

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, July 6, 2017, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill
 City Planner Chris Anderson
 Civil Engineer II Leonard Linton
 Planning Intern Alec Henderson

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 Surma, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Surma, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Nosan. 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 June 1, 2017

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to approve the following minutes as presented: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated June 1, 2017.

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

4.01.2: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Dated June 12, 2017

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to approve the following minutes as presented: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated June 12, 2017.

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

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

5.01: Public Hearing: Consider Variance to Cul-de-Sac Length for Riverstone Phase 1; Case of Riverstone Development, LLC (Capstone Homes)

Public Hearing

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

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating this case was withdrawn after a Public Hearing Notice was sent. The Developer will now be making a second connection with Phase 1 to eliminate a cul-de-sac condition that exceeds 600 feet in length. The only action necessary at this time is to close the Public Hearing to avoid any ambiguity.

Citizen Input

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

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

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:02 p.m.

5.02: Public Hearing: Consider a Request for a Variance for a Fence Installation at 7214 167th Terrace NW; Case of Brandon Sis

Public Hearing

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

Chairperson Bauer disclosed for the record that Brandon Sis served on the Park Board and noted he served as a Deacon at St. Catherine Drexel Church, where Brandon Sis was also a member.

Presentation

Civil Engineer II Linton presented the staff report stating the resident at 7214 167th Terrace NW (the "Subject Property") submitted a fence permit application in 2016. Staff rejected the application on the grounds that most of the back yard is encumbered with drainage and utility easement and is part of the stormwater ponding system for the development. The City does not allow fences through stormwater ponds. Staff recommendation will be dependent on the determination of the wetland status by ACD and BWSR staff. If the wetland is still partially functioning, then staff recommends denying the variance to allow placing a fence around most of the perimeter of the back yard. Staff would support placing a fence along the northerly line of the property to define the property boundaries and address the trespassing concerns the applicant has raised. Staff would also support placing a closed fence near the house to separate the children and pets from the pond. If the wetland is nonfunctioning and does not need wetland protection, then Staff would support the variance request to place the fence around the entire perimeter of the back yard as proposed.

Citizen Input

Chairperson Bauer recommended this item be tabled until the Planning Commission had further information available regarding the wetlands.

Civil Engineer II Linton reported it would take professionals to determine if this area was still a wetland.

Commissioner Anderson asked if this area had water in it currently.

Chairperson Bauer stated the pond area had water.

Commissioner Nosan questioned if the City could get into this area to further evaluate.

Civil Engineer II Linton explained there was a drainage and utility easement over a good portion of the rear property that allows stormwater to be stored on the site. He explained the City would have viable access to the area by foot.

Commissioner VanScoy questioned if all rear yard fences abutting a stormwater pond had to have gates.

City Planner Anderson stated this was not a City requirement.

Brandon Sis, 7214 167th Terrace NW, thanked the Commission for their time. He stated his primary reason for making the Variance request was for safety purposes. He explained that last year a brush fire was started on the south side of the pond. He indicated he wanted to keep his rear yard safe for his children and believed a fence was the best option.

Jason Hubler, 7218 167th Terrace NW, explained he has lived in his home for the last eight years. He commented on the wetland in his rear yard and how it flooded throughout the year with heavy rains. He discussed how Mr. Sis has begun altering the area abutting the wetland by mowing and pumping. He asked that the City protect this area and not allow a permanent fence to be installed in a protected wetland area.

Commissioner Anderson asked if Mr. Hubler had a fence in his rear yard.

Mr. Hubler stated he had a two to three-foot plastic white picket fence in his rear yard. He reported that all of the land between his property and the wetland was undisturbed.

Commissioner Brauer requested further information on the wetland altering or draining that was conducted by Mr. Sis.

Mr. Hubler explained that Mr. Sis had dug a trench in order to put in drain tile, which was removed after receiving complaints. He indicated Mr. Sis has been running a pump with a hose to the pond.

Mr. Sis reported he was not aware of what could and could not be done in the wetland area. He stated after installing drain tile he was informed this was not allowed and has since removed the drain tile and restored the area to its original condition. He commented the pump was used to get rid of the standing water in his rear yard after a large rain event. He explained the water was pumped to other areas of his property. He did not believe he has modified the wetland area over time.

