

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, March 2, 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  
                                          City Planner Chris Anderson

**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 Meeting Minutes Dated February 2, 2017**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to approve the following minutes with corrections: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated February 2, 2017.

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

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

### **5.01: Public Hearing: Preliminary plat and Zoning Amendment for Covenant Meadows (Project #17-102); Case of Eric Thomsen.**

#### **Public Hearing**

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:01 p.m.

#### **Presentation**

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to review an application for a Rezoning of the Subject Project from R-1 Rural Developing to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Preliminary Plat. The site is generally located south of Trott Brook and west of Germanium Street and is identified as PID 02-32-25-44-0004. The Applicant has proposed to subdivide the approximately thirty-eight (38) acre Subject Property into twelve (12) single family homes that would be serviced by individual private utilities. The Preliminary Plat proposes deeding approximately fifteen (15) of the thirty-eight (38) acres to the City as the public benefit in relation to the PUD application. The proposed fifteen (15) acres straddles both sides of the Trott Brook, has steep slopes, and is also considered to be high quality natural open space. Staff reviewed the request in further detail along with the alternatives available to the Commission.

#### **Citizen Input**

Chairperson Bauer requested further clarification on where the pedestrian pathway was located and asked if it would connect to Trott Brook.

City Planner Anderson described the location of the trail easement that would be deeded to the City within the proposed development. He explained the steep slopes would not allow for an ADA trail. It was noted the trail would have a dead-end. Further discussion ensued regarding the specific standards for ADA trails.

Chairperson Bauer questioned if the cul-de-sac could be altered in any way to assist with better fire access.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported this was not the case and noted there was a broader neighborhood issue given the fact it only had a single access point.

Commissioner VanScoy inquired what the status was of the east/west cul-de-sac.

City Planner Anderson indicated the east/west cul-de-sac would be signed as a potential thru street but would be designed to meet full cul-de-sac standards.

Commissioner Anderson expressed concern that this neighborhood would have a single-point of entry.

Eric Thomsen, 6210 Green Valley Road, stated he has tried to make this development neighborhood friendly. He appreciated the assistance he has received from staff and thanked them for the thorough report.

Dan McShane, 17310 Geranium Street, reported he has lived at his address for the past 20 years and he appreciated the wildlife and trees. He feared how the new development would impact the wildlife population.

Terry McShane, 17310 Geranium Street, expressed concern with how the new development would impact the turkeys and deer behind her home. She did not approve of the tranquility being destroyed behind her property. She requested a sanctuary or buffer area be preserved for the wildlife.

Mr. McShane stated he would support the developer constructing nine houses instead of twelve. He asked how many of the lots were a single acre.

City Planner Anderson reviewed the lot sizes for the proposed development, along with the lot sizes of the adjacent properties.

Commissioner VanScoy discussed the purpose of a PUD noting the City would be receiving 15 acres from the developer. He explained the developer could be constructing 15 homes and was proposing 12.

Mr. McShane further commented on how the additional homes would impact the single point of entry to the neighborhood. He asked if any of the proposed homes would be low-income.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated this was not the intent of this project and explained the City does not determine housing prices. He understood the developer had not applied for any funding assistance. He clarified that the developer was proposing single-family homes and not duplexes.

Mark Ladean, 17330 Germanium Street, expressed concern with the added traffic that would be added to his neighborhood with only a single point of entry. He was also concerned with how water would drain off the new homes onto his property given the grade differences between the parcels. He understood new wells would be installed and feared how the water table would be impacted. He stated he moved to this neighborhood for the peace and quiet and it was his hope the trees, wildlife, deer and turkeys would remain.

Julie Ladean, 17330 Germanium Street, stated she was concerned with how difficult it was to access the creek in the spring and during large rain events. She believed it was a complete waste of tax dollars to construct a trail that would need constant repairs. She questioned if it was the developer's idea to provide land to the City. She explained that the 15 acres that would be turned over to the City were not buildable and could not be used as a park. While she understood these 38 acres would eventually be built on, it was her hope that her view of the creek would be maintained and that strangers would not be walking through her property in order to get to the creek.

Chairperson Bauer questioned how the width of Trott Brook varied during heavy rain events or wet springs.

Ms. Ladean explained Trott Brook was normally 12 to 20 feet in width but could reach up to 500 feet in width during the spring.

Len Simon, 17349 St. Francis Boulevard, stated he owns 40 acres directly west of this proposed property. He commented on the history of his property and noted he had a natural amphitheater. He explained he purchased his property to preserve the amphitheater, which required the combining of four lots. He recommended the City maintain the 2.5-acre minimum for the lots sizes to ensure septic waste does not seep from one property to another. He believed this property was a gift from God and should be preserved.

