

RE: Incorrect Information being Disseminated to Laramie County Residents

From freelaramie
To Justin Arnold
CC Gunnar Malm
Troy Thompson
Linda Heath
Don Hollingshead
Ty Zwonitzer

BCC [REDACTED]

Date Tuesday, August 5th, 2025 at 10:25 AM

Justin,

Thank you for your detailed response and for your openness to incorporating feedback. It's encouraging to see your changes were based on constituent input, and we do appreciate the effort to deregulate where possible.

In your original email, you stated:

ALL existing Home Occupations that do not have a permit are currently illegal under existing regulations.

Looking at the current Land Use Regulations document on the Planning Commission website, we see:

- Home occupations are explicitly listed as a use by right (i.e., permitted without Board approval or conditional use processes) in all residential zoning districts:
 - AR (Agricultural Residential, 4-2-100): Listed under "Uses by Right" (Page 217).
 - LR (Low Density Residential, 4-2-102): Listed under "Uses by Right" (Page 212).
 - MR (Medium Density Residential, 4-2-104): Listed under "Uses by Right" (Page 214).
 - HR (High Density Residential, 4-2-105): Listed under "Uses by Right" (Page 215).
 - Other Districts: Also allowed by right in MU (Mixed Use, 4-2-112) and PUD (Planned Unit Development, 4-2-113) if compatible with residential components (Pages 223-224). In the LU (Land Use) district, while not explicitly listed, standards in 2-2-114(c) imply permissibility but require obtaining necessary licenses/permits from relevant agencies.

This means home occupations are allowed outright in these districts, provided they meet the general standards in Section 2-2-114 (Pages 82-83). No additional zoning approval (e.g., conditional use or Board review) is needed unless the use deviates from standards.

Could you clarify how a use allowed "by right" becomes illegal without a permit? From the regulations, it appears enforcement is reactive rather than requiring proactive approval in most cases.

This is the primary reason for the opposition (at least as I understand it). Can you understand why your statements appear to be at odds with the current regulations, and have been taken by many as disingenuous?

The addition in your new code of 1-2-100, which lists Home Occupations as requiring a permit, **represents a new layer of oversight rather than deregulation**. You have eliminated the entire concept of use by right for these activities and replaced it with a formal application process. **This is where the comparisons to an HOA come from.**

While I understand your point that the permit serves as an acknowledgment to protect neighbors' expectations, you continually say that home occupations are illegal without a permit, yet the code lists them as allowed by right in the vast majority of the county (yes, not in industrial and other areas, but that's not the concern here). In the 2022 regulations, home occupations are truly "by right" in residential districts (and compatible others) without any proactive permit or certificate requirement. They are allowed if standards are met, with enforcement reactive (e.g., via violations). No overarching permit is mandated or even offered.

In the proposed 2025 regulations, while standards may be more permissive and home occupations are still "permitted" in districts, Section 1-2-100 classifies starting one as a potential "change of use" requiring permits/approvals (including an application & plot plan). This eliminates pure "by right" status; all home occupations now require some form of county verification (e.g., a Certificate of Compliance after review), or they are deemed illegal under 1-2-100. This represents a shift toward more oversight and more regulation, even if not a full "conditional use" process.

I agree with you that, in most cases, the proposed 3-1-103(i) rules for Home Occupations are less restrictive than the current 2-2-114 rules, if they stand alone. Specifically, removing all categorization and simply stating that anything that doesn't otherwise require approval is allowed is a great improvement. So is the addition of allowing people to have customers visit. You do restrict outdoor storage (except with an additional permission) and remove all signage, both of which are more restrictive and shouldn't be (in a deregulation).

But, when coupled with the new administrative requirements of 1-2-100 and ancillary permits, it's challenging to view this as overall deregulation.

So that's the ultimate proposal to align with your deregulatory intent while protecting neighbors:

- Remove Home Occupation entirely from 1-2-100, and restore it to a pure by right status;
- Restore the signage and outdoor storage aspects (without additional permits);
- Keep the other changes you made; and
- Explicitly allow minor businesses like lemonade stands, which would technically violate the "In person sales – one person at a time by appointment only" rule (perhaps via an exemption for temporary, reasonable, and low-impact activities with no significant traffic or noise – this could also cover an occasional yard sale or somesuch).

Do that, and you can call it deregulation.

With Respect.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

On Tuesday, August 5th, 2025 at 8:13 AM, Justin Arnold <justin.arnold@laramiecountywy.gov> wrote:

To whom it may concern,