

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
CITY OF WYOMING, MINNESOTA  
FEBRUARY 24, 2009  
7:00 PM**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

*Frank Storm called the Regular Meeting of the Wyoming Planning Commission to order for February 24, 2009 to order at 7:00 P.M.*

**CALL OF ROLL:**

*On a Call of the Roll the following members of the Wyoming Planning Commission were present: Frank Storm, Judy Coughlin, Sean Wagner, Ken Meyers and Mark Lobermeier  
Members Absent: None  
Also Present: City Staff Member Robb Linwood, City Administrator Craig Mattson, City Engineer Mark Erichson and City Council member Roger Elmore*

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM:**

*The Planning Commission Chairman determined a Quorum was present.*

**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 maybe deferred to staff for research and future Planning Commission Agendas if appropriate."*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

1. **Consider approving the minutes of the "Regular Meeting" of the Wyoming, Minnesota Planning Commission for February 10, 2008.**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER WAGNER SECONDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER LOBERMEIER, TO APPROVE THE "REGULAR MEETING" MINUTES OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION FOR FEBRUARY 10, 2009. CONTINGENT ON THE FOLLOWING:**

- **Add an "H" in Judy Coughlin's last name on the approval of Minutes motion.**

*Voting Aye: Lobermeier, Wagner, Storm, Meyers, and Coughlin  
Voting Nay: None  
Abstain: None*

## 2. Public Hearing Security Victor Sign Variance

Open the public hearing for Security Victor Insurance

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Planning commission asked how close the sign would sit from the right of way boundary. Security Victor said about 4.5 feet in from the right of way. Planning Commission also asked if there were any issues with the height of the sign and overhead power lines. The applicant stated none.

Close Public Hearing

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER MEYERS, SECONDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER WAGNER, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN VARIANCE FOR VICTOR SECURITY INSURANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: THE SIGN WILL BE PLACED AS FAR AWAY FROM THE FRONT SETBACK AS POSSIBLE AND THE APPLICANT WILL GO THROUGH THE NORMAL SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION PROCESS.**

*Voting Aye: Lobermeier, Wagner, Storm, Meyers, and Coughlin*

*Voting Nay: None*

*Abstain: None*

## 3. Greenwood Concept Plan

Representatives - Mike Gair - Former MFRA employee, Kent Roessler CEO, Scott Dahlke Engineer

Presentation by Mike Gair:

Kent Roessler acquired the Greenwood property in 2001, at that time he acquired 204 acres, subsequent to that time he has acquired an additional 5 sites with an additional 15 acres. He acquired the additional sites in 2008. Paxmar made a decision to proceed with a plan for the acreage in 2008. Paxmar's vision is mixed land uses, for live, work, play and shop on the 200+ acres. Paxmar is hoping that the city will embrace the vision. Mr. Roessler would like to eventually proceed with preliminary plat to the planning commission and city council. Mr. Roessler would like to mass grade the property. Paxmar is asking for assistance from the city an access from county 22, sewer and water availability and compliance with the tree ordinance and the sites wetland issues. Tax capacity revenues from this site will come from both commercial and residential revenues. In the 2008 comp plan the area that Paxmar would like to develop is shown as mixed use. Plan is to layer in retail and commercial in beginning of site and slowly into residential houses the further you go in on the site.

Development will be made up of:

31.5% residential

29% non residential - retail, commercial, office, light industrial, hospitality

39.5% Open space - Green areas

### Review of Master Plan:

Variety of housing, single family, townhome, senior, apartment, significant retail opportunities, hospitality, recreational facility in middle of development. The Plan will respect the beauty of Carlos Avery. The Plan has longevity, legal status, process of entitlement and vision are transparent. Applicants states that economic values, social values, and property values, all must sustain.

### Planning Commission Questions:

First question entitlement process or legal status entitlement what does this mean?

Gair - actions that planning commission takes and city council takes and development agreements should be very clear and transparent. Make sure we are on the up and up.

The planning commission asked what do you need help with. Give us details. Developer answers they need city assistance, especially for the mass grading plan. They would like assistance in site access from 22, direction on sewer and water, approvals on environmental review, and grading and tree ordinances. Paxmar needs to do some grading to make the property more presentable for future buyers.

The Planning Commission asked about some of the unique wetland conditions with soils. They are assuming the mass grading permit would be for corrections, to make muck areas suitable for building. The applicant believes that the muck areas are skewed, site is 220 acres, the Seelyville muck are preserved in green acres, and about 40 acres of it that will not be corrected.

The residential area has about 2 and half feet of black dirt then sand. The commercial area near the hotel is all sand and buildable. The only correction areas of muck are in the residential area is about 20 acres. Planning Commission states that the staff report says there are 110 acres of Markey muck and Seelyville muck. Planning commission wants to make sure this plan is attainable. The applicant states that the next step would be do go for grading plan and have documents on soils from our engineers, approved by your engineers. We would know what we were getting into right away.

