

Dear City Officials,

I am writing regarding the proposed rezoning of Project No: 20-105 Hunt Property (Platinum Land) and Project No: 20-103 Trott Brook Property (Excelsior Group). I am asking that you **DO NOT** rezone the land to R-1 detached villa (65 and 75-foot lots) and R-2 detached villas (55-foot lots). Please keep the zoning as is, R-1 detached single family (80-foot lots).

Rezoning of the land to create more homes on very small lots would negatively impact and infringe on the citizens who currently reside on land adjacent to the Hunt and Trott Brook Properties. This would create noise pollution and put added stress on the existing wildlife and failing roads that have not been able to be fixed in the last 30 years (specifically Variolite).

As a resident of Ramsey for most of my life I understand that growth will happen, but it needs to happen proportionally to the existing environments. From the time I was born I grew up and now reside in a home that is adjacent to the Hunt and Trott Brook Properties. As a child I remember seeing cows in the field, corn, soybean and other crops that farmer Brown had planted during my 39 years. I remember watching the tractor till that land and then collect the harvest in the fall. I've seen deer wander from the field into our yard and watched eagles and hawks soar in the air. Listening to the crickets and the frogs croak at night, walking down to the creek to skip rocks, watching the ducks and trying to fish with my Barbie fishing pole, watching the current take my bobber through the culver are some of my fondest memories. This image I have painted is why I, my husband and our 2 children decided to move back into the house my parents built in the 1970's instead of selling it after my father passed away 6 years ago. Ramsey has already changed so much in my lifetime, however this area has a quieter feel. My son loved watching the big tractor last fall, going on walks and spotting turkeys, sandhill cranes, hawks, bunnies, deer and other wildlife is one of my daughter's favorite things to do. She even insists on picking up the litter for the animals which I think is awesome for a 6-year-old to be aware of environmental impact.

The Hunt and Trott Brook Properties are already zoned for 80 ft. lots, which is small in my opinion. This is already going to bring more traffic directly behind my home on a road that has always been riddled with potholes due to the swampy land it crosses. Yes, the road is scheduled to be redone this summer but how long will it last especially with increased traffic flow? This will also bring more people, which unfortunately means more trash on the sides of our road and it will destroy the natural habitats of those deer, turkey's and other wildlife. There is no need to bring hundreds of more people by creating smaller lots. As an existing citizen of Ramsey my quality of life matters too. I don't want a constant stream of traffic behind my home. It will create noise pollution, when I go play with my children I don't want to hear cars, I want to hear the birds chirping, I want to see the wildlife; this is why I chose to live here. These things I value and cherish will be nonexistent if the Hunt and Trott Brook Properties are developed into a high-density housing development with 65-foot and 55-foot lots. The only people rezoning benefits is the developer and the tax revenue. Please be considerate of your existing constituents and DO NOT rezone!

Thank you for your time,  
Amanda Shreiner  
16931 Willemite St NW

Dear City of Ramsey Officials,

This letter is to express my concern about the re-zoning of Hunt (Project #20-105) and Trott Brook (Project #20-103) properties. Our property will be affected greatly because of the close proximity of a main entrance to the proposed neighborhood off Variolite Street and our backyard. Vehicles turning south out of the new development will be accelerating past my home and backyard where my kids play. The increased amount of traffic in the area is sure to have a negative effect on our household and our property.

I recently had to explain to my children that the deer, birds and other wildlife in our area will probably not be around anymore after the new houses go in; a sad moment in my parenting life. I am well aware that change happens and feel change is okay as long as it is fitting to the area and environment. In my opinion, high density neighborhoods are a hideous sight to be seen. In my opinion the proposed rezoning of the Hunt and Trott Brook properties is the exact opposite of what I have always considered my vision of Ramsey to be.

Thank you for taking the time to read this e-mail regarding the re-zoning of Hunt (Project #20-105) and Trott Brook (Project #20-103) properties. Please vote NO to re-zoning.

Thank you,

Andrew Shreiner

16931 Willemite Street NW

Hi,

My name is Brian Walker and I live at 17289 Variolite St NW here in Ramsey. I was on the webinar last week and we asked about getting a petition going. We have done that on Change.org, but I need to know the statute that says how many signatures we need and the benchmark that the statute uses.

Please keep me informed so I can rally the neighborhood to stop this disaster of rezoning.

Brian Walker  
17289 Variolite St NW

Good morning,

We write to express our opposition to the zoning proposals for the Trott Brook North and Hunt Properties. We understand these properties are currently zoned for as low as 80 foot lots. In accordance with the Ramsey's 20 year plan, that appears appropriate for this plan. However, to re-zone these areas for as low as 55 foot lots no longer adheres to this plan. While we understand the developer intends to leave the wetlands alone, to build up to 450 homes that will potentially house up to 1000 additional people will without a doubt chase the wildlife into another area and do nothing to protect the natural environment. It will create a significant amount of traffic that is also not conducive to maintaining a natural, rural environment. In addition, looking at the developer's plan, the area will be crowded with homes and will be safety hazard as fire trucks will have difficulty manipulating the tight turns and at 55 foot lots, it would take little time for fires to jump from one home to the next. To allow this re-zoning compromises Ramsey's vision and does not respect the balance and connectivity between Ramsey's unique urban, rural, and natural environments. .

Our specific story involves living in the City of St. Paul for over 30 years. In doing a significant amount of research into where we would start the next phase of our lives, we looked at the City of Ramsey's 20 year Plan and chose a home, in part, based on the City's expressed desire to balance the rural areas of Ramsey with urban growth. We chose a home in the northern part of Ramsey believing this area was and would remain the rural part of Ramsey. This plan threatens the natural and rural environment of this north side of Ramsey.

We respect and understand the desire for growth and the need to increase a city's taxpayer base. As referenced in your proposed 2040 plan, there are over 1,000 acres of developmental land in the COR located near U.S. Highway 10 that can accomplish meeting this vision and goal so that the rural Ramsey can remain an area for current homeowners to continue to live within the natural, rural environment that drew us to this great city.

