

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, January 5, 2017, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Randy Bauer
 Commissioner Bruce Anderson
 Commissioner Ralph Brauer
 Commissioner Cindy Nosan
 Commissioner Patrick Surma
 Commissioner Gary VanScoy

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill
 Economic Development Manager Patrick Brama

1. CALL TO ORDER

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 Anderson, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Brauer, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

4. APPROVE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

4.01: Approve the Following Planning Commission Minutes:

4.01.1: Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes Dated December 1, 2016

4.01.2: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Dated December 1, 2016

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to approve the following minutes as presented: Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes dated December 1, 2016.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer requested a change to the minutes, noting when he spoke under Citizen Input, his address should be 14600. He asked that the vote on Page 7, for the Woodlands 4th Addition, be corrected.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to approve the following minutes as amended: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated December 1, 2016.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

5.01: Public Hearing: Consider Request for Zoning Amendment for Woodlands 4th Addition (Project No. 16-102); Case of Lennar Corporation.

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:02 p.m.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating Lennar Corporation (the "Applicant") has applied for Zoning Amendment from R-1 Residential (Rural Developing) to R-1 Residential (MUSA) for property related to Woodlands 4th Addition. Staff discussed the request further and recommended approval of an Ordinance rezoning the project.

Citizen Input

There was no input from the public.

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Surma, Anderson, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:05 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #17-02 approving a Zoning Amendment for the Subject Property from R-1 Residential (Rural Developing) to R-1 Residential (MUSA).

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

5.02: Public Hearing: Consider Request for an Interim Use Permit to Utilize a Membrane Tent Structure for a Secondary Showroom; Case of Skeeter Boat Center.

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:06 p.m.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to consider a request from Jim Peterson of Skeeter Boat Center, (the "Applicant") for an Interim Use Permit to erect and utilize a temporary membrane tent structure (the "Structure") as a secondary showroom on the property located at 9421 Highway 10 NW (the "Subject Property"). The Structure would be thirty feet by sixty feet (30' x 60') in size and would have sidewalls. The Applicant has noted that they would not provide heat for the Structure and would ensure access throughout the winter by plowing around the Structure. The Applicant has stated that they have picked up a second line of boats and that their existing indoor showroom does not have sufficient space to accommodate the new line of products. The Applicant is proposing the use the structure through the month of May to provide additional showroom space for customer viewing of boats in advance of the fishing opener.

Citizen Input

Commissioner Anderson asked if the applicant had considered adding onto the building.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the applicant was currently leasing the space from the property owner. The applicant would like to add on, however, they were not in a position to take full ownership of the property.

Commissioner Anderson expressed concern with how the tent looks from the street. He questioned if the building had a rear exit and if the tent could be placed towards the back of the building.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated there was not an access point at the rear of the building. He then reviewed the site plan with the Commission noting the size and location of the existing showroom.

Commissioner Nosan inquired when the IUP would expire.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained an Interim Use Permit had the ability to sunset or expire. He stated the City could set a time frame or deadline. He indicated the applicant could request an extension.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the City had received any comments from neighboring properties.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported the City had not received any comments.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, Surma, Brauer, Nosan, and VanScoy. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:20 p.m.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer stated the City has concerns with moving forward with this request as presented. He explained the options available to the Commission would be to approve with conditions or denying the request.

Commissioner VanScoy commented he would be interested in discussing an alternative location for the tent. However, he understood the applicant was not in attendance.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated the Commission could approve the request subject to staff working with the applicant on the location of the tent. Staff could then work with the applicant on this matter prior to the request being reviewed by the City Council.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-01-008 approving Findings of Fact favorable to the Applicant.

Further discussion

Further discussion ensued regarding the City's terms for an Interim Use Permit.

Chairperson Bauer recommended #16 be removed and suggested #10 be amended.

Commissioner Brauer requested #10 be amended removing “adjacent to” and changing this to read: to the rear of the building.

Chairperson Bauer discussed #17 and asked if this should also be amended to read: to the rear of the building. The Commission was in agreement.

Commissioner VanScoy requested information on how the City defines transient merchant.

Community Development Director Gladhill defined transient merchant for the Commission and suggested #13 be removed from the Findings of Fact.

Commissioner VanScoy supported this recommendation.

Chairperson Bauer requested the Commission amend the motion to reflect the discussed changes.

Amendment by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, amending Item #10, deleting Item #13 and amending #17.