Juliann Simon, 17349 St. Francis Boulevard, shared the sentiments of the others who spoke previously. She expressed concern with the amount of traffic that would have to be accessing Highway 47 from a single access point. She understood the concerns that were raised by the Fire Department and cautioned the future homeowners on this. She encouraged the City to further investigate this development prior to approval.

Diane Weber, 5450 173<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW, stated she appreciated her secluded neighborhood and appreciated the 2.5 to 3-acre lot size minimum. She requested the City hold the proposed development to these standards. She questioned who would be using the proposed trail. She worried about the number of new wells and septic systems that would be installed given the small lot size. She asked that the neighbors be made aware if low-income housing was being constructed. Lastly, she expressed concern with the water runoff from the new development and feared how it would impact the creek and river.

Chairperson Bauer discussed the approval process for this Planning Case and noted it was in proposal phase and the final approval would rest with the City Council.

Mr. Simon suggested this piece of property be preserved and that a monumental act be taken.

David Magnuson, 13907 Bluebird Street in Andover, stated he was interested in building in Covenant Meadows. He discussed the history of the proposed development and explained the dream was for several friends to be able to build homes and live among their friends. He loved the nature surrounding this property. He reported the land would not be clear cut or stripped.

His goal would be to do life with friends while allowing the natural beauty of the land to remain. He stated if the City did not approve this proposal, he would have to pursue another parcel of land.

Chairperson Bauer thanked Mr. Magnuson for this information.

Tim O'Shaughnessy, 17201 St. Francis Boulevard, stated he owns 37 acres along the south side of the proposed development. He reported he was new to the City of Ramsey. He suggested the development allow seven homes and not eight. He recommended that the 15 acres not become a public park.

Don Qveton, 5750 177<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW, discussed the flooding on this property and explained that during wet springs and winters, he has to move his cattle. He agreed that it would be a waste of money to put in a trail as it would routinely flood. He understood this was a beautiful piece of property and appreciated the sentiment behind the development. He understood the property would develop someday. However, he offered to purchase the 15 acre outlot, after receiving an appraisal, and indicated he could donate it back to the City if he ever sells his property. He explained that he bought his land so that he could live in the country, same as all the other neighbors.

Dave Jones, 17331 Germanium Street, commented on the cliffs surrounding his house and stated he would never allow a path in this area. He expressed concern with the water runoff in his neighborhood because of the steep slopes and cliffs. He stated if this development were to proceed the water runoff would have to be addressed. He noted he has lived at his home for the past 17 years.

Chairperson Bauer discussed the PUD that would allow lots less than two acres in size. He asked how several of the lots to the east were approved at less than 2.5 acres.

City Planner Anderson anticipated these lots were developed prior to this standard being put in place and were now lawful non-conforming lots.

Mr. Thomsen explained the entire development would be privately financed and all single-family homes were being proposed. He stated he was not an engineer but noted the property would be engineered properly for water runoff and infiltration.

Community Development Director Gladhill understood the neighbors were very concerned with the protection of the natural resources. This led the City to propose protecting 15 acres of land surrounding Trott Brook through a PUD. He stated his primary intent was to lock the property into its natural state. He explained if the trail was not seen as a benefit, the City would not have to pursue it. He reported the 15 acres would have to be deeded over to the City in order for the PUD process to be considered. He provided further comment on how the engineering of this site was reviewed and addressed by City staff. He discussed how traffic would enter and exit the neighborhood noting only 120 extra trips per day would be generated by the new homes. Staff

provided further comment on the financing plan for the project and noted the City would be securing sureties from the developer.

Commissioner Anderson understood this was a property with solitude. He discussed the cliffs within the neighborhood and questioned what the City would do with the 15 acre outlot.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned how the wildlife would be impacted through the proposed development.

Mr. Thomsen commented on the protection of the 15 acres stated this was being done to assist with preservation. He explained he was 56 years old and has lived in Ramsey the majority of his life. He discussed the proposed site plan further and stated a natural corridor would be maintained for the wildlife. He indicated his goal was to maintain as many trees as possible and noted new trees would be planted.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if any if the new homeowners would be installing fences.

Mr. Thomsen stated he was uncertain if fences would be installed.

Chairperson Bauer discussed the PUD approval process and noted the plans, once approved, could not be altered.

Mr. McShane questioned how far a home within the new development would be from his.

City Planner Anderson estimated a new home would be roughly 250 feet from Mr. McShane's home.

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 8:28 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Commissioner VanScoy requested further information from staff regarding the City's septic system regulations.