Catherine Epp, 7158 167th Terrace, stated she formed a petition for this Planning Case. She explained she has lived in her home for nearly eight years and has enjoyed living in Ramsey. She indicated she purchased her lot with the understanding the land behind her home would remain untouched. She expressed concern with how the pond has deteriorated over time and was frustrated by the fact her neighbor was doing things he was not supposed to be doing. She believed the wetland had become an eyesore when it should have remained untouched. She stated that Mr. Sis had removed the natural barrier between his property and the wetland. She provided further comment on how Mr. Sis has been adversely impacting the wetland over the past several years. She expressed frustration with how the City has handled this situation over time and encouraged the Commission to deny the fence request as this would further reduce her property value.

Community Development Director Gladhill requested the Commission focus their comments and discussion on the fence proposal and not on previous code violations. He followed up on several items stating the City was aware of the drain tile situation noting this had been corrected.

Amanda Hora, 7190 167th Terrace NW, believed the proposed fence would provide safety for her three children. She understood the land behind her home would remain untouched. She stated she could support the proposed fence.

Danielle Hubler, 7218 167th Terrace NW, stated the Sis family were great neighbors. She commented on the current condition of the pond noting there was no standing water at this time. She expressed concern with Mr. Sis being allowed to construct a permanent structure in a DNR protected wetland area. She commented on how Mr. Sis's actions have already altered the wetland through the drain tile installation and pumping. She reported her small decorative fence was placed in its location due to the DNR requirements and for the health of the pond. She recommended that Mr. Sis not be allowed to install a fence as this would further alter the wetland and would negatively impact property values. She believed it was not environmentally responsible and feared a precedent would be set by the City if this fence were approved.

City Planner Anderson provided several areas of clarification noting the wetland area in question was not a designated DNR protected wetland, due to its size. He reported the wetland was below the 2.5-acre threshold. He recalled that wetland buffer signs were in place at one point in time. However, some time ago, the signs were removed after the City's buffer requirements were lifted.

Chairperson Bauer noted for the record the Planning Commission had received an advisory petition, along with the letter offering support to the request.

Scott Ostrander, 16772 Limonite Street, agreed with the points being made by his neighbors and stated he opposed the fence request. He believed that if fences were not allowed around stormwater ponding areas, a fence should not be allowed in the Sis backyard either. He did not want to see the City bending the rules for this one property.

Mr. Sis explained when he purchased his lot promises were made by realtors and he believed it was within his right to mow his property. He stated that any pumping he does goes through a buffer area and noted the grass adjacent to the pond remains untouched. He was of the opinion that the fence would improve the safety for his children and he did not want neighboring children accessing the pond through his yard.

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

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

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:56 p.m.

Commission Business

Community Development Director Gladhill commented the wetland area was not considered to be a recreational public pond. He anticipated this Variance request would spark broader neighborhood discussions. He requested the Commission not hold the allegations over Mr. Sis and that only the fence request be considered at this time.

Commissioner Surma stated he would like to see this item tabled until the wetland status could be verified.

Motion by Commissioner Surma, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to table action on this item until the Planning Commission could receive further information on the wetland status.

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

Commissioner Surma encouraged Mr. Sis to reconsider his request given the fact he had 30 neighbors that opposed his request. He suggested a smaller or shorter fence be considered as a compromise.

5.03: Public Hearing: Consider Preliminary Plat Plan, Zoning Amendment, Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Estates of Silver Oaks 2nd Addition (Project No. 17-119); Case of John Peterson

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:04 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Intern Anderson presented the staff report stating the purpose of this file is to review the official Preliminary Plat Plan, prepared by Roshell Engineering, LLC, for Estates of Silver Oaks 2nd Addition. This subdivision would create eight (8) new single family residential lots and it located on Lithium Street NW, PID #14-32-25-12-0011 (the "Subject Property"). The Preliminary Plat Plan submitted includes nine (9) sheets. The application also includes a request for a Zoning Amendment and Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The Planning Commission reviewed the Sketch Plan for this project at the June 1, 2017 meeting. City Staff is recommending that the Preliminary Plat, Zoning Amendment, and Comprehensive Plan Amendment be approved contingent upon compliance with the Staff Review Letter.

Citizen Input

John Peterson, 2281 County Road B West in Roseville, thanked the Commission for their consideration. He stated he appreciated staff's assistance and noted he was supported all of staff's recommendations.

