

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY OF RAMSEY  
ANOKA COUNTY  
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, October 15, 2015, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present:           Vice Chairperson Randy Bauer  
                                  Commissioner Andrew Andrusko  
                                  Commissioner Ralph Brauer  
                                  Commissioner Cindy Nosan  
                                  Commissioner Gary VanScoy

Members Absent:           Chairperson Gary Levine  
                                  Commissioner Matthew Maul

Also Present:               Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill  
                                  City Planner Chris Anderson  
                                  Planning Intern Jeff Solmonson  
                                  Housing Intern Michael Healy

**1.     CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chairperson Bauer called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2.     CITIZEN INPUT**

None.

**3.     APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion Carried.   Voting Yes:   Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Brauer, and Andrusko.   Voting No:   None.   Absent:   Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

**4.     APPROVE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**4.01:   Approve the Following Planning Commission Minutes:**

**4.01.1: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Dated August 6, 2015**

Commissioner Andrusko recommended that Community Development Director Gladhill's title be changed to Community Development Director Gladhill.

Motion by Commissioner Andrusko, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to approve the following minutes as amended: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated August 6, 2015.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Andrusko, Brauer, Nosan and VanScoy. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

#### **4.01.2: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Dated September 10, 2015**

Motion by Commissioner Andrusko, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to approve the following minutes as presented: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated September 10, 2015.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Andrusko, Brauer, Nosan and VanScoy. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

### **5. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS**

#### **5.01: Public Hearing: Consider Request for a Variance to Allow a Detached Accessory Building to be located Nearer the Front Property Line than the Principal Building on the property located at 16841 Wolverine Court NW; Case of Allen and Ginger Millner.**

##### **Public Hearing**

Vice Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:03 p.m.

##### **Presentation**

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating the City has received an application from Allen and Ginger Millner for a variance to allow a portion of a detached accessory building to be located nearer the front property line than the principal building at the property located at 16841 Wolverine Court NW. Staff reviewed the request in detail with the Commission and recommended denial.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented that the lack of staff support was due to the City's current ordinances.

##### **Citizen Input**

Commissioner VanScoy requested further information on what it means for an accessory structure to be closer to the property line than the principle structure.

City Planner Anderson discussed the City policy currently in place that addresses property line setbacks for principle and accessory structures. He explained that the City could revisit this regulation in order to determine if a portion of an accessory structure could be in front of the home, but not the entire accessory structure.

Commissioner VanScoy believed that the current code was quite clear in that accessory structures were not to be located in front of the principle structure.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated this was the case and staff was questioning if the Commission was willing to consider allowing a small portion to be in front.

Ginger Millner, 16841 Wolverine Court NW, explained she was requesting the accessory structure size due to the fact she had a very small attached garage at the time. She explained that she and her husband enjoy woodworking and would be using the detached structure for a woodshop, in addition to providing parking spaces. Given the angle of her home on the lot and the large row of conifers on her property, she believed the proposed location for the accessory structure made the most sense. She indicated that if the garage were attached to her home, her property would have more pavement and fill. She then discussed the number of detached garages in her neighborhood.

Allen Millner, 16841 Wolverine Court NW, commented that the proposed location of the detached garage would allow for access into and out of the structure from the existing driveway.

Commissioner VanScoy asked how much of the detached structure would be in front of the current line of the house.

Ms. Millner estimated a triangular shape that was approximately 15% of the structure would be in front of the line.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned if the building could be moved straight back 10 feet in order for it to be in alignment with the home.

Ms. Millner explained the City required there to be a minimum of 14 feet between structures and septic tanks. For this reason, the structure could not be pushed back 10 feet.

Commissioner Brauer inquired if the building could be made smaller in order to meet the City's requirements.

Ms. Millner stated the angle of the property line was causing concern with the placement of the building. She commented if the building was made smaller, she wouldn't have the same level of flexibility that she was seeking. She indicated that she could always attach the garage to the home, but believed the better option for her property was to build a detached structure, as this would save a large number of cedar trees on her lot.

Further discussion ensued regarding the accessory structure placement on the lot and access to and from the building.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the rear yard could be used for the accessory structure.

Ms. Millner indicated a structure in the rear yard would be difficult to access. She explained she and her husband were planning on using the new building for vehicle parking.

Commissioner Andrusko inquired if the applicants had considered attaching the structure to the home with dual doors, which would allow for access through the garage.

Ms. Millner commented this was considered, but would require large doors in order for a sewer truck to be able to drive through the garage to the back yard.