We understand, correctly or incorrectly, from talking with numerous long term residents of Ramsey that it is their belief that both Brookside and Woodlands developments were "crammed" down residents throats, and despite public hearings, their voices went unheard. Whether that is true or just a residual feeling by residents, we hope you consider the voices of those that oppose this development and what we believe would amount to the removal of the rural and natural environment.

Thank you for considering our opposition.

Christine Rued/Brian Walker  
17289 Variolite St NW  
Ramsey Residents

I am concerned about the proposed land consideration of rezoning parcels A B C D and E to reduce lot sizes.

The first concern is the impact on wildlife and birds. This is a very large development for rezoning and will take away habitats and cause flooding of existing land that remains undeveloped I feel we need an impact study to determine how this change will impact migratory and resident species of birds and animals. Last fall and this spring the flooding we had was high enough to come in contact with the walking path that goes across my property. If we add even more houses by reducing lot sizes I can only imagine that flooding would be worse. I think we need an impact study to determine how this reduction in lot sizes will impact the land and migratory and resident birds and animals.

Second is the impact on our school system. Last year a badly-needed school was completed and it is already at full capacity according to teachers and staff of Brookfield Elementary. The amount of housing proposed will put us right back to overfilling our classrooms and negatively impacting our children's learning. Something I think a city would want to avoid.

Third is police and fire. The high density of housing will put great pressure on roads and impact police ability to maintain safety. High-density housing also increases stress on police force and will negatively impact the city of Ramsey.

Fourth concern is water and sewer. We already have issues with some sources of water due to high levels of manganese and I believe we actually had stop using these sources because they were well above safety standards.

I am not the only resident of Ramsey with concerns. We feel these concerns should be addressed prior to any consideration of rezoning. This land change proposal to shrink the lot size will negatively impact all City of Ramsey residents by overtaxing Schools, Police and Fire, roads and sewers, and migratory and Resident wildlife.

We hope that you will please consider all of these issues before any change is made. We also feel that during these times of the Coronavirus is not the time to be making these changes. This is a big concern and has the possibility of making a big negative impact and we cannot even gather to discuss in a suitable manner. If you do not decide to refuse this rezoning request, we at least ask that you delay it until such a time as we can gather in a normal fashion.

Thank you,  
Cynthia Showalter  
7341 168<sup>th</sup> Circle NW  
Concerned city of Ramsey resident

Thank you Chloe,

I appreciate all the hard work you did but as you can see we're not real happy about this development being so dense. I didn't share with you before but I backup to Trott Brook and those fields which was the main reason that we bought this house. I appreciated at the time that we purchased that this would eventually be developed but not to this extent. And yes we do want a park out here but not at the expense of looking out at house upon house upon house. I think there needs to be a compromise, in my opinion that compromise is to stick to the 80 foot Lots. Like I said before houses in this neighborhood houses don't last for more than a week or two, we don't need higher density in order to sell properties. But in my opinion a huge development like this is going to detract from all that value and cause the ones that bought in this neighborhood to move, not to mention the fact that people who want higher density living don't want to drive the extra mile. Keep it the way it was zoned please....

Thanks,

Cyndy Showalter

Please keep me informed on this meeting as I will be attending.

This request to leap frog clear across the city with ultra high density housing makes absolutely NO sense other than to line the developers pockets at citizens expense as another fire station may now be needed on northern of city due to density at which homes will be packed together should rezoning be approved.

It also increases safety risks since all services are on southern end of city, where high density housing was always "planned" to occur first before moving further northward.

Depending upon type of homes, it also may run inheritant risk of high crime rates and need for increased law enforcement presence on northern end of city too.

Stick with original plan, which was done with lots of planning and consideration of these factors.

Very Best Regards,  
Del Fredricks  
7550 158<sup>th</sup> Ave NW

---

Followed link in email at 6:30 PM and GoTo claimed meeting had ended, when clearly it hadn't. When I tried to inform this over phone connect, I was muted and then UNABLE to ASK a SINGLE question.

So HOW the heck does it qualify as Public Feedback? More cramming down residents throats and not wanting to here from existing residents to appease foreign developer?

Very Respectively,

Delmont Fredricks  
  
7550 158th Ave NW  
Ramsey, MN 55303

---

I was unable to join since it was after 6:30 and GoTo said meeting had ended!!

Tried phone ,but was UNABLE to speak after chair muted me for trying to inform you of GoTo problem. So HOW does this Qualify as Public Forum meeting when Public is not allowed to enter?

Very Respectively,

Delmont Fredricks  
7550 158th Ave NW  
Ramsey, MN 55303

Hello Chloe,

I wanted to share my opposition with the rezoning of the Trott Brook North property.

Our home is backed up to Variolite and we moved here in 2016 because we love the rural atmosphere that our neighborhood provides. The volume of traffic that Variolite currently has is tolerable but if the city adds 400+ plus homes to that property that will add a lot more traffic that I prefer not to have. We also ride our bicycles on Variolite to get to various bike paths and it can be a bit dangerous with the amount of traffic the road already has. Please consider keeping the zoning the same.

I also want to add that no matter what, please consider not putting the houses right up to Variolite - it just does not fit into the neighborhood. It may match up to what is off Nowthen Blvd, but Variolite.

Thank you,

Heidi & Matt Miller  
16390 Uranimite St NW

Hello Cloe

I am writing to voice my opinion on the zoning of Trott Brooke North, in Ramsey. I vote NO to this rezoning. It is my understanding it has already been zoned for 80 ft lots, but is being looked at to rezone to smaller lots, for more houses which would mean more traffic on Variolite. I live off of Variolite and would not like to see this increase in construction and volume of traffic.

Again, if you are forwarding this information to the planning committee, my vote is NO

Thank you for your time and understanding.

Janelle and Gary Patterson  
7881 168<sup>th</sup> Ln NW

Dear Ramsey City Council members,

Our names are Jeff and Laura Uecker and we have lived at 17121 Variolite St NW in Ramsey since November of 1995. We moved out to Ramsey for the wide-open spaces, and currently live on about 10 acres of land. We have enjoyed the rustic feel and privacy that the Ramsey living community has provided. However, the area we live in has transitioned from a rural preserve to rural residential which, from our perspective, is unfortunate.