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

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

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:08 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #17-09 approving a Zoning Amendment for the Subject Property to R-1 Residential (MUSA).

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

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-07-160 approving a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to reguide the Subject Property as Low Density Residential.

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

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-07-161 granting preliminary plat approval of Estates of Silver Oaks 2nd Addition contingent upon compliance with the Staff Review Letter.

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

5.04: Public Hearing: Consider Preliminary Plat for Cole Addition (Project No. 17-132); Case of Bryon and Lynn Cole

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:11 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Intern Anderson presented the staff report stating the purpose of this file is to review the Preliminary Plat for Cole Addition, an eight (8) lot subdivision located northwest of the

intersection of 168th Avenue NW and Garnet Street NW. The project is a re-plat of an existing residential lot at 6951 168th Ave NW and two adjacent, small outlots (together the "Subject Property"). The Planning Commission reviewed the Sketch Plan for this project at its June 12, 2017 special meeting. As long as the plans can be revised in accordance with the Staff Review Letter, including solving for the drainage (and easement vacation) concern and the cul-de-sac design, Staff would recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat. If the revisions result in a change in lot configuration, number of lots, and/or deficiencies in lot size, the revised Preliminary Plat could be routed back through the Planning Commission.

Citizen Input

Commissioner VanScoy questioned how the plat would be impacted if a portion of the site was determined to be a wetland.

Civil Engineer II Linton explained if a portion was determined to be a wetland the plat boundaries would have to be redrawn and the applicant would have to come back before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if structures on the site would be removed.

Planning Intern Anderson stated the structures would be demolished.

Chairperson Bauer asked if it would be best to table action on this item until further information was known about the wetland and cul-de-sac.

Reid Schultz, Landform Professional Services, thanked staff for their assistance on the Preliminary Plat. He commented on the Preliminary Plat and stated at this time, there has been no determination that there are wetlands on the site. He stated he looked forward to working with staff on the cul-de-sac issue. He requested the Commission offer their support to the Preliminary Plat and that he be allowed to work with staff on the cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Surma questioned the length of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Schultz stated the existing temporary cul-de-sac would be extended an additional 240 feet, which would.

City Planner Anderson reported the proposed cul-de-sac would comply with the City's maximum length requirements.

Thomas Hunt, 16850 Grant Street West, stated he would like to see a temporary cul-de-sac be developed as this would allow him to subdivide his property at some point in the future.

Josh Underbakke, 6960 169th Lane, requested the developer consider sparing the trees on the north side of the subject property.

Doug Barren, 7008 168th Lane, stated he lived on the south side of the temporary cul-de-sac. He understood that the neighborhood was changing and would continue to change. He stated he supported the proposed Preliminary Plat.

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

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

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:29 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the house on the northern end touches the property line.

City Planner Anderson stated this home would have had to meet the six-foot side yard setback when constructed.

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-07-162 contingent upon compliance with the Staff Review Letter.

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

5.05: Public Hearing: Consider Preliminary Plat and Zoning Amendment for Pearson place (Project No. 16-31); Case of Development Consulting Services, LLC

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:32 p.m.

Presentation

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating the City has received an application for a Zoning Amendment and Preliminary Plat for Pearson Place, a proposed twelve (12) lot single family residential subdivision located on the north side of Bowers Drive near the end of the cul-de-sac where there is a gap between existing homes (the "Subject Property"). The Planning Commission reviewed a concept plan for this project in March of 2016 and the City also hosted two (2) public workshops regarding that concept plan in 2016 as well. The Planning Commission reviewed the official Sketch Plan for Pearson Place on June 1, 2017. Staff recommends approving the Zoning Amendment and Preliminary Plat contingent upon compliance with the Staff Review Letter.

Citizen Input

John Dobbs, 22 Clement Street in Maplewood, thanked staff for their assistance through the Preliminary Plat process. He stated he was excited to be bringing a development to the City of Ramsey.

Terry Lueck, 14250 Bowers Drive, stated he loved living in the country. He expressed concern with the zoning for the property to the north and east beyond the 50-foot area. He questioned if this land would be zoned high density.

Chairperson Bauer indicated this property was not being considered this evening but noted it was currently zoned R-1 Residential MUSA.

Joshua Fear, 14573 Bowers Drive, stated he was generally in favor of the proposed Preliminary Plat and urged the Commission to offer their support.