Community Development Director Gladhill discussed the MPCA and City's septic system requirements.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned what the City's minimum lots size standards were.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained lots with septic systems were to have enough room for a primary and secondary septic. This allows for a system to fail on a residential lot and still be replaced.

Commissioner Nosan believed there was no purpose in putting in a trail as this area frequently floods. She discussed the single access point to this neighborhood and requested further information.

Community Development Director Gladhill discussed the single access point and stated staff would be conducting additional study on a potential second access point.

Commissioner Brauer questioned if an EAW should be completed.

City Planner Anderson explained the proposed development would not trigger this requirement. He discussed how the neighbors could petition for an EAW. He indicated the development would have to meet all Rum River Watershed District requirements with regard to stormwater runoff.

Commissioner Nosan asked if this property could have any endangered species, such as turtles.

Community Development Director Gladhill understood the City could order an animal species database from the DNR. He explained a blanding turtle might exist in the general area of Ramsey but stated this had not stopped other projects in the area.

Ms. McShane questioned how an EAW process could be started.

Community Development Director Gladhill discussed the citizen petition process for an EAW. He commented further on the eight step requirements within the EAW. He stated he could email all of this information to Ms. McShane.

Commissioner Surma thanked all of the residents for being in attendance this evening. He appreciated their input and Mr. Simon's passion for this property. He stated he supported property rights and wanted to see all lots within the development be 2.5 acres in size. He supported the land surrounding Trott Brook being preserved.

Community Development Director Gladhill appreciated all of the comments received this evening as well. He recommended action on this development be delayed to allow several issues to be worked through with the developer that do not include an EAW. He stated Mr. Thomsen has been excellent to work with and staff would like the Commission to table action on Covenant Meadows to April.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to table action on Covenant Meadows to the April 6, 2017 Planning Commission meeting.

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

## **5.02: Stone Brook Children’s Academy & Childcare Center Purchase Agreement**

### **Presentation**

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama presented the staff report stating The EDA and City Council are considering the attached purchase agreement (PA) with Stone Brook Academy for 1-acre of land located near the center of The COR for a children's academy and childcare center. It is customary for the City to allow the Planning Commission to comment on purchase agreements for City-owned land before they are executed. Specifically, the City Council is seeking preliminary comments on the proposed land use/ concept site layout.

### **Staff suggests three major talking points for the Planning Commission:**

(1) The proposed Stone Brook project has sparked the discussion of the Yolite Street connection. At this point, the EDA, Planning Commission, and City Council have all generally agreed, a connection is needed. However, the “type” of connection is an outstanding item. Should the City require Yolite to be a formal public roadway, designed to public road standards (much like Sapphire Street in The COR). Or, can the Yolite Street connection be constructed as a private drive connection (much like Residence at The COR or Casey’s). Stone Brook would prefer a private drive connection. Staff is open to either option.

(2) The proposed Stone Brook building orientation does include portions of the building set-back from Sunwood Drive (much like the City's Municipal Center Building). Generally speaking, The COR Design Standards require the building to be pushed up against Sunwood Drive. Staff believes this project meets the general intent of The COR Design Standards. However, the proposed Stone Brook building orientation, partially set-back from Sunwood, will likely require some sort of deviation (or variance) from the City's COR Design Standards. Staff would like to know if the Planning Commission is open to the proposed building orientation on Sunwood Drive? From a preliminary perspective, Staff is generally comfortable with the proposed building orientation.

(3) The Planning Commission reviewed the attached four master plan options in February. At the time, the Planning Commission showed general support for layout “B” due to the internal east-to-west road connection. Staff would like to confirm the Planning Commission's position on that item.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama explained it should be noted, this case is not an “official/ formal review” of the site plan by the Planning Commission. That will occur formally in the future, during the entitlement process (i.e. official site plan/ plat). The purpose of this case is to gather “preliminary” input on the site layout for the benefit of the Council and Stone Brook, as they negotiate the attached purchase agreement. The site layout of

any project drastically effects project costs, and therefore has a direct effect on the purchase agreement negotiation. Additionally, this feedback will help Stone Brook with providing direction to their architects/ engineers that will formally design the project (and prepare for official applications). Therefore, any preliminary

### **Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer understood the sentiments of each group that has reviewed this request was that Yolite Street should be connected and that Mr. Johnson supported shared financing. He requested further information from staff on the benefits of this connection being public or private.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama offered a definition for a public road and explained sidewalks and lights would be required, which would be more costly. He indicated a private drive option would be less costly and noted the standards would be negotiable. He reported the City would pay 60% and the developer would pay 40% for a public roadway. If the road were to develop in a private manner, the expense would be negotiable and staff anticipated this could be split 50/50. He explained that if the road were developed as a private drive, it would remain open to the public.