Given the direct proximity of our home to the proposed development we suspect it is the property most negatively impacted by this project, though it seems many of our city's other citizens feel they will be also be impacted and have expressed their opposition based on the number of signs and petitions that are circulating. The sketch plan we have seen deliberately maximizes the number of 55-foot lots along our property line and does not match the spirit of Ramsey's rural area. Allowing 55 and 65 lots only benefits the developer's profit margin while destroying the character of the neighborhood which we, along with so many of our neighbors, originally moved here for. The wildlife in the area such as deer, foxes, wild turkeys and endangered Blanding's turtles will be only be more negatively impacted by increasing the lot density as they will be pushed out of the area during the massive amount of construction and continually disrupted with the significant increase in traffic.

We strongly encourage you to keep the existing zoning laws in place and to not allow any 55 or 65-foot lots. We also strongly encourage you to require the full density buffer zone.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Laura Uecker

17121 Variolite St NW

Hi Chloe-

Thank you for all of your work for the City; contributing to a well-thought out and thriving place to live is important work!

I wanted to touch on the thoughts I was having throughout and in response to the public hearing regarding our property and the development proposal for Trott Brook North.

To begin with, I feel that both developers have come up with great layout plans; the plans maximize use of space for building while at the same time, allowing some nice open space areas. As far as lots per acre, both developments are within the allowable numbers, averaging close to 3 units per acre; it really seems like this is the parameter that should matter the most, and for as much as opposition was saying they were not for any smaller lot sizes, ultimately the lots per acre allowed determines the number of dwellings. The number of dwellings is already a decided factor with the current comprehensive plan; current zoning allows this number of homes. It is the environmental factors and including green and open spaces that sometimes make it advantageous to vary the lot widths. I feel that neighbors commenting demonstrated a definite lack of understanding of this aspect in designing a development.

As you know, market conditions are an important aspect contributing to what any developer decides to build; currently villas (slab on grade or with a basement, which ARE single family homes designed to meet various certain needs of home buyers) are a very popular and in demand item. If the City has done market research, I am confident this trend is showing up. What is the benefit of forcing the builder to build more of something that may not have as high of demand? Additionally, it is really nice to have developments encompassing a variety of buyer needs; this creates diverse and interesting developments. Also, I specifically recall the Excelsior Group mentioning the fact that though the street frontage was smaller, more of the lots were deeper, keeping backyards more private and with a view. As a realtor, I know this is an aspect that buyers definitely appreciate!

As I already mentioned to you, though all of the comments/protests were carried forward from the Trott Brook North Development to ours, there are many that feel like they should apply the same. First, the majority of comments were not from people adjacent to our property, and second, with our property running directly next to Nowthen (and with roads on 3 sides), it feels a bit less like you're in a rural place as compared to how it might feel at the west side of the McKowsky property, on Variolite. That said, I still think that people are ultimately upset about the idea of ANY development happening near them (regardless of lot size!); this development has already been determined by the comprehensive plan, one that has been in place for more than a decade. Also, my family has lived in this area for the past 50 years and we have watched development happen over that time; there is plenty of good that comes with new development.

I have to say that when I look at the objectives of both the EPB and the EDA, it is easy for me to see reasons why both would be interested in allowing developments with a higher variety of lot sizes. In terms of the EPB, allowing such a project most certainly enhances preserving as much of the natural environment as possible; by grouping homes tighter, you leave a lot more open space all around the edges of the development, as well as creating open common spaces (park, fields). And in terms of the EDA, growing the City's residential dwellings (making the most of the space available and zoned for development) will provide the base to grow the commercial, retail, and industrial development.

Regarding each of the boards (EPB, EDA, and the PC) which make recommendations to the City Council, I see that the EDA & EPB both have meetings coming up, in addition to the City Council; do you know if any of these meetings over the next week will include discussion about these developments (Trott Brook North & Hunt)? Also, during the hearing on the 7th, it was stated that the matter of the developments would be taken up with the City Council on May 26th; does this mean they will not visit the topic earlier when they meet, May 12th?

Finally, I have some questions about how everything falls into place; now that the public hearing is over, and in light of the fact that the PC voted in the affirmative to table the project (in light of an extension) in order to look at coming up with a new plan containing only the lot sizes (65 & 80 feet) that the Planning Commission agreed upon, how does the process proceed from here? And, is final approval of any development plan left up to the City Council?

Thank you for the time, Chloe!

Best,  
Jessica

Hi Chloe,

Thanks again for all of your patience with me and all of your help with the webinar, letting us know what in the works that would affect us, etc.

First: Is it possible to ask that these two developers that submitted the application to rezone, if they would consider withdrawing their application and waiting until this whole COVID-19 thing is over. We, as residents, cannot even go door to door to talk about this with our neighbors because of all of what's going on in the 'world' right now. We cannot attend meetings at City Hall to discuss things because what's going on, etc.

Second: Here are our concerns if this application for rezoning goes through:

1. Pedestrian & bicycle safety along Variolite & Cty. Rd. 63 – this one is huge!
2. Increase in traffic and noise pollution along Variolite. It is already really bad much of the time.
3. Heavy gravel truck traveling on Variolite during 'years' of construction. We aren't rated for that kind of weight limit, are we??? Not to mention the extreme noise of dump/gravel trucks – if they use Variolite.
4. Very concerned for our property values going down with small lots and condensed style housing, which is what is really being proposed here, being put across the street from us. Those of us on the west side of Variolite have 1-3 ½ acre lots with our own wells & septic. It just doesn't make sense for our 'rural' area to have such small lot sizes in our area.
5. We want to keep our area feeling as rural and wooded as possible. (My husband does have some ideas on that, but for now, we want this rezoning application to be declined)

Well, I guess that is it for now. Thanks for taking all of our concerns under consideration. Much appreciated.

Sincerely,  
Mark and Jill Winger  
7610 168th Ave NW

Hey Chloe,

Me again. If I understood correctly, those two huge plots of land are zoned for city sewer and water – so the housing development, I'm assuming, is going to happen at some point. Am I correct in that? If that is the case, then please keep the lots to 80' which is what you said in the letter they are currently zoned for. Please, again, I am asking that Ramsey's Planning Commission decline the rezoning application as that would directly affect us where we live. We are on the corner lot on 168<sup>th</sup> & Variolite.

