025, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Abstain: *None*
Absent: *None*

SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2. Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Amendment

Location: Forest Boulevard, south of Stacy City Limits, Section 8

Applicant: City of Wyoming

Parcel ID Numbers: 21.21.10120.00, 21.10121.00, 21.10122.00, 21.10123.00, 21.10124.00, 21.10124.01, 21.10125.00, 21.10127.00, 21.10129.00, 21.10130.00, 21.10130.10, 21.10133.00, 21.10133.30, 21.10133.40, 21.10133.50, 21.10133.70, 21.10133.80, 21.10134.00, 21.10135.00, 21.10136.00, 21.10137.00, 21.10138.00, 21.10139.00, 21.10140.00, 21.11145.00, 21.11145.01, 21.11145.02, and 21.11145.03.

Zoning Administrator Weck clarified that this item was for a Comprehensive Plan map amendment and was not a rezoning. He explained that some of the parcels just south of the Stacy City Limits in Section 8 were shown as Industrial, currently zoned as Agricultural, and were guided for change to Mixed Use on the Comprehensive Plan map. He noted that this had been initiated by the Planning Commission after comments received from citizens during the Open Forum. He clarified that within the text, the Comprehensive Plan stated that this area was supposed to be mixed-use, and on the map, it was mistakenly designated as Industrial.

Chair Lobermeier explained that this was a minor amendment due to the text and the map related to land use did not align.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER WEST, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Voting Aye: *Ortwerth, West, Holl, Iverson, and Lobermeier*
Voting Nay: *None*
Abstain: *None*
Absent: *None*

Lyle Koski, stated that he lived in the area and asked for clarification on mixed-use.

Zoning Administrator Weck gave a brief explanation of permitted uses and conditional uses and noted that within a Mixed Use district, everything would be a conditional use and had no permitted uses. He listed off examples of conditional uses that would be allowed in a mixed-use district.

Mike Purdy, 7733 East Viking Boulevard, asked how Mixed Use was more restrictive for accessories than Agricultural would be. He asked what rights those residents may be losing by this change.

Chair Lobermeier reiterated that this discussion was not about rezoning and was about the Comprehensive Plan map. He stated that these residents would not be losing anything as part of this amendment to the Comprehensive Plan map.

Mr. Purdy asked what rights these residents would lose if the City did change their zoning.

Zoning Administrator Weck stated that if there was a single-family dwelling, they would still have a single-family dwelling and would have the same rights that they currently have. He explained that the purpose of Mixed Use was to accommodate 2 or more types of land use and read aloud

the list of examples.

Jenny Humble, 28615 Forest Boulevard, asked why the City didn't acknowledge agricultural land. She stated that they feed America and asked why the City didn't acknowledge that this is what the land was used for.

Zoning Administrator Weck explained that her property was Agricultural, and they can keep on farming the land. He noted that there was nothing here that would stop her from farming the land.

Ms. Humble stated that their land was in trust for their son and asked if he would still be able to use it for Agricultural purposes.

Zoning Administrator Weck acknowledged that Ms. Humble's son would be able to use the land for Agricultural purposes.

Trevor Penning, 7731 East Viking Boulevard, asked about surface water fees for mixed-use and noted that there was a huge difference between Agricultural and Commercial.

Zoning Administrator Weck explained that the surface water fees were based on how the land was being used.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER WEST, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IVERSON, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:12 P.M.

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

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WEST, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT

LOCATION: FOREST BOULEVARD, SOUTH OF STACY CITY LIMITS, SECTION 8, APPLICANT: CITY OF WYOMING, PARCEL ID NUMBERS: 21.21.10120.00, 21.10121.00, 21.10122.00, 21.10123.00, 21.10124.00,21.10124.01, 21.10125.00, 21.10127.00, 21.10129.00, 21.10130.00, 21.10130.10,21.10133.00, 21.10133.30, 21.10133.40, 21.10133.50, 21.10133.70, 21.10133.80,21.10134.00, 21.10135.00, 21.10136.00, 21.10137.00, 21.10138.00, 21.10139.00,21.10140.00, 21.11145.00, 21.11145.01, 21.11145.02, AND 21.11145.03.

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

NEW BUSINESS: NONE

OLD BUSINESS:

3. Conditional Use Permit Amendment C-25-001 – Dead End Hayride

Location: 28186 Kettle River Boulevard

Applicant: John B. Hastings Family Limited Partnership

Property ID Numbers: 21.10118.00, 21.10128.00, 21.10132.00, and 21.10116.00

City Planner Lindquist reminded the Commission that there was a presentation done at the last meeting, and following discussion at the meeting, they continued this item in order to allow staff to continue to work with the applicant on the remaining concerns. She noted that staff had received information from the applicant that resulted in some modifications to the previously recommended conditions of approval. She briefly reviewed the modifications staff was recommending for items #4 and #6. She reviewed the proposed modification suggested by the applicant for #6 to allow the operation hours for October to go until 1:00 a.m. and all other times stay at midnight. She stated that the applicant had also mentioned the idea of reducing the volume of the sound at midnight, which had been incorporated into the conditions, along with language that any bands on site would also have to cease at midnight. She stated that this was saying that all public customers should be off the site by these times, but staff recognized that there would still be workers doing clean-up on the site after that time, but there should not be customers there at that time. She stated that for condition #4, there have been modifications, but clarified that it had not been modified to give it a limit for the costs, except for providing more clarity that this would be a rural-designed section. She noted that there was also more verbiage included on how this process would unfold, related to design and payment. She explained that the reason for this detailed condition was that the staff is not in a position to support City funds going to this road, and this condition would be consistent with other developments in the community that had to install infrastructure associated with their project. She stated that staff did not want to make any commitments to picking up responsibility for any portion of the road, for design, or construction. She noted that this point may be at a stalemate tonight, but was recommending that this be sent forward to the Council for their decision on whether or not the City should facilitate some financing for the roadway. She noted that staff felt this was a reasonable solution and reiterated that this would be no different than other developments that have also had to pay to get their site access via a public road. She stated that staff were continuing to work with the applicant's consultant on some of the operational issues. She noted that she believes that the City will see some changes this fall that will help mitigate some concerns and stated that the applicant can come back to the City in the future and ask to modify their CUP. She explained that staff had spent a lot of time talking through these conditions and trying to make sure that they capture the concerns that were shared by residents and some of the operational issues that exist. She stated that the City was not trying to negatively impact the applicant or their business, but did want to make sure that there were some changes made.

Jeremy Hastings, applicant, stated that they were still opposed to condition #4, but thanked City staff for the time they have put into this application. He explained that he did not believe that condition #4 was reasonable and believes that there could still be some solutions between them and the City to try to mitigate the dust and maintenance. He noted that he was hopeful that the changes they were putting into place with the event management plan would work even better than expected.

Commissioner West stated that with condition #4, the applicant had time to figure out the funding.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER LOBERMEIER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WEST, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT C-25-001 – DEAD END HAYRIDE, LOCATED AT 28186 KETTLE RIVER BOULEVARD, FOR APPLICANT: JOHN B. HASTINGS FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, PROPERTY ID NUMBERS: 21.10118.00, 21.10128.00, 21.10132.00, AND 21.10116.00, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT.

Voting Aye: Ortwerth, West, Holl, Iverson, and Lobermeier
Voting Nay: None

Abstain: *None*
Absent: *None*

4. Rezoning Petitions.

Chair Lobermeier noted that the City had received a petition on July 8, 2025, from the Forest Boulevard neighborhood and had just gotten another one from Mr. Purdy.

Mike Purdy, 7733 East Viking Boulevard, noted that very few people knew about this, and only 3 out of 18 people in his area were aware of the City's plan. He explained that they have spoken to people outside of their immediate area and explained that everyone was surprised by the proposal and opposed to the City taking this action. He stated that he had a really good meeting with City Administrator Linwood and Assistant City Administrator MacFarlane, and stated that it was good for him to get a better understanding of the City's logic. He stated that what he learned was that the logic behind this was to facilitate development, and explained that he felt that any developer with common sense would look at the future land use map. He noted that was why he didn't think that the argument being made by the City to rezone the properties made sense. He stated that he also didn't think it made sense to change the zoning for a handful of potential buyers because by changing their zoning, the City would be taking away a ton of their rights. He noted that this was especially the case with properties like his that would be rezoned from Agricultural to R-3 because it has stricter zoning than anyone who serves on the Commission has. He stated that he chose his properties because it was rural, secluded, and also had agricultural freedoms. He stated that he believed that by changing their zoning, the City was choosing future potential residents over the current residents and felt they were being penalized for the City's vision. He noted that the proposed zoning contradicts the survey conducted in 2019 that asked residents what they wanted the City to look like in 2030. He noted that the calm theme that came from the survey was that people wanted small, quiet, rural settings, with small-town qualities. He stated that he understood this was part of the Comprehensive Plan and that they could include it in their places for decades down the road, but changing the zoning now did not make sense to him. He stated that if the City chooses to do it, it would essentially turn them into the Met Council, which comes in and changes zoning. He stated that a zoning change should be upon request by the property owner or a group of property owners and should not be a zoning push. He explained that for the petitioners, the only acceptable outcome is to maintain the existing zoning. He stated that they also want to maintain the zoning for future property owners unless they want to have it rezoned to match the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that they have not gotten the impression from the City that their concerns were being taken seriously, and explained that because of this, they were ramping up their efforts to get the word out via social media and knocking on doors. He noted that he knows that there is at least one other neighborhood working on another petition to submit to the City. He explained that they had also looked into the possibility of annexing their area into Chisago City or Stacy. He reiterated that they feel it was critical that they be allowed to maintain their current zoning and that future property owners can also maintain that zoning. He stated that they have spoken with a real estate attorney who communicated to them that they had never heard of this happening in this manner because a zoning change is typically done upon request. He stated that there would be more petitions coming forward in the near future and noted that every person he had spoken with opposed this rezoning.