Laura Meyer, 16840 Wolverine Court, stated she has been the Millner's neighbors for the past eight years. She believed the Millner's were kind and generous neighbors that took great care of their property. She encouraged the Commission support the Millner's variance request.

Rick Newman, 16821 Wolverine Court, indicated he had submitted written comments to the City regarding his concerns. He recommended that the Commission adhere to the City regulations already in place. He believed the proposed building location would negatively impact his property as he did not want a woodshop adjacent to his bedroom. He suggested the applicants consider another location for their accessory structure.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Andrusko, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Andrusko, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Vice Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Commissioner VanScoy did not support the variance. He did not believe it would be in keeping with the neighborhood for the Millners to construct a garage in front of their home.

Commissioner Andrusko commented that with the City Ordinance as written, he could not support the proposed building location and variance either.

Commissioner Nosan did not agree with these statements. She understood that the applicants were interested in parking in the new structure. There was some concern with accessing the septic tank, which means the building could not be placed in the rear yard. She explained she supported the applicant's request.

Commissioner VanScoy clarified that the septic tank was not the issue, but rather the fact that the applicants wanted to park vehicles within the detached garage and it would be an inconvenience for the building to be placed in the rear yard.

Commissioner Andrusko stated the City had a viable alternative location for the structure that would not require a variance.

City Planner Anderson reported this was the case.

Ms. Millner reported that if her property required a new septic system, it would have to be located to the extreme rear of her lot.

Commissioner Brauer indicated the City had Ordinances in place for a reason. He feared that if the Commission were to approve the Millner's variance, a precedent could be set. He encouraged the applicant to reconsider the proposed size of their detached structure in order to meet the City's requirements.

Community Development Director Gladhill discussed the action that was required of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Commissioner Brauer, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to adopt Resolution #15-10-257 adopting unfavorable Findings of Fact #0954 due to the fact the applicant had an alternative building site for the proposed accessory structure.

### **Further discussion**

The Commission reviewed the Findings of Fact at length adjusting the language to ensure the language was amended to be not favorable.

Community Development Director Gladhill suggested that Findings 32, 33 and 34 be removed. The Planning Commission supported this recommendation.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned if a Finding should be added to state that alternatives do exist for the applicant by either adjusting the accessory structure location or building size.

Commissioner Andrusko supported this recommendation.

There was a friendly amendment to the Findings of Fact adding #32 stating alternatives do exist for the applicant by either adjusting the accessory structure location or building size.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Brauer, VanScoy, Andrusko, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to adopt Resolution #15-10-258 denying the request for a variance to allow a detached accessory building to be located nearer the front property line than the principal building on the property located at 16841 Wolverine Court NW striking Conditions 2 through 8.

### **Further discussion**

Community Development Director Gladhill reported that the action taken by the Planning Commission this evening would be appealable to the City Council, if the applicant wished to submit an appeal to City staff.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Brauer, and Andrusko. Voting No: Nosan. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Community Development Director Gladhill recommended that the Commission direct staff to look at the City's existing Ordinance regarding accessory structure setbacks in order to allow a small portion to extend in front of principle structures.

Commissioner VanScoy supported the Ordinance as it stands.

Motion by Commissioner Andrusko, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to direct staff to investigate how other cities address accessory structure setback requirements with respect to being in front of principle structures.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Andrusko, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: VanScoy. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

### **5.02: Public Hearing: Consider Request for a Variance to Fence Height and Shed Location at 5650 156<sup>th</sup> Lane NW; Case of Walter Gleb and Sandy Warner.**

### **Public Hearing**

Vice Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:00 p.m.

### **Presentation**

Planning Intern Solmonson presented the staff report stating the City has received an application from Walter Gleb and Sandy Warner for a Variance to fence height and required setback for a shed on the property located at 5650 156<sup>th</sup> Lane NW. The applicant is requesting a variance for an existing fence higher than eight (8) feet and a shed setback of less than six (6) feet. This variance request arises out of a complaint brought to City staff regarding the two structures. Staff reviewed the request in further detail and recommended approval of the variance for the fence and recommended not approving the variance for the shed location.

## **Citizen Input**

Vice Chairperson Bauer questioned if the two variances should be handled together or separate.

Community Development Director Gladhill requested the Commission make a motion on how to address the variances.

Motion by Commissioner Brauer, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to address the two variances requests for Walter Gleb and Sandy Warner separately.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Brauer, VanScoy, Andrusko, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Walter Gleb, 5650 156<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, requested the Commission approve the fence variance as the fence would allow for privacy given the change of grade between his property and his neighbors. He explained that he was unaware of the City's fence height requirements when the fence was constructed.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned where the hot tub was located.