Second, at the townhall meeting online, the host of the meeting asked for ideas and suggestions on how we might keep our rural feel. I don't know if there's really any way that can happen, but an idea I had to keep our 'woody – rural' feel would be to do what was done along Variolite on the east side of the road, south of 161<sup>st</sup>. I do really like to walk along that tarred path that runs underneath the trees up by where the gun club used to be. There is a buffer zone of trees which is so nice. It's nice to be off the road as Variolite has become a busy road as well. We've appreciated that.

So, maybe something similar could be done on the east side of the Variolite where that new development is being proposed. You could do that from Trott Brook up to the farm house and do what's necessary to not have to cut down trees along the road. Minimize using the wooded areas and build where it's already wide open with no trees. That way there would be beautiful trees lining Variolite's east side of the road. Does that make sense? It would also give people more of a sense of privacy which is what many of us are used to.

I actually really do love our new wooden walking path on the east side just up from our property on 168<sup>th</sup> & Variolite and that tarred path that runs under the trees north of us closer to the new development.

I want to help, not complain, and I so I hope that all of you on the planning commission know that. You've got a big job for sure and I'm trusting that you'll have our best interest at the forefront. Thanks for all you do and all the help you've been, Chloe, with all of my concerns and questions.

Sincerely,  
Jill Winger  
7610 168th Ave NW

Dear Chloe,

Thanks for keeping Mark and I in the loop of this upcoming meeting on Thursday. We will be on the call. I really appreciate all you've been doing on our behalf and letting us have input. I'm writing because we want you and all decision makers serving on our behalf in Ramsey, to know our stand on this proposed application for the Hunt and Trott Brooke properties. Everyone I've spoken with in the Golden Eagle Estates area - via dropping off flyers letting people know what is being applied for - via Ramsey's community Facebook page and anyone I pass while out walking and others who live around here who would be affected by this development all share the same concerns. No one wants this application approved or this type of housing development out here. It certainly will not help our property values to go up nor our taxes to go down.

The more I look at the map of what is being applied for and proposed just doesn't make sense for this area. When you look you see a visual of all of the 2-10 acre lots, *(depending on where you live along Variolite Street north of Alpine Blvd, those of us who live in Golden Eagle Estates and/or along 175<sup>th</sup> heading to Nowthen Blvd. and looking north and south from the corner of 175<sup>th</sup> and Nowthen)*, all you see are properties with homes that are 1 to 2 acres and larger – everywhere you turn. Then I look at what this developer wants to put in and it reminds me of a fungus or a destructive ground cover that is trying to takeover where it doesn't belong. That is what comes to mind when I look at the map and see these beautiful existing large lots where people out here are living.

We need to keep rural areas rural! Was that not the original 20 year plan for Ramsey? Rezoning to smaller lots does not fit out here and it does NOT make sense to bring the condensed style neighborhoods out this far. With all of the people that I know have been calling and emailing in their opposition to this rezoning application, my question is this: What is preventing the Ramsey Planning Commission from declining it? Just say no. Honestly, we feel that 1+ acre lot sizes for the Hunt & Trott Brooke properties would be more fitting and have much more appeal to those who are looking to get out of the urban setting and have some space in which to build their home. That's what is so great about living out here.

If people want smaller, condensed more urban type homes and townhomes, they have lots of options along Hwy.10 in and around Ramsey City Center & it appears to me that there are more homes being built every day out in that area with the plan to build even more. There is no need to bring all of that out here. We do not want it nor do we feel that it is in the best interest of those of us who live out here (in and around the Hunt & Trott Brooke properties) to change our whole environment for the City of Ramsey Planners or City Council to even consider rezoning the lot sizes out here and allowing a development such as the one being proposed.

Thank you again, Chloe. Please forward this email to all concerned. Much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mark and Jill Winger  
7610 – 168<sup>th</sup> Ave NW  
Ramsey, MN

Dear Chloe, Tim and City Planning Commission Members,

This is a follow up letter concerning the Thursday, May 7<sup>th</sup> virtual city planning commission meeting that we were invited to be a part of. We felt we were listened to and heard by many who were on the call and we really appreciated the opportunity to speak and share our input and concerns. We also very much appreciated that our letters, calls and petition were shared with the mayor, all city planners and city council members. Chloe, I think we have you to thank for that, so thank you! I also wanted to thank City Council member Debra Musgrove for taking the time to sit in on this very long meeting and listening to all we had to say. Thank you.

However, we felt that a few members on the planning commission were either not listening, didn't understand our concerns or had already made up their minds.

- For example: One of the planners commented, "But I like small lots." The issue is 'should the 80' lot sizes be rezoned to smaller lots, NOT what is the planner's opinion of what they like or dislike. That is irrelevant. They should be neutral and make decisions based on the information given to them & what is in the best interest of the Residents of Ramsey.
- Another planner said, 'I like having a home owner's association to take care of my yard and snow removal.' Again, this was also an opinion and is an irrelevant point.
- One of the other planners said, 'Some people can't handle a larger lot and shouldn't have one.' I contend that when it comes to taking care of your own property, lot sizes have nothing to do with it. You either do or you don't care for your own property to someone else's standards.
- One of city planners, we felt, refused to consider anything we said. It was obvious, her mind was made up before this meeting. (Conflict of interest???) It certainly does not build an atmosphere of trust.

There were 55 people on that call, I know that many Ramsey residents had written letters, called city planners and city council members and the mayor, letting their concerns known and asking that the application be denied. Many were not on this call. One of the residents on the call, I felt, said it best, "You don't live out here. I don't think you understand what we are trying to say."

A well thought out 20 year plan should be respected and adhered to, especially when the application to rezone the Trott Brook and Hunt properties that was submitted was so far off of the original long range plan. In all seriousness, we feel this application should have been denied out of the box for that reason alone.