John Jacobson, 14691 Bowers Drive, expressed concern with the zoning of the property behind his home. He understood a 50-foot buffer was in place, but he did not want to see an apartment complex behind his home.

Chairperson Bauer reported the land behind Mr. Jacobson was not being considered this evening.

Mr. Dobbs explained the 50-foot buffer zone was an outlot that would be deeded to the City.

Mr. Lueck appreciated the plat that has been presented and encouraged the Commission to offer their support.

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

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

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:51 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy thanked the developer for working with the neighborhood on this project.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #17-010 approving the Zoning Amendment.

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

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-07-163 approving the Preliminary Plat for Pearson Place, contingent upon compliance with the Staff Review Letter.

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

6. COMMISSION BUSINESS

6.01: Review Sketch Plan for Bunker Lake Industrial Park; Case of PSD, LLC

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to review a concept plan in design stages for Bunker Lake Industrial Park by PSD, LLC. This Sketch Plan is for the first two (2) buildings (9.05 acres) of a 45-acre future industrial park along Bunker Lake Boulevard. The purpose of Sketch Plan Review is to provide initial feedback to the Developer before preparing more detailed construction and plat documents. The first building proposed for construction is proposed for Adrenaline Sports Center. The Planning Commission had previously reviewed that concept for another location in Ramsey. Adrenaline has chosen not to move forward at that location, and is now working with PSD, LLC at the Bunker Lake Industrial Park. Adrenaline Sports Center desires to occupy the facility in January or February, which is an aggressive schedule for the status of this greenfield development. Staff will attempt to accomplish a timely review wherever possible. This may require advanced approvals and special meetings along with certain risks of plan amendments to the Developer.

Commission Business

Matt Kuker, PSD, thanked the Commission for their consideration of his request and for fast tracking this project.

Commissioner Brauer believed this was an exciting project.

Chairperson Bauer agreed and stated the Adrenaline Sports Complex would bring a lot of traffic to the City of Ramsey.

The consensus of the Commission was to direct the applicant to proceed to the Preliminary Plat phase.

6.02: Consider Sketch Plan Review for Greenway Terrace; Case of Aeon (Project No. 16-84)

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to review a sketch site plan and plat for a 1 lot subdivision that would be developed as a 54-unit apartment building. A Sketch Plan affords the Planning Commission the opportunity to review a project before it enters the official Preliminary Plat stage. The Preliminary Plat (future step) is the most important step in the review process and gives the project 'entitlement' to the project.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy believed the proposed structure was remarkable that would enhance The COR.

Commissioner Anderson agreed.

Commissioner Nosan questioned what the building color scheme would be.

Bart Nelson, Aeon representative, provided the Commission with detailed information on the building color scheme.

Commissioner Surma requested the stacks on the roof be painted to match the building.

The consensus of the Commission was to direct the applicant to proceed to the Preliminary Plat phase.

6.03: Consider Appeal of Architectural Review for Single-Family Home in The COR; Case of Purmort Homes

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to respond to an appeal of a Staff interpretation from Purmort Homes, Inc. on an interpretation of architectural requirements in The COR. At issue is the definition of a front porch, a required element of The COR Design Framework (the Zoning Code for The COR). A reminder that these enhanced architectural requirements only exist in The COR Zoning District and not in all areas of the community. Staff recommends that this model not be approved until the City finishes the update to The COR Development Framework. However, if the Planning Commission feels the original intent of the guideline is met, Staff will feel comfortable in approving the model and use this as policy directive moving forward.

Commission Business

Commissioner Anderson disclosed that he lived in this neighborhood and he had seen the model homes that were presenting in the neighborhood.

Shawn Rogers, Purmort Homes representative, thanked the Commission for their time. He believed there was not a lot of clarity within the Code. He explained he has had the proposed elevation (with a 6 x 8-foot porch) in other locations in the City. He provided further comment on the four-level split and stated from the street this home would look the same as a Rambler. He requested the Commission approve his request and allow for a split-entry model in The COR.

Commissioner VanScoy stated the original intent was to have street oriented, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods. He did not believe a recessed covered area was the same as a porch. He asked staff how many split entry homes the City has approved since 2012.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated he had not counted the number specifically noting it was difficult to plan backwards. He understood there was a gap in the code which made this situation difficult.