Chairperson Bauer questioned if a private road made more sense for the remnant lot.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama stated this would make more sense for the remnant lot as this would allow for additional width.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the future sale of the remnant lot would be improved if the roadway were public versus private.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama believed this issue would have to be further vetted. He anticipated that a private drive would reduce the entry costs for a future developer, while also maintaining more of the land.

Commissioner VanScoy discussed the importance of the Yolite connection for users of the train. For this reason, he supported a public street.

Commissioner Nosan questioned who would maintain the roadway if it were private.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama stated the maintenance would be negotiable.

Commissioner Anderson expressed concern with a private road and recommended the connection be public to allow for proper access.

Michael Johnson, Stone Brook Children's Academy, introduced himself to the Commission and stated he would be one of the owners of Stone Brook.

Chairperson Bauer understood Mr. Johnson's father-in-law owned two daycare academies.

Mr. Johnson reported this was the case. He explained that he has been doing research over the past two years which led him to deciding to choose Ramsey for his academy. He indicated he recently received his director certification.

Chairperson Bauer asked what the difference was between a daycare and an academy.

Mr. Johnson stated a daycare was an in-home service run by the County, while a childcare center was run by human services and the State of Minnesota. He reported all building requirements would be governed by the State. He elected to add the word academy after Stone Brook to set his facility apart and to show it was focused on preschool education.

Community Development Director Gladhill encouraged the Commission to not get wrapped up on this issue and noted this was a State licensing issue. He explained Stone Brook was proposing to have a commercial childcare facility.

Commissioner VanScoy commented on the building design. He asked if any brick could be put on the building.

Mr. Johnson indicated his plans architectural plans were preliminary and had yet to be finalized.

Commissioner Anderson questioned if the developer had looked over the four site plan options.

Mr. Johnson stated he had reviewed these options.

Commissioner Anderson understood the Commission supported Plan B and asked if the developer had any comments on this plan.

Mr. Johnson had no concerns but recommended the east/west drive be further south for safety purposes.

Chairperson Bauer questioned how drop-off and pick-up would be managed by Stone Brook.

Mr. Johnson reported a receptionist would be hired to assist with this process and noted the center would be open from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Commissioner Nosan inquired how many parking stalls the academy would have.

Mr. Johnson indicated Stone Brook would have 27 parking stalls and he anticipated he would have 18 staff members.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned if the building would have access from Sunwood.

Mr. Johnson stated the building would only have one main entrance point, via the parking lot for safety purposes.

Commissioner Anderson inquired if the property would be fenced.

Mr. Johnson indicated only the playground area on the southwest corner would be fenced.

Commissioner Surma expressed concern with the lack of parking that would be available for pick-up and drop-off. He believed the Coburn's was not adequately parked and did not want to see this new business impacted.

Mr. Johnson stated the proposed parking was all that would be allowed on the one acre lot.

Commissioner VanScoy believed the proposed project was much needed and would greatly benefit the City of Ramsey and The COR.

Chairperson Bauer was pleased that both parties were able to reach an agreement on the purchase agreement.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama summarized the feedback provided by the Planning Commission. He understood a public road connection was preferred.

### **5.03: Consider Draft Ordinance Amendment Addressing Irrigation Requirements (Discussion Purposes Only)**

#### **Presentation**

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating over the past two months, the Environmental Policy Board (EPB) has discussed a potential ordinance amendment regarding irrigation requirements for multi-family and commercial/industrial developments. The intention originally was simply to eliminate the City Code requirement that in-ground irrigation systems shall be installed in all multi-family and commercial/industrial projects. However, based on information received at their January meeting from a guest speaker, the EPB directed Staff to revise the DRAFT Ordinance so that it also stipulates that if an irrigation system is installed (including single family parcels), it shall be equipped with a rain sensor (per state statute) as well as one or more water efficient technologies. This could include, but would not be limited to, a smart controller, soil moisture sensor(s), and/or an evapotranspiration (ET) sensor(s). This provides enough flexibility so that as future advances in water efficient irrigation technologies are developed, it will not require additional ordinance amendments.

City Planner Anderson explained the cost of these 'smart', water efficient technologies has come down as they have become more commonplace. Again, based on input from a guest speaker from Conserva Irrigation, including a smart controller, for example, to a new irrigation system, only adds about \$250 to \$350 to the overall cost. It is more expensive to retrofit existing systems with the more water efficient technologies, approximately \$650 to \$750. However, the Return on

Investment (ROI) for a standard residential system could be realized relatively quickly, maybe in as few as two to four years (and would be even quicker on larger, commercial systems).