Again, we are very thankful that the senior planner brought it to our attention and is allowing us input concerning this application(s) to rezone to such small lot sizes. Most of us weren't even aware of the original plan to zone to 80' lot sizes out here until this all came up a few months ago. We would not have been in favor of that, but we absolutely are NOT in favor of anything smaller than that. What we need city planners to understand is this: All of us asking you to deny the rezoning application to anything smaller than an 80' lot size for the Trott Brook & Hunt properties is already a compromise on our part, if you really think about it.

In closing, we love our rural area and the beautiful feel that we have out here. We appreciate that we have a voice in this. Please deny the re-zoning application and ask the Excelsior builder to work with the 80' lot sizes or better yet, submit ideas for even bigger lot size plans. He seemed like he had a lot of experience and probably has many wonderful and creative ideas on how to keep the rural feel and character in a development. Thanks so much.

Sincerely,  
Mark and Jill Winger  
7610 – 168<sup>th</sup> Ave. NW  
Ramsey, MN

Hello Chloe & Chris: I live on the west side of Variolite St, directly west of the Trott Brook Property and I would like to express my opposition to the proposed higher density plan. It is shock enough the Ramsey's open space is disappearing, without cramming even more homes into the space than it is zoned for now. I do hope that if the farm is developed, it would not be at a density any higher than the current zoning. I would prefer lot size like Golden Eagle, but I know that will not happen. That is already a loss to our neighborhood.

I listened to the planning meeting of April 2<sup>nd</sup> and I take issue with a few items mentioned. It was said that the Trott Brook Corridor would protect wildlife habitat. It is a wet land and would only be habitat for wetland creatures. The farm is upland, deer, sandhill cranes live there and they would not move to a wet land.

As to the park area, two fields are not usable if there is no parking. Is everyone supposed to park on the street? Cars would be a half mile a way in the neighborhood to the get teams and fans to two fields with no parking adjacent.

I will be paying attention to the next meeting and do want to see this high density plan get shoved through despite the feeling of the neighbors that it is too much.

I have said for 30 years that if the farm was sold, I would have to move. It will not be the country that we moved out to Ramsey for. The farm was designated "agricultural reserve" in a previous plan and that is what I love to see as my neighbor.

Sincerely,

*Kathryn Kloster*  
*17021 Willemite St NW*  
*Ramsey, MN 55303*

This is official notification that William J. Holland and Kathleen M. Holland both say NO to the proposed request to rezoning of properties involved in these projects. We were one of the first to buy and build our home at our property in Golden Eagle Estates in 1974 and we remain living here for a reason. We oppose up to 450 homes to even be considered into our nearby area.

Kathy Holland  
7701 169<sup>th</sup> Ln NW

Dear Ramsey Council,

I am writing regarding the proposal for 20-103 Trott Brook Property. I apologize I am not able to make the meeting but I would like to better understand a few things and hopefully provoke a few thoughts for the council to consider.

What is the vision long term for the city of Ramsey? This is a serious question that is asked countless times and there seems to be no answer which leads people to believe it's whoever will give the city money. This is not profitable long term in getting businesses to come or stay. So again I will ask, how does this development fit into the vision.

Second, why build a beautiful new school to surround it by old folk/low income homes? Villas are bought by elderly (snow birds) and low income neither of which will be attractive to look at when new families looking to make Ramsey their home visit the new school.

Finally why is Ramsey considering more detached townhome style living with tiny lots this far out? Families look at Ramsey because they want and are willing to pay for more space/land. Long term these villas will become an eyesore and a drug hub just like bunker and dysprosium st.

Please help me understand, I really do want to understand. As it appears right now you may as well get a Walmart right in the middle of this reckneck, low income, trash town you are creating and make Michael James your Mayor.

Regards,  
Linda

I have owned property out at the end of Variolite since 1987. I have sold 5 acres but own 5 acres at the end of Sapphire. This plan is ridiculous, and if you listen to the people of Ramsey and not the developer, you will know that the consensus would be for larger lots in this development. Listen to the people of Ramsey and not the developer who only wants to line his pockets with more money. I have wanted to sell my property for years but had to deal with your minimum lot size. I know you threw that out the window a few years ago. Please do the right thing and make the lot sizes larger to keep with the rural feeling of Ramsey out in that area.

Thanks

Lisa Becker

14614 Quicksilver St NW

I am vehemently against the rezoning of the Hunt property to accommodate high density housing. I am not against development, but this is beyond belief. My concerns are several:

1) The Road system (Nowthen Blvd. and Variolite) are grossly insufficient to handle the increased traffic generated by the number of homes proposed. Even if you keep the zoning the same, it will be questionable as to whether or not the increased traffic is tolerable. Traffic on Nowthen Blvd. even during the Covid shut-in still is very, very heavy. It is currently extremely dangerous to time the exiting of our driveway. A big part of the problem is the speed of vehicles from both directions. My neighbors complain of the same thing. We are of the opinion that it is not a question of "if" we are going to see fatalities, but "when." When businesses re-open, the addition of near 1,000 or more cars from the development will make traffic totally intolerable. Has any traffic studies been done on Nowthen Blvd.? It would be absolutely necessary to do studies AFTER the Covid-19 crisis to witness what I am saying with the addition of 1,000 or more cars into the system. A reduced speed from Green Valley Rd to the new school perhaps further is mandatory! 35-40 mph?

2) The loss of property valuation is also a huge concern. We moved here to enjoy a quasi-rural atmosphere which will be lost with high density housing being adjacent to our property. With high density also comes with possible increase in crime and other factors associated with heavily increased population. If the City of Ramsey is so obtuse to the lifestyle we have enjoyed and the concerns of its residents' objecting to high density housing, then it would be sorely disappointing.

3.) Are the concerns of Ramsey's citizenry more or less important than the developer's desire to make huge profits? What is wrong with keeping the zoning at the current level? There will still be an issue with roadway concerns, but at least it would be lessened greatly.

4) I think much is lost in terms of the Council and Planning Commission witnessing face-to-face emotions and concerns of residents over said project - another loss we suffer from the Covid-19 situation, except this will haunt us far beyond the Covid crisis. I ask for a further delay, so that we can adequately address this important issue.