The planning commission is impressed with vision, but there biggest concern is the environmental workup. Is EAW and AUAR a necessary document?

The applicant states that they were possibly thinking AUAR. The planning commission also states they have concerns about trees that would be removed in the grading in accordance with our tree preservation act. The applicant stated that we are not looking to circumvent any of the ordinances, we plan to comply. We will work with city to make sure we comply with environmental issues and trees. The planning commission thinks the plan is appropriate for community. We need to recognize the future of our community, and this development is a potential example that can shape the community. Planning commission hope's in the process that you take the opportunity to recognize or acknowledge our tree, wetlands, and traffic concerns. Everyone is willing to work together to move forward.

The planning commission also stated they would look at changing the southwest corner of the light industrial on the plan; Wyoming may already have enough of that type of area.

Secondly, Lot size questions, the frontages are significantly less that our standard lot sizes. Not crazy about narrowing of lot size. On the northern side of the development possibly consider having a gated community or more upscale area. Planning commission is also concerned that the

residential area has about 150 homes and only one access. You would need at least an emergency access if not another regular access. The commission thinks the large area to the north that is currently planned as light industrial will require another access as well. It is asked if the applicant is in control of all property in the area and they respond that they are.

The planning commission asks City Engineer Mark Erichson when sewer is planned for this area. Mr. Erichson responded that a feasibility study needs to be completed for extension to the site. Most likely the city could provide utilities to the site. It would have to be studied and the costs responsibility would need to be decided by the city and the developer. The planning commission asks that the applicant provide a time frame for staging and phasing of the development in the future so they have a better understanding. The planning commission thanks the applicant and believes it is a likeable plan they just have some hurdles to overcome.

#### **4. City of Wyoming Zoning Tables - Bill Weber, MFRA**

Bill Weber gave some background on the zoning tables and the steps to move forward with writing a new zoning ordinance for the City of Wyoming. He explained with the comprehensive plan concluded the course of action was to adopt the zones as they are now and then rezone to a pattern more consistent with comp plan map. He is in a process of taking township ordinance and city ordinance and shuffling them together. There are several locations where districts are redundant, we needed to pick one or the other. We will have only one commercial district, only one Industrial district and a new mixed use district. We will use the shoreland and flood plain from the township. You won't see dramatic changes, we are going over the existing ordinance and deleting things that are not good features. We will try to point major changes or deletions to you. One fundamental change - in the cities two residential districts, the lot size for the current R-2 it is relatively large, so you have two urban districts one with 100 foot width and a 75 foot width.

#### **Summary of the roles of the decision makers**

The only change asked for by the planning commission is not have city council be the board of appeals, have it made of a residents, planning members, and council members.

#### **Possible corrections in tables and discussion items:**

- We will use the 500 feet for written notification requirements
- Animal raising - Define farm animals and how many acres, fence, setbacks etc..
- Look at keeping interim uses instead of accessory uses
- Greenhouses possibly allowed in R2
- Livestock feedlots and sales as one land use? Regulated at one place.
- Mining can be in R2 change to interim use.
- Roadside stands? Would those be interim permits? What is the difference between roadside and wayside stands?

Bill suggested we want to move away from long list of permitted uses for businesses in districts. Use more generalizations to cover the businesses we want in these areas.

## Corrections and discussion items cont'd

- Make Convenience with fuel sales conditional in mixed use and remove from industrial
- Dog Kennels should be conditional in both commercial and permitted in industrial.
- Funeral homes should be conditional in mixed use.
- Should day cares be conditional use in industrial?
- Take out religious buildings from industrial
- Restaurants in Industrial should be taken out
- Remove Drive in Restaurants in industrial
- Remove schools from industrial
- Social and fraternal organizations - conditional in mixed use area
- Remove car wash from mixed and industrial
- Interim use permit on wrecker services/junkyards instead of conditional
- Remove Nursing and Convalescent homes and personal services from Industrial
- Add Bed and Breakfasts to R3 and R4

Bill Weber we plan on being at the next Planning and Zoning meeting in March.

### Updates:

Planning Commission member Judy Coughlin asked if it was possible to have a book made up instead of sending planning commission meeting information electronically. Staff will look at this item and speak with other members about what works best for them.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER WAGNER, SECONDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER COUGHLIN, TO ADJOURN THE "REGULAR MEETING" OF THE WYOMING, MINNESOTA PLANNING COMMISSION FOR FEBRUARY 24, 2009 AT 9:35 P.M.**

*Voting Aye: Lobermeier, Wagner, Storm, Meyers and Coughlin*

*Voting Nay: None*

*Abstain: None*