

COMMENTS RECEIVED

MAYORS TOWN HALL MEETING: 3/12/2012

1. We need the new park built (regarding North Commons). North Commons will be closer and better connect the community.
2. I have three children; I need a park for my children with good access (regarding North Commons).
3. We need a park for our children (regarding North Commons).
4. How much money will be raised from selling this park versus the cost construct the new Town Center area (regarding North Commons). If nothing else, leave the park alone as open space (regarding Peltzer Park).
5. Reduce park land as needed for the benefit of all tax payers.
6. The park behind Ramsey market (regarding Peltzer Park) is not safe for our kids to cross Ramsey Boulevard; therefore, I want to include my idea for the large project (regarding North Commons).
7. I'm here today on behalf of my family and neighbors. We are very concerned about the over 56 kids at or near our 24 town homes (regarding the COR) that have no place to go to have fun. They are always playing in front of the house; and it is not safe. So please, please help us get space or a park for our kids. Thanks for understanding our concern.
8. Community development sale helps neighborhood? Tradeoff for something lost. How about thinking "outside" the COR development box. Can we utilize some of these parks for neighborhood functions like trees, fruits or a community garden? Neighborhood use? Neighborhood development?
9. I DO NOT want to see Peltzer Park closed.
10. I am in support of the new large park project (regarding North Commons) because it is [not] safe for my kids to cross Ramsey Boulevard to former Park (regarding Peltzer Park) which is behind the Ramsey Market. So, I am in support of the new large park (regarding North Commons).

COMMENTS RECEIVED

BY CITY STAFF, EMAILS

11. Please also pass on my opinion, and it is only opinion, that the plan to sell Peltzer is flawed, and for these reasons:

1.) It is my opinion based on my previous statements that closing Peltzer Park would create a parcel that couldn't be sold.

2.) The costs to make that lot suitable for a single family dwelling would be prohibitive. I believe it would need substantial grading, just to build.

3.) The lot is in a neighborhood with homes in the 150-200K value range. I believe you would have to spend so much to improve the lot and build on it, that building a home on the improved lot would create a property much more expensive than the surrounding dwellings, and any sensible contractor would balk at the prospect.

In short, I believe the city would be creating a vacant lot, which would not generate the tax income advertised. I also hold that the city would remain responsible for maintaining that lot in the same way the park is maintained and that there would be no gain in loss of maintenance costs.

12. I am glad to see forward progress on such a potential volatile subject. I think that once all involved see real fact regarding our park system in Ramsey they would be fine with their sale.

13. Hello, I am writing to you regarding the possible closing of Peltzer Park.

The park is located just a few blocks from my home. My 3 children and I use this park almost on a daily basis. We love and enjoy this park so much because of the play equipment and location. We rarely visit Alpine Park due to the lack of play equipment. The play equipment is **much** smaller and dangerous for small children!

Having to cross the busy intersection of Ramsey Blvd. is dangerous and inconvenient. If the park is moved to the proposed location, we will not be using it due to the risks associated with crossing a dangerous road like Ramsey Blvd.

I am asking for the City Council to please not eliminate Peltzer Park.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

INQUIRIES RECEIVED BY STAFF BEFORE THE MAYORS TOWN HALL MEETING

Q1: Is the City considering to sell Peltzer Park or has the decision already been made?

A: The City Council has not formally voted on the sale of Peltzer Park. However, this topic was discussed at the January 17th City Council Works Session and there is a desire amongst the City Council to close down Peltzer Park and sell the remaining parcel.

Any time the City wants to sell land an ordinance needs to be adopted, which requires notice to surrounding property owners and a public hearing (this would be the case for Pelzter Park). An ordinance will not be brought forward to the Council until March 27. The City realizes that closing and selling Peltzer Park is a potentially contentious decision and would like to further inform/notify the public of the Council's intentions; and to provide the public with greater opportunity for input (i.e. the mailing you received, the Ramsey Resident article, the website article and the Mayor's Town Hall meeting next week).

Q2: What considerations as far as changing the park lot into a one acre single dwelling property are being taken as far as well and septic concerns with respect to the surrounding wetlands?

A: the City would regulate future development of Peltzer Park like any other property in the City. If the new property owner wishes to install a septic system a permit would be required by the City, at which time State and local regulations would be applied. You are probably correct, the elevation of the property and the surrounding water table is a concern. However, I can't speak for the City's Building Official and I don't know the specific regulations. Regardless, your concern would be addressed at the time a permit is applied for. If you would like to see what specific regulations are in place, regarding septic systems, I can get you that information— please let me know.