5) I also ask is this a Metropolitan Council issue of "cultural diversity?" Is there going to be low-income, subsidized housing in any part of the development?

Sincerely,

Lonnie D. Gray

17530 Nowthen Blvd., NW

Ramsey

Dear Chloe,

Re: Hunt Property (Platinum Land) Project No. 20-105

As residents of Ramsey at the above address for 30 years, we are very much against the rezoning of referenced property. We moved to Ramsey from Eden Prairie due to the massive development that was being experienced there. We moved here for the semi-country style of living, and we have enjoyed the semi-rural setting of Ramsey with bountiful wildlife very much. We own 7 acres just across 175th Avenue NW - 2nd property north of 175th. The rezoning of the Hunt Property would result in an abrupt change from the project to our 7 acre parcel bordering it. We are not against development, as we realize that is going to happen, but to rezone so dramatically, and abruptly adjacent to acreages, it is going to impact our lifestyle, and according to a relative in real estate, our property desirability and valuation. We are also concerned about the wildlife we enjoy - sandhill cranes are nesting on the north part of the property in question - the water along the south of 175th Avenue NW.

As I stood in my driveway just past 175th on Nowthen Blvd. (Cty 5) this A.M. at 7:00, I am blown away by the tremendous amount of traffic despite the fact that the majority of business is still shut down by Walz. Semi after semi barreling by at 60+ mph and car after car. The semi-tractor trailer traffic down Nowthen Blvd (Cty 5) is for the drivers to avoid the weigh station on Hwy 10. I am thinking it is good that I have nowhere to go this morn because it would be near impossible for me to get out of my driveway. The latter is very much like pre-virus shut-in. When the Covid thing is over, I can only imagine AND then I think, OMG! what is it going to be like when the City of Ramsey drops 1000 more cars onto Nowthen Blvd (Cty 5) via the Hunt property development! This project is totally INSANE given the current road system which will not be able to handle it. Obviously, they will have to put lights at the junction on Nowthen and 175th (Cty 73) and they will have to reduce speeds back to at least Green Valley Rd. otherwise they will have a killing field on their hands. We will have "butcher road" right here in Ramsey. And they talk about doing a road study in 2021?? That's kind of like starting birth control after 4 mos pregnant! The developer doesn't care - if he had his way, he would have 3,000 houses in the development -follow the money!! I have listened to developers in other municipalities and they all sing the same song - "you have a beautiful city and we would never do anything to disrupt that."

Bottom line concerns to the development:

1) The current road system will not accomodate the huge number of cars it will dump onto Nowthen Blvd. The road system already doesn't support the current traffic. Our concern over safety upon entering the high speed traffic on Nowthen Blvd. from our property CURRENTLY is tantamount- let alone what we will experience with the grossly increased traffic from the development. I have selfishly expounded upon OUR safety, but the safety of those in the proposed development is notwithstanding. Traffic/speed studies will reveal our concern.

2} Rezoning objection.

Regards,  
Lonnie & Denice Gray  
17530 Nowthen Blvd NW

April 27, 2020

Matt Woestehoff, Planning Commissioner,

I have been a resident of Ramsey since 1986 and in recent years I've seen some very disturbing decisions coming out of city hall. The government overreach seems to be directed at silencing the community because it sure doesn't feel like we are being heard.

I hope we are not silenced when asked the question, 'What do we want in our backyard?'

As you debate the proposal to change the zoning from R-1 detached single family homes to R-1 & R-2 detached villas in the Trott Brook North and the Hunt Property I challenge you to weigh the rural versus urban mission the community of Ramsey has voiced so strongly in the past! I didn't move out to rural Ramsey so I could live the Anoka lifestyle!!

Please do not proceed with this PUD!

Lieutenant Ronald Bouley, Anoka County Sheriff's Office, (Ret.)  
7650 – 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW

Hi,

I tried to listen as best I could on the webinar last night. So correct me if I'm wrong but it's proposed to make some of these housing lots into 1-3acre lots but you want to change that into high density lots and smaller than the ones in the current Brookfield development?

My husband I have been crossing our fingers and hoping that land would get developed into some acre lots as we would love to build our next home. I heard someone say in the meeting that the more high density/smaller lots are more desired for young families and empty nesters, less yard work, etc. I couldn't disagree more! We are a younger family with two kids 8 and 3, the last thing we want is to be so close to our neighbors that you can touch both houses if you stood between them. If someone wants high density they can move downtown. As for the older folks or empty nesters, you really think they're gonna look at developments that are geared towards families when it's right next to a brand new school?

Please listen to your residents, there are so many of us that do not want the high density/extremely small lots and would really love to see some acreage lots with some big beautiful homes on them!!

Thank you,  
Meigan Wills  
6302 169th Ln NW

Dear Ramsey Planning Commission, City Council and Mayor:

I am writing about the request to rezone the Hunt and Trout Brook Properties to allow for more homes than the current zoning laws allow. I have lived in Ramsey for 43 years, raised my family, and now am blessed to have my grandchildren living in this community. I have seen many changes as the City of Ramsey has grown and developed and realize change in a community has many positives, including improvements and opportunities. However, I am opposed to these requests for rezoning.

I am wondering who benefits if these properties are rezoned to allow more structures? The developer, builder(s), sub-contractors? Certainly! But how does this proposal benefit the residents of Ramsey? Maintaining the current zoning standards allows for growth and development of the property while honoring the vision outlined in the City of Ramsey's Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted by the city and written with input from residents.

The City of Ramsey's mission is to ***work together to responsibly grow our community***? Will changing the rezoning for these properties help responsibly grow our community? In my opinion allowing for rezoning will create more traffic, more noise, more pollution, more crime, and the inability of the schools and other infrastructure to be able to keep pace with the population growth. In my opinion, that is not being responsible.