City Planner Anderson reported as water supply continues to be a prominent concern for the City and as the ‘smart’ technologies become more commonplace (and therefore with prices coming down), the EPB believes that requiring water efficient technologies is appropriate. However, the EPB has also noted that they want to ensure that this is enforceable. Thus, staff is still assessing how the water efficient requirement could be verified in the field. At this time, it does not appear that it could be addressed through any existing inspection. Additional review is still needed on this aspect.

### **Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer supported the City being proactive on the City’s water usage and its proper management.

Commissioner Anderson agreed.

Commissioner VanScoy also supported the City addressing this issue and asked if the proposed plan went far enough. He questioned if something other than sod should be considered in order to reduce the City’s dependence on water.

City Planner Anderson stated this was an excellent point. He discussed a portion of City Code regarding the use of native plantings and how the City was working to address landscaping that required less chemicals and water. He indicated the EPB was hoping to get something in place prior to the 2017 construction season.

Chairperson Bauer thanked City Planner Anderson for the update on this item.

### **5.04: Discussion Regarding Two Story Accessory Buildings; City Code Section 117-349.**

#### **Presentation**

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating Recently, City Staff received an application for a two-story accessory building, which has brought about lengthy discussions about the standards that apply to such structures. While City Code allows for two-story accessory buildings, either by right (on parcels two [2] acres or larger and outside the MUSA) or through the issuance of a conditional use permit, there is no provision for such structures to deviate from the height limitation for accessory buildings (either sixteen [16] or twenty-two [22] feet), without the issuance of a variance. He explained a two-story accessory structure being approved through a conditional use permit was originally put into place due to oversized attics that contained enough room between the floor and the ceiling that Building Code deemed the attic space a second story even though from the exterior the structure did not appear to have a full two (2) levels. This is the reason for the height limitation remaining at sixteen (16) feet for two story

accessory buildings on parcels less than two (2) acres rather than allowing for additional height allowances at this time.

City Planner Anderson reported staff would like to have a discussion on this topic to determine if a text amendment that would allow for an increase in accessory building height for a two-story accessory building is warranted. Note, City Staff is not advocating for or recommending that an amendment is needed. There are several items to consider:

1. What does the Planning Commission feel was the intention of allowing a two (2) story accessory buildings: to accommodate a 'bonus room' or if it was to truly allow for two (2) full stories?
2. Would allowing a deviation from height standards by Conditional Use Permit rather than by Variance be a more appropriate tool to address accessory building height (similar to how deviations to sign standards are addressed)?

City Planner Anderson explained addressing the two above points will indicate whether a text amendment should be contemplated. However, staff also wanted to raise a potential concern related to two (2) story accessory buildings being converted to an accessory dwelling unit (complete independent living facilities entirely isolated from the primary dwelling unit). If the intention is to allow a true, two (2) story building, Staff would need to work with the City Attorney to develop proper and enforceable language prohibiting converting these into accessory dwelling units. That is, unless that is something the Planning Commission believes is worth exploring as well.

### **Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer asked if staff was aware of the intended use for the second story of the proposed accessory structure.

City Planner Anderson stated the second story was labeled storage/shop.

Chairperson Bauer feared that by allowing second stories on accessory structures they would be converted over time to living quarters. He recalled that this was never the City's intent to allow living quarters above a garage.

City Planner Anderson believed that the proposed language was strong enough that the City's requirements would be clear.

Commissioner Nosan questioned why the City had this restriction in place.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated the Commission could review this policy. It was his understanding that the City Council was not interested in allowing an accessory structure to become an accessory dwelling.

Commissioner Nosan supported a homeowner having a two-story accessory structure.

Commission Surma also supported this, so long as the surrounding neighbors offered their support.

Commissioner VanScoy recommended the current requirements remain in place.

Commissioner Anderson asked if an existing barn could be converted to allow for a second story.

City Planner Anderson reported this would only be allowed through a conditional use permit on a lot smaller two acres inside the MUSA.

The consensus of the Planning Commission was for the City to not allow a two-story accessory structure.

## **6. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE ITEMS**

Community Development Director Gladhill provided the Commission with an update on the recent Comprehensive Plan workshop. He discussed the upcoming Comprehensive Plan workshops and encouraged the public to participate.

## **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 Anderson, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to adjourn the meeting.

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

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 10:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Tim Gladhill

Development Services Manager

ATTEST:

---

JoAnn Shaw  
Planning Division Secretary

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