

3. CITIZEN INPUT

Dave Vogel, 16660 Coquina St NW, stated that he would be speaking for Ms. Kimberly Nelson who lives at 14024 Dysprosium Street and is also present tonight. He stated that Ms. Nelson has lived at her property for 24 years and the adjoining property owner has decided to construct a fence. He noted that the definition of front yard is not clearly defined in Ramsey's Code and explained that the neighboring property owner would like to construct a six-foot fence on what he considers his side yard while Ms. Nelson considers that to be her front yard.

Kimberly Nelson stated that she considers her front yard to be where her front door and sidewalk are and does not want to see a six-foot "wall" when she goes outside of her home.

Mr. Vogel stated that Ms. Nelson is a single woman and would not have a view of the street or shared driveway and; therefore, an intruder could be hiding behind the fence when she is exiting or entering her home. He believed that the fence between the homes should only be four feet high to protect her view and safety. He stated that they do not oppose the fence but would like to see City Code amended to protect those with homes positioned in this manner.

Mayor Strommen stated that she does understand and also received the email from Ms. Nelson but does not believe that there is enough information known at this time. She stated that if the Council is interested in looking at this issue staff could bring that information back for discussion but noted that timeline may not address this issue.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that there is an application for a zoning permit that would allow the construction of a six-foot tall fence, noting that initially the permit was approved. He noted that Dysprosium Street is unique because of the shared driveways and; therefore, that approval was rescinded. He stated that a discussion item will be brought back to the September 8 Council meeting and the Planning Commission will review the issue at their September 10 meeting. He stated that City Attorney Langel has also been reviewing case law.

City Attorney Langel stated that at this point there is no clock ticking as the approval had been rescinded and; therefore, the timeline outlined by Community Development Director Gladhill is appropriate to address the issue.

Mayor Strommen stated that the Council is not directing staff to amend the Code at this time but simply to bring additional information back for review.

Councilmember LeTourneau stated that he would like the timeline reviewed as an appeal was not a part of that process.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that it was not an issue with how the Code was being interpreted but how the Code is applied to that neighborhood as the Code does not address the issue at hand. He stated that this is a unique situation because of the layout of the homes and did not believe that there would be similar requests of this nature where a front yard abuts a side

yard. He explained that this was not an appeal because the standard was being interpreted correctly but the standard itself is in discussion.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that without an appeal the City can continue to review the issue and work with the property owners outside of a strict timeline.

DRAFT