The City of Ramsey's Comprehensive Plan includes assumptions on physical development throughout the community and is the blueprint for the City over the next 10-20 years. This is an important plan and was established with residents' input and adopted by the city for a reason. It is my understanding that the Comprehensive Plan is to be used to guide public facilities, areas of preservation and development, and development of various zoning guidance. The current plan has this property tagged as R-1 Residential (MUSA) District, or 80-foot side with overall density less than 4 units per acre. The plan also states the City of Ramsey's allocation is 499 new units during this 10-year (2021-2030) period. These two proposals alone show 435+ units to be built. I don't believe the intent of the Comprehensive Plan was to concentrate most of the 499 units in one 240-acre development. Although the plan doesn't specifically state this assumption, I believe a large majority of residents enjoy and moved to Ramsey for the rural environment, and stuffing 435 homes on 240 acres is not most people's definition of ***responsibly growing the community***.

Just because studies show a demand for this type of product (per the Land Use Webinar on April 2, 2020), it does not mean the City is required to meet that demand if the result is not in the best interest of its residents. Again, I ask, who benefits most from this rezoning?

As mentioned above I have many concerns, but the ones I will expand on are traffic (and the concomitant noise) and infrastructure. My home backs up to Variolite. I realize the road from Alpine to 173<sup>rd</sup> will be improved and reconfigured this summer. However, my main concern is the road is basically a "straight shot" with a couple of hills. **For 43 years** I have seen people speed down Variolite over, and over, and over again. I have seen animals killed, including domestic pets, drag-racing, and issues with maintaining the road my **entire 43 years**. Adding to the traffic is only asking for more problems. **For 43 years**, nothing that has been done to counter these problems has worked; people continue to speed, animals continue to be killed and the road remains in complete disrepair. Just south of where the entrance to this new development would be located there is a stretch of Variolite that has had issues maintaining its integrity due to some type of water presence beneath the road. That stretch has been worked on, repaired and completely replaced countless times in addition to all the times the rest of the road has been fixed. To date there has not been a single attempt to repair that spot in the road that has been successful for more than 2-3 years. Let's just say that it **is 40 years of trying** to maintain the integrity of the road and every attempt has failed—putting more traffic on that stretch doesn't help infrastructure that has a history of repeated failure.

I hope you will consider my input as a long-time resident of this community. I pride myself if being adaptable and learning from change. However, unless you have a solid reason to deviate from the Comprehensive Plan that was adopted by the City and can provide information on how the community benefits from this deviation, I hope you deny the rezoning request.

Pauline Knox  
16931 Willemite St NW

Matt and Dan,

For the record, here were my comments at the online meeting tonight. The first listed was a written comment, which was not read aloud.

*“I struggle with the size of the current R1 lot widths, so I clearly oppose any rezoning to reduce this width. I believe that approving these rezoning requests opens the door for many more attempts to rezone lot sizes for reasons that are purely motivated by financial gain by the developer.....which I assume is why they are pursuing a rezoning and not a variance. PLEASE provide actionable items the city staff and council has moved upon to PRESERVE the rural feel, per the comp plan. I see it in word and in writing, but not in action.”*

My spoken question was about whether or not this zoning amendment had any predetermined requirements to be met in order for the request to move forward. As you know, the variance process has a three factor test for practical difficulties, and if the request does not meet ALL three, the request is denied. Tim Gladhill did not readily know if the zoning amendment process had any minimum requirements to be considered, but thought it was a good question and needed to be looked into.

My goal when moving to Ramsey was to enjoy the second half of my life, happily from the sidelines. However, the explosion of high density residential and smaller (than I support) R1 lot sizes has me much more fired up than I wish to be. I would be happy to discuss these current, and I would assume, future high(er) density projects with you.

Thank you,

Richard Sonterre

7911 152nd Ln NW

Planning,

What is the best way to explain that me and my wife are totally against the rezoning of this development to jam in high density housing in our area. We have lived here since 1994 and love the wide open woodsy setting where we live off of 168th Ave and Variolite on a culdesac. We only see added unwanted traffic and noise down our street. We have been very disappointed with the decisions made by the planners of the Ramsey town center since it began. We were imagining some of the nice services that the Maple Grove area provides, such as good restaurants and retail. We have been waiting patiently but only have one Mexican restaurant and a subway. We are not ones to complain, but we will have to consider moving out of here, as this would be the worst decision by the planners yet. It is great to hear they finally decided to repair variolite after it has been way over do. You should add the central park road also. Hope there are finally some safe paths for biking and walking for the residents.

Thanks

Rob Ollila  
7880 168th Ln NW  
Ramsey Resident

My name is Robert Tomaszewski and I live at 17220 Tiger Street, and I want to voice my displeasure with your reducing the lot sizes for new homes in Ramsey. I feel that the two and a half acre limit was plenty sufficient instead of cramming all these houses into little spaces and crowding people into minute lots. So I wish you wouldn't do that and return to the two and a half acre lots where people can enjoy their yards. Goodbye.

I would like to state that as a Ramsey resident for the last 31 years, I am totally against re-zoning residential lots less than 2 1/2 acres. Ramsey, as we know it, has always been an "open air" residential area in the Northwest suburbs. It has long been known as a rural, country residential area. People here love their space and do not want high density lots which will cause extreme traffic changes and overall crowding.

An example of overcrowding is found in the area of Bunker Lake Road and Dyprosium Street NW which has high density housing where residents share driveways. Someone on the City Council thought that was a good idea and it was allowed.

I think it's about time the City Council started listening to WHAT THE RESIDENTS WANT and help protect the vision of Ramsey we all have.

Thank you for listening and please keep Ramsey rural.

Robert Tomaszewski  
17220 Tiger Street NW  
Ramsey, MN 55303

Hello. Please add me to the list of residents opposing both high density projects in Ramsey. In particular the ones near Variolite.

Respectfully

Ronald Brokhausen

8211 157th Ln NW, Ramsey, MN 55303

I'm emailing in regards to the rezoning for the Trott Brook North concept. There are many reasons I believe this should not be rezoned to high density residential.

The infrastructure in the area is currently stretched to near the limit. Adding the traffic signal at Nowthen & 170th Ave have helped some. Adding several hundred more vehicles per day in the area could cause additional headaches.