Amendment Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, VanScoy, Brauer, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Amended Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, VanScoy, Brauer, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-01-009 approving the request for an IUP contingent upon the Applicant working with Staff to site the Structure such that it is at the rear of the building and requiring the Applicant to have a \$2,000 financial surety.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Brauer, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

5.03: Review Sketch Plan for Brookview Estates (Project #17-102); Case of Eric Thomsen.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this file is to review the official Sketch Plan prepared by LHB, Inc. for the purpose of a proposed eleven (11) lot Planned Unit Development subdivision of Outlot A, Meadowbrook (the "Subject Property"), located generally west of Germanium Street and south of the Trott Brook. The Sketch Plan Review process affords the Planning Commission an opportunity to provide early direction on the layout of a proposed plat, before the Developer prepares detailed Preliminary Plat plans. A

key decision will occur at Preliminary Plat, in which the layout can be approved, subject to approving final construction plans and Final Plat documents. At that time, the City will review items including, but not limited to, Grading, Utility, Landscape, and Street Light Plans. Staff requested the Commission review the plans and provide staff with feedback.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy asked if septic systems and wells required a minimum lot size.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained a property had to have a primary and secondary septic location. He recommended lot sizes not be less than one acre in order to meet this requirement.

Commissioner Anderson expressed concern with the limited width of the rural roadways surrounding this development.

Commissioner VanScoy believed this would be a beautiful development. He recommended the development have a dedicated public access.

Chairperson Bauer requested the applicant come forward.

Eric Thomsen, 6210 Green Valley Road, thanked the Commission for their time. He understood the project would require a rezoning. He reported he intends to apply for a zoning amendment. He had no objection to providing the City with public access.

Commissioner Surma questioned if police and fire had signed off on sketch plan.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated a non-binding review had been offered by both the police and fire departments.

Commissioner Surma inquired if the neighbors had provided any feedback to the City regarding the proposed development.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained a mailing had been sent to neighboring property owners and the City had not received any negative feedback.

Commissioner Surma recommended the Sketch Plan move forward.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there were any comments from the public. There were no further comments.

The Commission supported this item moving forward.

5.04: Public Hearing: Adopt Resolution #17-01-013, #17-01-014, and #17-01-015 Related to the Preliminary Plat for Vistas at North Commons (Project No. 16-90); Case of Lifestyle Properties (Project Originally Known as Ramsey Town Center 12th Addition/Gleason Plat).

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:52 p.m.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to hold a Public Hearing and consider a recommendation on a Preliminary Plat for a development known as Vistas at North Commons. The proposed development consists of twelve detached single-family dwellings. The Sketch Plan has already been reviewed by the Planning Commission, which has provided policy direction on net density and sidewalk requirements. Staff reviewed the request in detail with the Commission and recommended approval.

Citizen Input

Bill Gleason, 215 Merry Avenue in Wayzata, explained he brought the proposed development to the City. He stated he was excited about the project and believed the proposed product would benefit the City. He thanked staff for all of their assistance on this project.

Commissioner Surma understood Mr. Gleason had a great relationship with the City.

Mr. Gleason discussed his development history with the City noting he excelled at developing difficult properties.

Commissioner Nosan was pleased to see this type of housing product being brought to the City of Ramsey and thanked Mr. Gleason for working with the City on this development.

Chairperson Bauer understood senior housing was a priority for the City.

Commissioner Anderson commented he lives near the proposed development and he and his neighbors support the proposed single-family development. He asked if the units would be screened from the trail.

Mr. Gleason stated he was proposing to have landscaping in order to assist in screening the units from the trail.

Commissioner Brauer supported the development and believed it fit well on the proposed site.

Commissioner VanScoy thanked Mr. Gleason for all of the work he had put into the development.

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Brauer, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:05 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to adopt Resolutions #17-01-013 (Findings of Fact) and #17-01-014 (Variance) granting a Variance to Vistas at North Commons as indicated in the report.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Brauer, Anderson, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-01-015 recommending that the City Council approve the Preliminary Plat for Vistas at North Commons.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Surma, Anderson, Brauer, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

5.05: Consider Concept Plan for Potential Trott Brook Hall Expansion.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the Staff Report stating representatives of Trott Brook Hall met with City Staff recently to discuss a potential expansion of their building, which is located at 17301 Nowthen Blvd NW (the "Subject Property"). They did provide Staff with a Concept Plan for the potential expansion and Staff offered to route it through the Planning Commission for some very preliminary input/feedback before they incurred more expense in plan development.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the site had space for wetland mitigation.

Community Development Director Gladhill discussed how wetland mitigation would have to be completed for this property. He anticipated wetland credits may have to be purchased by the developer.

Commissioner Anderson explained he drove by this property and feared a portion of the wetland would have to be filled in in order to complete the proposed addition. He questioned the size of the addition.

Community Development Director Gladhill reviewed the sketch plan and noted which portion of the wetland would be impacted. He stated the impact would be relatively minor.

The Commission supported this item moving forward.