Mr. Gleb stated the hot tub was sunk into the existing deck in the rear yard.

Commissioner Andrusko asked if the fence had already been built.

Mr. Gleb stated this was the case.

Craig Thumstetter, 5641 156<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, explained he lived to the east of the applicant. He did not believe the fence should remain in place as it did not adhere to City Code. He recommended that the fence variance not be approved.

A friend of Mr. Walter Gleb, who resides at 1117 Marsh Street in Mankato, indicated he assisted with the fence construction and reported the fence was constructed at its present height to provide privacy. He understood there was some tension between the two neighbors and believed that no matter the fence height, the neighbor would object.

Alex Bannis, 15600 Iodine Street NW, opposed the fence and believed it was an eyesore. He recommended that the applicant be made to follow City standards.

Motion by Commissioner Brauer, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Brauer, VanScoy, Andrusko, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Vice Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing at 8:11 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Community Development Director Gladhill requested the Commission take separate action on the fence and shed variances.

City Planner Anderson reviewed a visual of the subject property with contours to provide the Commission with additional information on the elevation of the property.

Commissioner Andrusko asked if the City has required property owners to remove fences or sheds in the past.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that while rare, this has occurred in the past.

Further discussion ensued regarding Mr. Gleb's deck elevation.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned how high a fence could be without requiring a variance.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported that a fence could be up to eight feet in height. He explained that another alternative would be to construct a wall attached to the principle structure, which could then be higher than eight feet.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to adopt #15-10-246 adopting Findings of Fact #0953, Items 1 through 11 and 17 through 26.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy and Nosan. Voting No: Andrusko and Brauer. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to adopt Resolution #15-10-247 approving a variance to exceed the fence height only on the property located at 5650 156<sup>th</sup> Lane NW.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy and Nosan. Voting No: Andrusko and Brauer. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Planning Intern Solmonson provided the Commission with additional information regarding the storage shed and noted that it was located four feet from the property line and was within a drainage easement.

## **Citizen Input**

Mr. Gleb explained he was not aware of any easements at the rear property line when he constructed the storage shed. He indicated he spoke to his neighbor along the side property line and stated they tried their best to locate the property line. He believed it would create a real hardship for him to have to move the shed given the fact it had a block foundation. He understood that the shed did not require a foundation, however given the fact that the majority of his backyard was wetland, he believed the block foundation was necessary.

Commissioner VanScoy inquired as to the size of the shed.

Mr. Gleb reported the shed was 8 feet by 12 feet.

Commissioner Brauer asked why a surveyor was not contacted to properly locate the property line.

Mr. Gleb stated he had contacted a surveyor a few years later and that was when he learned he was four feet off the property line.

Commissioner Andrusko questioned who the easement belonged to.

Community Development Director Gladhill indicated this was a public easement to be used by the City, for private utilities or can be used for surface grading to manage water runoff.

Vice Chairperson Bauer asked if Mr. Gleb recalled hearing about the easement when he closed on his property.

Mr. Gleb was only aware of the easements on the side of his property and not along the rear property line. He then discussed the location of a large tree stump that would hinder equipment from reaching the rear property line.

Alex Bannis, 15600 Iodine Street NW, explained that the shed was built up on a mound of soil that was reinforced by rocks within a wetland. He did not approve of how the shed foundation was constructed as this was pushing more water onto his property. He did not believe the property was properly delineated prior to Mr. Gleb constructing his shed.

Craig Thumstetter, 5641 156<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, encouraged the Commission to not allow Mr. Gleb's shed to remain in place just because he claims he did not know where the property line and easement was. He questioned why Mr. Gleb did not speak with the City prior to building his shed. He feared that he and his neighbors were being adversely impacted due to the retaining walls that were constructed surrounding the shed.

Mr. Gleb commented that the retaining wall and shed have in no way impacted the runoff pond. He reported that the retaining wall was fully on his property.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Brauer, Andrusko, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Vice Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing at 8:42 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Community Development Director Gladhill discussed the property and its delineation. Staff did not believe Mr. Gleb had a wetland encroachment. He reported that if the Commission required additional information staff would have to report back at a future meeting.

Commissioner Brauer stated the issue at hand was not the wetland or the retaining wall, but rather that the shed encroached on the easement.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented this was the case.

Commissioner Andrusko questioned how the Commission has handled easement encroachment issues in the past.

Community Development Director Gladhill indicated encroachment agreements have been reached in the past with property owners, however, this was not the standard for drainage and utility easements.

City Planner Anderson provided further comment on encroachment agreements that have been approved by the City Council in the past. He noted these agreements were generally for portions of a driveway, deck or stairway and not for a structure with a foundation.