The city seems intent on attracting/approving high density and multi-family residential construction. While I believe there is a place for this sort of development, it is not suitable for all areas of the city. The city should instead focus more on attracting retail and eating establishments. While there are a few options, there is a lack of such businesses for a city with a population of our size. Continuing to stack the city with high density residential will only exacerbate this problem.

By allowing high density residential in this area of the city it will destroy some of the natural beauty and open space that the city of Ramsey has to offer. The reason many people choose to live this far away from the urban center is for the openness and to not see houses, townhomes, and apartments stacked on top of each other. The area for this proposal seems much more suited for low density. Single family homes, with 2 acre lots, or agricultural seems more appropriate for this land.

It seems it would be a bigger benefit to city residents if the city encouraged (and even proactively sought out) development of retail, dining, and the like. Further, it would benefit the city's tax base to have additional tax income, other than residential tax rates. It would also allow residents to spend money within their own city, instead of forcing residents to surrounding cities for shopping.

Please do not allow this development in this area of the city. There may be other areas of the city this development would make sense, but not on the proposed land.

-Seth Wilson, Ramsey resident  
7212 170th Trl NW

I was under the belief that land was zoned for 2.5 acre lots, which would help maintain the slight rural feel of the area . While I understand by definition it's not "high density", packing 343+ more detached houses/villas in that area would drastically change the entire area, both in appearance and traffic patterns. I live in the Brookfield development, and I have not heard of a single person who is in favor of this potential project. We have a beautiful area by us, with a good mix homes, wooded and open areas. I do sincerely appreciate you responding to me, but also understand if this is what members at city hall want, it will inevitably happen.

-Seth Wilson, Ramsey resident  
7212 170th Trl NW

We love the country feel that surrounds our neighborhood. We like the path by Trott Brook, and all the open land to the North of the brook. We like the wood walking path over the wetlands that connects the path to Variolite. We like the wildlife that surrounds us. In short, the things we like would all be gone, or drastically change with this addition. I understand you're taking in people's considerations, and think if you're set on developing the land it should be with larger lots, leaving wooded and open areas for habitat (not just wetlands that can't be built on). I personally think .25 acre lots are too small for that area, and don't know why that was ever zoned that way.

-Seth Wilson, Ramsey resident  
7212 170th Trl NW

Dear City of Ramsey Planning Commission,

We are writing to let you know how we feel about the Project No: 20-103.

We like the thought of the park and walking trails. Within that park we would like to see a playground for the children of the neighborhood. With the Hunt property we would also like to see a park with a playground area. It would also be nice to have a walking trail that attaches the two communities. The playground for the children is something we have missed seeing in the neighborhood of Brookfield.

The concern we have for both sites is the size of the lots. We use to live in Coon Rapids and there is a neighborhood named Shannon Park which has lot sizes of approximately 55 X 110 feet. We have attached an overview of the neighborhood and the plat map. I would highly recommend that the planning commission take a drive around that neighborhood and decide if that is what you would like to see here in Ramsey. We would not like to see that type of neighborhood on these properties. I would also recommend talking to the Coon Rapids Police department about the amount of calls and types of calls they receive for that neighborhood. Also, please check to see the time frame for buy and resale for the houses in that neighborhood.

One thing we have noticed is a lot of time these small lot size houses are bought and then turned around as rentals.

With the normal set back of 35 feet and with the smaller lots what styles of houses would be appropriate? The more the set back the smaller the house.

One of the thoughts we had for Verolite Street was the application of roundabouts to slow the traffic down. It would also be nice to have biking and walking trails at the side for the protection of the public.

At the next meeting would you be able to show us some of the nature based parks that are being developed for the City of Ramsey? We are worried that we will lose the habitat for the Sandhill Cranes and do not want to see that happen.

We would like to see, at both sites, lots that are 80 to 85 feet across and at least 135 feet deep. We feel that it would be better to keep the area conformed to the same standards as Brookfield since the neighborhoods are close together. This lot size is more in keeping with the country feel of Ramsey as compared to city feel of smaller lots.

One of the reasons we moved to Ramsey was to leave the traffic and congestion of Coon Rapids. We moved here for the serenity and calm of the neighborhood and are hoping this can be continued with the new sites.

Sincerely,  
Stan and Rebecca Johnson  
6905 170th Ave NW

Dear Sirs and Madams,

My family moved to Ramsey in 2011 for the explicit reason of the rural environment. We recognized, of course, that over time development occurs and that things change somewhat. However, because all of the lots in our vicinity either had some acreage, or at a minimum were single family homes with fair-sized yards, we expected that future growth would follow those established patterns.

We are opposed to the proposal of the Trott Brook North/Hunt Properties project being rezoned as high density and ask that you not rezone this land.

In the letter we received from you, you say that you value our input in this important 'neighborhood decision'. I can tell you that not one person I've heard from in my neighborhood is in favor of this rezoning. Every family I know chose to settle in Ramsey BECAUSE of the rural environment. It's why we purchased homes in an area that was zoned the way it was.

To be blunt, if we wanted to live in Coon Rapids, or even somewhere like Maple Grove...we'd have purchased homes there. Please stop trying to make Ramsey into something it's not. If your family wants to live in a more crowded city...you should move.

Do not rezone this land.

Thank you,  
Susan Landry  
17349 Sapphire St NW

What will be the proposed starting price point?  
Will there be shared driveways?

T Williams

I have been a resident of Ramsey for 12 years. I moved to Ramsey for the country feeling an  
larger lot sizes. I totally disagree with rezoning and absolutely 100% against the proposed  
"Cluster Housing". Our roads near this proposed area near Variolite cannot support 400+ houses.  
Co Rd 5 cannot support it either. Proven fact of cluster housing will create more crime also. Our  
city does not need this. I understand the city needs and wants the taxes but that's just greed. Think  
about the current residents for once. We don't want this cluster housing. I live near Variolite and  
173rd. Very peaceful, crime free, and desirable. If this housing goes in it will be a greedy and  
shameful decision. I own a Landscape company in Ramsey. I probably would benefit from  
Landscape projects. BUT, I don't think it's the best interest of our neighborhood and other  
Ramsey residents. I OPPOSE THIS.

Thank you for your time,

Tom Marks

17631 Chameleon St NW Ramsey MN