5.07: Review Concept Plan for Pearson Farm; Case of Capstone Homes.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to provide preliminary feedback for a future plat currently known as Pearson Farm. This is not an official application at this time, but does include several unique policies.

1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment (subsequently a Zoning Amendment)
2. Use of Planned Unit Development District
 1. Lot Sizes
 2. Setbacks
3. Mandatory Environmental Review

Community Development Director Gladhill reviewed the proposed concept plan in detail with the Commission and requested feedback.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy discussed the potential PUD and asked if staff was proposing to rezone the site PUD or R-2.

Community Development Director Gladhill discussed the requirements of a PUD and stated staff would be evaluating this further prior to making a recommendation.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned the intent of the small portion of property along Highway 10.

Steve Bonna, Capstone Homes, explained three townhome units would be located along Highway 10. He noted there would be a 12-foot landscaped berm between the property line and the railroad tracks. He anticipated the material for the berm would be generated from the site. He provided further comment on the proposed housing types that would be included within the

development, along with the estimated prices. He described the pond and park amenities that would enhance the neighborhood. He stated one of the challenges with the development was working through the transportation and utilities.

Commissioner Surma appreciated the great work Capstone had done in the community. He questioned how close the townhome units would be to the railroad tracks.

Mr. Bonna estimated the units would be over 100 feet from the railroad tracks.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the streets would be private or public.

Mr. Bonna explained the townhome area of the development would have private streets and an HOA would maintain these roadways.

Commissioner Nosan was pleased with the proposed greenspace within the development.

Commissioner Surma understood a number of the units would be slab on grade. He questioned if these residents would have a safe place to be during inclement weather.

Mr. Bonna appreciated this question and stated a storm shelter option would be offered for these homeowners.

Chairperson Bauer recommended the community building be constructed with a basement.

Mr. Bonna noted the community building would be quite modest in size and would not serve as a storm shelter.

The Commission supported this project moving forward.

5.06: Stone Brook Children's Academy & Daycare Purchase Agreement for OUTLOT B of COR ONE

Presentation

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is for the Planning Commission to review the attached potential project site locations; and to provide feedback to the EDA and City Council--as they are considering a corresponding purchase offer (purchase agreement). Staff reviewed the potential eight site location options. It was noted Stone Brook would like to move forward with site location #1. The EDA has asked Stone Brook to also evaluate sites #1 through #4. Staff discussed the potential sites in detail with the Commission and requested feedback on the proposed project.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer understood Stone Brook wanted to be located on a prime parcel within The COR, but was not willing to pay the price for this prime real estate. He expressed concern with this scenario and did not want to see the City drop its prices too much

Commissioner VanScoy asked what the purpose of the academy would be.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama stated he could not speak in detail to the curriculum that would be taught at the academy but his understanding was students would be taught from early childhood to preschool. The focus would be on classes and learning. It was noted the academy would have an indoor rec space.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned if the facility would be a daycare or an educational institution.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama stated the primary focus would be education.

Commissioner VanScoy reported educational uses were not allowed in COR 1, COR 2, or COR 3.

Community Development Director Gladhill clarified the business would be licensed as a daycare. Further discussion ensued regarding the differences between a daycare and an academy.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if a private street with easements could be created to eliminate the need for a public roadway connection.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated staff could investigate this further.

Commissioner VanScoy appreciated the focused concept of Stone Brook. He stated he would like to see this facility located within The COR. He anticipated staff would have to negotiate with Stone Brook on the cost of the property.

Commissioner Nosan expressed concern with dropping the price for the property. She feared how The COR would be impacted by 100 cars entering and exiting the property several times a day. She questioned how the remnant property (0.5 acre) would be developed in the future.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama discussed how a standalone development could be completed on the 0.5-acre lot. He explained the Council and EDA would address the pricing strategies for the property. He discussed how the per square foot asking prices were established in further detail with the Commission and noted the asking prices were always up for negotiation.

Chairperson Bauer did not understand why the applicant was requesting to be located in the center of The COR. He suggested the applicant consider another location in order to assist with traffic congestion and to avoid the street connection.

Commissioner VanScoy agreed with this recommendation.

Commissioner Surma did not support the academy locating on Site #1 and recommended Site #4 be pursued further.

Commissioner Brauer agreed stating this was one of the last pieces of real estate that was visible from Highway 10. He questioned what the applicant was bringing to the table that would contribute to The COR and the City. He questioned if taxes would be lost on this property given the proposed use. He believed Site #1 was a unique parcel and should not be sold short.

Commissioner VanScoy asked who owned Site #4.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama reported PSD owned this property and this organization was not willing to negotiate on the land price. In added that he feared the applicant would not qualify for a business subsidy loan, which means the City could not assist with the purchase price in any way. He provided further comment on the applicant's concerns with Site #4.