Vice Chairperson Bauer asked what year the shed was built.

Mr. Gleb stated the shed was constructed in either 2010 or 2012.

Commissioner Brauer recalled that a garden was constructed over an easement and the City required this homeowner to remove the garden from the easement. In addition, he recalled a resident that was storing miscellaneous items on an easement and the items had to be moved.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the engineering department had assessed the impact of the encroachment onto this utility easement.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained that an assessment had not been completed due to the fact a variance was also required. He reported that if the variance were to proceed, an assessment would be completed by staff.

City Planner Anderson recommended that if the Commission were to approve a variance that it be contingent upon approval of an encroachment agreement by City Council.

Motion by Commissioner Nosan to recommend to adopt #15-10-246 adopting Findings of Fact #0953, Items 12 through 26. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Andrusko, to adopt #15-10-246 adopting unfavorable Findings of Fact #0953, Items 12 through 26.

### **Further discussion**

Commissioner Brauer did not support the shed remaining in its current location due to the hardship that the encroachment could cause the City if access to the property were needed. He was disappointed by the dispute between these neighbors, however he understood that the City's Ordinances had to be followed.

Commissioner Andrusko reiterated that it was staff's recommendation to not support the shed variance.

Further discussion ensued regarding the proper language that should be included in the Findings of Fact Items 12 through 26.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Andrusko, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Andrusko, to adopt Resolution #15-10-247 denying a variance for the shed as there was adequate room to build or relocate the shed to properly meet City Code setback requirements.

### **Further discussion**

Community Development Director Gladhill explained to the applicant that the decision made by the Planning Commission was appealable to the City Council.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Andrusko, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Vice Chairperson Bauer requested a five minute recess. The meeting recessed at 9:13 p.m.

Vice Chairperson Bauer reconvened the meeting at 9:18 p.m.

**5.03: Public Hearing: Consider Recommendation on Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment for 6139 157<sup>th</sup> Lane NW.**

## **Public Hearing**

Vice Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 9:18 p.m.

## **Presentation**

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the intent of this case was to amend a previous approval for an existing use. There are, however, additional outcomes of the decision beyond the current, approved Conditional Use Permit for the property. Staff reviewed the request further and requested feedback from the Commission on how to proceed.

## **Citizen Input**

Jackie Abendroth, 15810 Sodium Street, stated she has enjoyed the daycare at this location. She understood the secretarial business had moved on. She expressed concern with how new businesses moving onto this site would impact her property value.

Lowell Parsons, 15813 Nowthen Boulevard, explained he lived just north of the daycare. His main concern was with the high speed and level of traffic along Nowthen Boulevard. He did not want to see a gas station and convenience store at this corner as it would bring too much traffic into this area. He reiterated that the parcel was zoned Residential.

Elaine Parsons, 15813 Nowthen Boulevard, did not want to see any commercial uses brought to this property as it was directly surrounded by a quiet rural residential neighborhood. She also did not want to see any expansion to the existing building.

Vice Chairperson Bauer explained that the original thought was to rezone this property B-1, which would allow additional types of businesses. However, staff has reconsidered this and was now open to exploring the creation of a new zoning district, which could be more restrictive in which businesses could locate on this parcel. He questioned if the residents present supported the more restrictive approach.

The members in the audience nodded in approval.

Community Development Director Gladhill appreciated the input from the residents and suggested that the property be rezoned for professional office space and/or daycare uses. He explained that the Commission could table action on this item and allow staff time to amend the proposed zoning for this parcel.

Motion by Commissioner Brauer, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Brauer, VanScoy, Andrusko, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Vice Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 9:35 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Motion by Commissioner Brauer, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to table action on this item directing staff to draft a new zoning classification for the property located at 6139 157<sup>th</sup> Lane NW and other similar properties.

### **Further discussion**

Commissioner Andrusko feared that the City could be setting a dangerous precedent by creating a specific zoning for this one parcel.

Commissioner Brauer believed that a new zoning classification would assist with addressing the concerns with this property along with others in Ramsey. It was his opinion that the new zoning district would allow for compatible businesses to be located near or adjacent to residential zoning districts.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned if the Employment District could be used for this property.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported that the Employment District includes business as well as manufacturing and he did not believe this was wanted adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

Commissioner VanScoy encouraged staff to continue to include the public throughout the rezoning and Comprehensive Plan Amendment process.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Brauer, VanScoy, Andrusko, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

### **5.04: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance Amending City Code Chapter 105 (Buildings and Building Standards) Related to Allowable Hours of Construction.**

### **Public Hearing**

Vice Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 9:45 p.m.