General feedback from staff on wetlands, the water table and drainage (Peltzer Park):

Depth to groundwater (GW) – this would affect the siting of a septic system, but it is always possible to construct a mound system as long as there is adequate separation from the drainfield and GW. I'm guessing this wouldn't be a problem in that we have a similar condition along most of our rivers and streams in the City. Look at Bowers Drive; they have to maintain separation from GW and the 100 yr flood elevation of the river – they place a water tight tank and pump up to a mound or drainfield near the street.

Fill – all homes must be built a minimum of 18" above street grade, unless the Building Official and/or City Engineer agree that this requirement can be waived. Fill will likely be required adjacent to the street, but I bet you can get a nice lookout/walkout lot and

take advantage of the existing topo. They may have to perform some dewatering during construction and install a sump basket in the basement as well if the GW is elevated.

Whoever comes forward to purchase this property will have to solve these issues. There is a process we follow with all building permits & this would be no different.

Q3: Is the intention to fill the lot so it drains to road ditches by Kamacite St. What consideration will be taken with respect to septic system and the wetlands?

A: the City would regulate improvements to this property like any other property in the City. If the new property owner desires to fill/improve the property a building permit would be required, at which time the City would review potential drainage issues. In this particular case, the City would likely require wetland delineation (determine the extent of existing wetlands). Furthermore, the Lower Rum River Watershed Management Organization (LRRWMO) would also require review if improvements to this property effect surrounding wetlands. For your reference, attached to this email is an image showing where the existing wetlands are in relation to Peltzer Park.

Q4: What is the status of the Whispering Oaks property?

This property is actually two separate parcels. The City does not own these properties.—the State of Minnesota does. As a result, the City has no control over property.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

**INCLUDED ON FOLLOWING PAGES ARE COMMENTS SLIPS FROM THE MAYOR'S
TOWN HALL MEETING, RECEIVED BY STAFF AFTER THE MEETING DATE**

3/13/12

Name: Osman. F Hassan

Address: 7274 149th Ave NW

Comments: As a resident of Ramsey City, we are a big family of 7 individual. We cannot express our happiness and support that we have ~~the~~ ^{supportive} for the new park (North Commons), it clear that our kids cannot cross very busy street and its not save for the kid to cross Ramsey Blvd. therefore we cannot wait the park to be build and completed. ^{by Osman's family whom} all ~~support~~ supportive the North Commons.

Name: Razika Aliye Abdoh Osman

Address: 14836 Olivine St NW Ramsey 55303

Comments: We are very supportive of this park.

We cannot wait for the park to be build and completed. In our neighbor we have about 56 kids that need place to play, and park that is on the other side of Ramsey Blvd is very dangerous for our kids to cross the street; therefore this park is what we want for our kids and all the neighbor as well.

Name: Fuad salad

Address: 14856 Olivine st NW Ramsey NW 55303

Comments:

I fully support that we should construct an environment or facility for our children. Families are complaining about their cars getting scratched by bikes. It's dangerous for kids to play by the road. Kids are penetrating people's flower bushes. What we need is a safe and secure area for the kids.

Name: DANIEL WLOYA

Address: 14864 Olivine St NW Ramsey, MN 55303

Comments: we need space for our kids to play. It's good to have common playing ground kids instead of playing on our grass, flowers and drive way. Because designated space good for kids not only to play but also for kids' safety and beauty of our neighborhood.

We appreciate any effort to solve this matter!

Name: MUSTAFA MOHAMOUD & ILHAN SUBAGLE

Address: 7252 149th Ave NW Ramsey MN 55303

Comments:

As we know our area doesn't have a play ground, so if the City Make this very helpful proposal, I am going to fully support. Obviously we have very large amount of children and they will be the first beneficiaries of this program. Finally, please help us and will be appreciated.

Thank you Very Much "Mustafa Mohamoud"

Name: Nikolay Levchenko

Address: 7255 148th Ln NW Ramsey MN

Comments: We think that building a new playground is a good idea. We think so because it would insure the safety of our kids. Also it will keep the kids in a more occupied location and off the streets. It will keep the children happy, too.

Name: Tigist Chiri

Address: 7260 149th Ave NW, Ramsey MN

Comments: I support building of new play ground close to our residence. I believe the future play ground in our community will guaranty the safety of our kids and will assist us to raise a health and efficient citizens

Thank you in advance

P.S : I have 3 kids in my household

Name: FAYSAL JILLO

Address: 14882 Olivine St NW Ramsey, MN
55303

Comments: As residents of Ramsey, we have many kids in our area, and we really appreciate if the city of Ramsey create a little park for our kids in this area. They will bring a peace to the neighbor hood because there is nothing important than seeing little kids happy and enjoying little park.

Name:

Tesfaye Dadi

Address:

14852 Divine St. NW
Ramsey MN. 55305

Comments:

It would be more closer for
the kids and they don't have to
get bored.