Commissioner Nosan commented again on the number of cars that would be coming in and out of this Stone Brook Academy property on a daily basis. She believed the proposed academy would be much better served if located along Ramsey Boulevard.

Commissioner Anderson thought Site #4 was the best location for the academy.

Chairperson Bauer did not believe this use had to be located in The COR and requested staff find out why Stone Brook was making this request. He also wanted to better understand what Stone Brook would be adding to The COR and the City.

Commissioner Brauer believed the academy should be licensed through ECFE and not as a daycare.

Chairperson Bauer requested staff bring the Planning Commission's comments and questions to Stone Brook.

5.08: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance to Amend Board of Appeals and Adjustment/Official Map

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 9:32 p.m.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the City of Ramsey, along with the City of Anoka, Anoka County, and the Minnesota Department of Transportation recently accepted the Highway 10 Access Planning Study, which is now the comprehensive vision/plan for Highway 10 future improvements. This is the third version of said vision over the past several decades. In the 1990s, the Interregional Corridor Study was completed and included several planned improvements along Highway 10. That vision was amended in the mid 2000s through the completion of the Highway 10 Access Management Plan. That plan proved to be challenging to implement, and in response, the current Highway 10 Access Planning Study was completed. Due to the change in vision, Staff has been preparing for an update to the City's Official Map, which places certain land use controls over properties and portions of properties ultimately needed for public purposes, such as frontage roads, interchanges, and other improvements.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained as part of that review, the City Attorney has recommended that the City's ordinance establishing a separate Board of Adjustment and Appeals for the Official Map Area be amended to consolidate into the Planning Commission's normal role as Board of Adjustment and Appeals. Both are powers granted under the State's Planning Enabling Law. It is the City Attorney's Legal Opinion that the Statute does not provide guidance to create two separate Board of Adjustment and Appeals. Staff indicated this will be the first in a series of amendments related to the Official Map.

Citizen Input

There were no comments from the public.

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Surma, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, and VanScoy. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

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

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #17-03 Amending the Board of Appeals and Adjustment/Official Map.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Brauer, Anderson, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

6. Comprehensive Plan Update Items

6.01: Receive Progress Report for the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating as the Planning Commission is aware, the City has established an ad-hoc Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee. Once every ten (10) years, the City is required by Minnesota Statute 473 to update its Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Aside from the statutory obligation, the City's existing plan has become dated in terms of policies, demographics, and land use vision. In order to freshen the City's vision for land use, including systems such as transportation, housing, economic development, natural resources, and parks/open space to name a few, now is an appropriate time to update the Comprehensive Plan. The Steering Committee has met twice so far on the project. The intent of the early meetings in 2016 is to set the stage and agree on a framework moving forward.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported the primary next step in the process is to finalize a working draft of the City's land use Vision Statement and Future Land Use Map. These two (2) pieces will lay the foundation on future steps and will be used to check in as individual system plans are developed. The group desires to have a working draft of both documents available in February for public workshops and engagement.

Community Development Director Gladhill indicated a primary system plan to update is the Transportation Plan. Staff anticipates to bring a discussion to the January Public Works Committee in January to discuss steps moving forward. The Planning Commission will also discuss this structure at the February Meeting. No drafts have been prepared thus far, but Staff will be checking in on the framework to complete this portion of the update. Staff anticipates a public workshop and other engagement for this system plan in April.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the Environmental Policy Board has begun to discuss how to update the Natural Resources Chapter and will be providing an update to the Planning Commission and Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee in February or March. Citizen Engagement is planned starting in April.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated the Parks and Recreation Commission will begin discussing a new format for the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan beginning after the first of the year. Currently, the plan comprises of a future improvement/planning map alongside the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP is an important financial planning tool for the City and is intended to be complimentary to the Comprehensive Plan. The Parks and Recreation Commission along with the City Council desire to bolster the Comprehensive Recreation Plan into a more thematic and visionary document, looking more long term and comprehensively at the community's recreation needs, rather than simply a chronological financial planning tool.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented Staff will be discussing the Economic Development Chapter with the Economic Development Authority (EDA) to gather their initial thoughts on a plan to update this chapter in January. Staff will report back to the Planning Commission in February and discuss a work plan to update this Chapter.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer explained the committee was in the very preliminary stages on how to attack the Comprehensive Plan update. He thanked staff for the thorough update on this agenda item.

7. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

7.01: Receive Staff Update

The Staff Update was noted.

7.02: Zoning Bulletins

Zoning Bulletins were noted.

8. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Brauer, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Gladhill
Development Services Manager

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Planning Division Secretary

Drafted by Heidi Guenther
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.

DRAFT