### **Presentation**

Planning Intern Solmonson presented the staff report stating residents have concerns with the hours listed as the maximum allowance, not necessarily being the standard hours of construction that most contractors choose to use. Based on discussion in a previous Planning Commission meeting, the goal of the proposed amendment would be to introduce wording to negotiate an earlier stopping time for construction and creating exemptions built in for public improvement projects. Staff recommended approval of the proposed City Code amendment.

### **Citizen Input**

There was no citizen input.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Andrusko, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Andrusko, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Vice Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing at 9:47 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to recommend that City Council adopt the Ordinance amending language regarding allowable hours of construction.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Andrusko, and Brauer. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

**5.05: PUBLIC HEARING: Consider Recommendation on Ordinance #15-15 Amending City Code Section 117-1 (Definitions) Chapter 117, Article II, Division 4, Subdivision III (Floodplain Overlay Districts).**

### **Public Hearing**

Vice Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 9:48 p.m.

### **Presentation**

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating in 1979, the City enrolled in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) by adopting floodplain regulations and Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) for the community. The Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and FIRMs currently in effect are dated November 1, 1979. The community has grown substantially since the late 1970's and thus, the maps lack much of the current street network.

City Planner Anderson stated the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has been systematically updating floodplain maps across the state and has recently completed new maps for Anoka County. If the City desires to remain in the NFIP, the floodplain standards must be amended to adopt the new maps. The floodplain standards are designed to minimize structural damage as a result of large scale floods, oftentimes referred to as the 100-year flood, by prohibiting the placement of structures within designated floodways and by requiring either flood-proofing and/or the use of fill to elevate a structure. Structures located within a designated floodplain are required to be covered by flood insurance. Staff provided further comment on the changes and recommended approval.

### **Citizen Input**

Vice Chairperson Bauer asked when the Ordinance amendment would become effective.

City Planner Anderson reported that the Ordinance and new maps would become effective December 16, 2015.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Andrusko, and Brauer. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Vice Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing at 9:58 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Andrusko, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #15-15 amending Section 117-1 (Definitions) and Chapter 117, Article II, Division 4, Subdivision III (Floodplain Overlay Districts) to incorporate by reference the updated Flood Insurance Rate Maps and the Flood Insurance Study, both dated December 16, 2015.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Andrusko, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

### **5.06: Consider Request for Extension of Approved Variance to Fence Height at 5859 Alpine Drive NW; Case of James Hirschman.**

### **Presentation**

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to consider an extension of a variance approved by the Planning Commission in October 2014. Due to the timing of completion of the Anoka County Improvement Project at Alpine

Drive and Nowthen Boulevard, the impetus behind the variance, the applicant has stated that they feel it is unfeasible to complete this year. It was noted that variance approvals are valid for one (1) year without approval of an extension. Staff finds the request for an extension to be reasonable.

### **Commission Business**

Motion by Commissioner Andrusko, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to recommend that City Council approve the variance request extension as presented.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Andrusko, Brauer, Nosan and VanScoy. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

### **5.07: Receive Presentation on Housing Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.**

#### **Presentation**

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report and provided a brief presentation on the status of housing in Ramsey and how this relates to the housing chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff discussed the comments received on the system statements.

### **Commission Business**

Commissioner VanScoy asked if all of the comments brought to the Met Council would be considered in the Comprehensive Plan.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported all comments were received by the Met Council and would be considered. However, it was his understanding that some comments were more important than others.

Commissioner Brauer read a newspaper article that addressed roadway congestion. It was his understanding that no new roads would be built and that residents would have to get used to congestion.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to recommend the City Council not formally dispute the system statements and direct staff to work prepare summary comments for the Met Council.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Brauer, Andrusko, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

Housing Intern Healy provided comment on the housing chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, along with housing trends for the City of Ramsey. Foreclosure rates for the past ten years were

discussed. He provided comment on the importance of maintaining the City's housing stock and reviewed the age of Ramsey's population. The shift in the household composition was noted.

Commissioner Brauer was interested in learning more about utilizing social media in order to draw more residents into the planning process.

Community Development Director Gladhill believed that staff would be working to tap into these avenues in the future in order to gain additional input from the public.

Community Brauer appreciated all of Housing Intern Healy's efforts and welcomed him to the City of Ramsey.

## **6. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT**

### **6.01: Zoning Bulletins**

Zoning Bulletins were noted.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Andrusko, and Brauer. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Levine and Commissioner Maul.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Tim Gladhill  
Community Development Director

ATTEST:

---

JoAnn Shaw  
Community Development Assistant

Drafted by Heidi Guenther  
*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*