Commissioner VanScoy reiterated that he was looking for a porch on these homes.

Commissioner Brauer agreed and stated split entries were never intended to be approved in The COR.

Commissioner Anderson respectfully disagreed and stated he believed the proposed elevation did have a porch-like amenity that was enclosed on three sides that appealed to the pedestrian friendly neighborhood.

Mr. Rogers asked if there was one property that met the true intent of the City Code and had a three-sided open front porch. He suggested the garage be pushed back in order to create a 6' x 8' unobstructed three-sided porch.

Commissioner VanScoy did not believe the porches had to be six feet in front of the garages in order to have three sides open.

Commissioner Brauer expressed frustration with this whole situation. He believed that the Planning Commission should support staff and their ability to interpret City Code unless there was a major reason not to. He recommended the developer work this issue out with the staff.

Commissioner Nosan asked if there were lots that had to be a split entry.

Mr. Rogers commented on the water table and noted how some lots would benefit by being a split entry versus a Rambler, but reported they did not have to be built as a split entry. He stated that if a split entry was not built the home would just be six or more steps above ground level. He believed that if split entries were allowed, this would create a more diverse housing stock.

Commissioner Nosan questioned how big the proposed recessed area was on the split entry homes.

Mr. Rogers stated the area was roughly 6' x 9' or 54 square feet in size.

Commissioner Surma believed the City's pictures with porches were not clear.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented on the porch issue further with the Commission.

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council approve the appeal request for a split entry model in The COR.

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

Commissioner VanScoy excused himself from the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

6.04: Discuss Concerns Raised on Accessory Building Architectural Standards

Presentation

Planning Intern Anderson presented the Staff Report stating at the June 13, 2017 City Council Meeting, concerns about the architectural standards for accessory buildings were brought up by a resident of Ramsey. The comments concerned a metal paneled pole barn that was recently constructed on his neighbor's property and whether these metal panel structures should be allowed on smaller lots. The City Council suggested the Planning Commission review the standards associated with accessory building and metal panel structures in particular to determine whether any additional design and architectural controls are warranted. Staff requested feedback from the Commission on this matter.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer asked where an accessory building would be allowed.

City Planner Anderson reviewed the lot sizes and zoning districts where an accessory building would be allowed.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented on the initial concerns that were raised and stated the placement of a metal paneled structure was of concern along with the minimum roof pitch.

Chairperson Bauer stated the roof pitch could make a building even more overbearing.

Commissioner Anderson believed that the structure in question had more square footage than the home. It was his opinion the accessory structure looked out of place and should have been pushed to the rear yard. He recommended that all accessory structures match the colors of the principle structure.

Chairperson Bauer agreed with this suggestion and recommended the Commission discuss this portion of City Code in further detail.

7. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE ITEMS

7.01: Receive Progress Report on Comprehensive Plan Update

Community Development Director Gladhill provided the Planning Commission with a progress report on the Comprehensive Plan describing the input the City has received from public workshops in preparation for the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee wrapped up the first phase of public engagement in June. This first phase focused on listening and allowing the community to define topics and priorities. Raw data, mark-up, comments, etc. are available upon request. The Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee will be reviewing first drafts of the Framework Chapter, Community Background Chapter, and Land Use Chapter at their July Meeting. Staff reported the Comprehensive Plan Update will also have a presence at the July 13 Draw Summer Event Series.

7.02: Consider Authorization to Distribute The COR Interim Development Plan for Public Comment

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the Staff Report stating the purpose of this case is to review a preliminary draft of The COR Interim Development Plan, which essentially puts into motion a more formal amendment to the master plan. Details of the recommendations prepared by the Planning Commission over a series of workshops were reviewed by staff. Direction from the April 25, 2017 Joint Work Session was to review this draft with advisory boards and commissions. The draft was reviewed by the Economic Development Authority on May 25, 2017 and by the Parks and Recreation Commission at their June 8, 2017 meeting. Staff will be seeking authorization for public comment on the draft in July.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend staff distribute The COR Interim Development Plan to the City Council.

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

8. COMMISSION/STAFF INPUT

8.01: Receive Staff Update

The Staff Update was noted.

8.02: Zoning Bulletins

Zoning Bulletins were noted.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Gladhill
Community Development Director

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Community Development Assistant

Drafted by Heidi Guenther
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.