There was a round of applause for Mr. Purdy.

Loren Osterbauer, 28180 Forest Boulevard, stated that even though the City had changed some of the zoning from Industrial back to a less restrictive zoning, he wanted to make sure that the City realized that the Forest Boulevard petition was still valid. He stated that their neighborhood completely agreed with what was shared by Mr. Purdy, and they were also opposed to any

changes and wanted it left as Agricultural.

Mike Beers, 8255 295th Street, explained that his parents had bought this land about 53 years ago. He stated that nobody who bought property on this road bought it because they wanted it to be developed. He explained that he was firmly opposed to this development, and if he wanted to develop it, he would come to the City and find out what he would need to do in order to be able to do that. He stated that the proposal was to take his parcel from residential to heavy residential with ¼ acre lots. He stated that he agreed that there are very few people who know what the City was trying to do and explained that he would also be bringing a petition to the City. He noted that he felt the City's communication related to this issue has been horrible and reiterated that nobody who lives in these areas wants this, and noted that it looked like the City was trying to turn Wyoming into Woodbury, and asked why the City was pushing for this.

Kim Anderson, 8278 295th Street, stated that she completely agreed with everything that has been shared tonight. She also felt the communication had been lacking and disagreed with the proposed rezoning and stated that was not why they had moved to the area.

Linda Miller, 7196 East Viking Boulevard, stated that the City wants to rezone their parcel to Industrial, and why and who thought of that idea. She stated that the reason she had been given by one individual was that they should be Industrial because they live next to Industrial, which did not make sense to her. She stated that they have lived here for almost 48 years and did not understand the thought process behind making them Industrial and wanted to stay the way they are right now.

Mr. Purdy stated that people are upset because they didn't know about this, but were also upset by the proposed changes, and there was a lot of anxiety among the residents. He stated that the initial communication stated that this would be implemented by January 1, 2026, and stated that many of the residents don't understand the process, or where this was within the City's process. He noted that more people need to get informed about this, and they were working on it, and appreciated the assistance the City had provided.

Chair Lobermeier asked if Mr. Purdy had a preferred method of communication and noted that the City had tried a number of different things to try to get the word out. He stated that the City would like to reach everyone and did not understand which key communication source was missing for them to be able to do that.

Mr. Purdy stated that a direct mailing would be the most expensive, but believed that it would be the best way to communicate with residents. He referenced a copy of the zoning map and stated that it says 'semi-rural', which he felt was ambiguous because it doesn't indicate whether it was R-1 or R-2.

Chair Lobermeier noted that the land use categories in the Comprehensive Plan were not a 1:1 alignment with the zoning, so there may be different descriptions.

Mr. Purdy asked how a Wyoming citizen was supposed to understand what this possible change meant for them.

Chair Lobermeier stated that people could go to the City website, click on the map, and then their property and find out.

Mr. Purdy noted that the map information was still wrong.

Zoning Administrator Weck acknowledged that the City had not yet fixed the map.

Mr. Purdy explained that he would really like the City to consider dropping the whole rezoning initiative.

Chair Lobermeier gave a brief overview of the timeline, process, and the public feedback they

have gotten, like what was happening tonight on this agenda item. He stated that he did not believe they were anywhere near being ready to hold a public hearing and needed to adjust the proposed schedule. He suggested that they remove the plan to hold the public hearing on September 23, 2025, and asked staff to put together a more comprehensive communication plan and strategy for public engagement. He stated that he would like to continue to be open to getting feedback from the public, possibly during the Open Forum portion of their meetings. He noted that once they have gone through all of that, they can revisit the zoning map and consider not looking at the whole community. He stated that based on the feedback the City has been getting, it felt like the City may be moving a bit fast on this action, which they had not thought earlier in the process, and believed it should be pushed into 2026.

Commissioner West stated that community engagement is important because the Commission was just 5 people from the community who were making recommendations to the Council. She stated that they want to hear from the community and assured residents that they appreciated the comments and were listening to them.

There was consensus of the Commission not to hold a public hearing on this on September 23, 2025, and push back further discussion and take a look at communication options.

Mr. Purdy suggested that the City post information on the website when they come up with a timeline and plan for proceeding. He reiterated that there is a lot of anxiety in the community about the proposed changes to zoning.

Chair Lobermeier noted that there can be a misunderstanding of what rezoning means and what it does or doesn't do to a property. He stated that they will try to find better ways to communicate this information and reminded the audience that the Commission values property rights as much as they do, because they all live in the City too.

COMMUNICATIONS:

UPDATES:

Mayorga Meadows, Summer Field CUP, and the Xcel monopole applications were approved by the City Council. The Cannabis ICUP application was denied by the City Council.

ADJOURN

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HOLL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WEST, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 26, 2025 "REGULAR MEETING" OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION AT 7:56 PM.

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