

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, September 23, 2021, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Randy Bauer
 Commissioner Bruce Anderson
 Commissioner Andrew Dunaway
 Commissioner Cheri Gengler
 Commissioner Eric Peters
 Commissioner Gary VanScoy
 Commissioner Brian Walker

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl
 Planning Technician Brian McCann
 City Council Liaison Matt Woestehoff

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Bauer led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. CITIZEN INPUT

None.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Peters, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Peters, Anderson, Dunaway, Gengler, VanScoy, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.01: Approve the August 26, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Peters, VanScoy, Anderson, Dunaway, Gengler, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

6.01: Public Hearing: Consider Request for a Variance to Fence Height for 15337 Nowthen Blvd NW (Project 21-133); Case of Kristina Myhers

Public Hearing

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

Presentation

Planning Technician McCann presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adopting Resolution #21-253 granting a variance to fence height requirements for the front yard on the subject property.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if this would be a variance to the height for the fence and whether the gate required a variance.

Planning Technician McCann clarified that the gate is permitted, and the variance would only apply to the requested height of the fence.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that a variance does not set precedent and therefore wondered why other previous fence variances were referenced.

Chairperson Bauer commented that he believed that reference was made to show that it would not alter the character of the neighborhood as there is a similar fence in the neighborhood.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that staff is not saying the variance has to be granted because the neighbor has one but was simply stating that the fence would not alter the character of the neighborhood. She displayed the driveway as shown on Google maps and noted that it appears to be a road and therefore the property owners have a lot of vehicles coming down their driveway.

Citizen Input

Kristina Myhers, applicant, stated that they would like the fence for the safety and security of their home and to reduce the noise from the roadway. She stated that since the land use sign was placed in their yard, they have had 27 vehicles go through that circle of their driveway. She stated that they typically have three to five vehicles per week coming down their driveway. She stated that the fence would also help to keep wildlife out of their yard and keep their children safe.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that the applicant would be permitted to install a four-foot fence with a gate. He asked why a six-foot fence is desired.

Ms. Myhers stated that the six-foot fence would provide more privacy from the road and would reduce the noise from Nowthen Boulevard as well.

Commissioner Anderson asked the distance from the road to the home.

Ms. Myhers replied that her home is about 400 feet from the roadway.

Commissioner Anderson commented that he could not see the home from the road. He stated that he did not see how an additional two feet would help because the home is setback too far.

Ms. Myhers stated that a lot of the issue is privacy. She commented that with the number of vehicles coming down their driveway, they can then see the items in their yard such as the boat and four wheelers.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that staff has worked a lot with the applicant on different permits. She stated that the Myhers recently purchased the property and in an attempt to clean up the property, removed dead vegetation that previously acted as a buffer and therefore the noise has increased from the road traffic.

Ms. Myhers commented that in speaking with the previous owners there was a fence on that side of the lot until 2016 or 2017, but that section was removed by the previous owners.

Kevin Myhers, applicant, commented that when drivers are going down Nowthen Boulevard they can see the items that he owns and therefore the additional two feet would block that view and prevent theft attempts. He stated that even though they are 400 feet off Nowthen Boulevard, they are only 100 feet from Alpine.

Ms. Myhers stated that they are State licensed contractors and build 100 to 120 decks and porches per year. She stated that as contractors they wanted to follow the proper path to apply for the required fence permit. She stated that they chose to live in Ramsey and their business is based out of Ramsey and are familiar with staff as they pull permits for the decks and porches they construct. She stated that the neighbor to the north would possibly be interested in extending their fence to the north as well in order to create a safer environment for their children. She commented that it was a lot of work to clean up the dead vegetation, as the previous owners stacked brush, which is a fire hazard. She stated that the property looks nicer, but that vegetation removal increased the noise they hear from the road.

Motion by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Walker, Gengler, Anderson, Dunaway, Peters, and VanScoy. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:16 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to adopt Resolution #21-253 granting a variance to fence height requirements for the front yard on the subject property.

Further discussion

Commissioner VanScoy commented that he feels a four-foot fence would be adequate. He stated that perhaps the ordinance should be reconsidered if six-foot fence heights continue to be approved. Commissioner Gengler stated that this situation is unique because that adjacent intersection is very busy with heavy amounts of traffic, in addition to the Google maps issue. She did not believe a six-foot fence would detract from this area and believed the variance criteria are met by the request.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Walker, Peters, Dunaway, and Gengler. Voting No: Commissioners Anderson and VanScoy. None. Absent: None.

6.02: Public Hearing: Consider Request for a Variance to Minimum Lot Size for Multiple Proposed Lots in Lynwood Subdivision, Located West and South of 15050 Armstrong Boulevard (Project No. 21-122); Case of Lennar

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:19 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff supports the request as it helps avoid potential impacts to a wetland complex on the subject property, creates a wider density transitioning corridor, and the resulting reduced lot sizes are just slightly below the minimum area requirement.

Commissioner Anderson asked for additional information on the outlot as it pertains to the back of the home. He asked the distance from the home to the outlot and whether there would be space for a deck, garden, or pool.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl estimated that the lots are about 100 feet deep and noted that the homes would meet the backyard setback.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he would like to know the distance from the back of the home to the outlot line, noting that he wants to ensure there is room for the homeowner to enjoy the backyard.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if there is rationale between the 35 feet and 45 feet mentioned in the case.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the berm will range from three to four feet and therefore some properties would have more of a berm than others. She stated that because of that some people would not get the full benefit of the berm and therefore an additional ten feet was added.

Commissioner VanScoy asked how many times an outlot has been used for transitioning in the past.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that the developments are handled on a case-by-case basis. She stated that some have been deeded to neighbors, some have been done under easements, and the outlot has been introduced as a new tool.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he did not recall something like this situation. He stated that creating a 45-foot outlot and asking the developer to provide the additional space has taken away some of the lot space. He noted that previously that transition area would have been the whole lot with an easement. He stated that perhaps that ordinance should be revisited.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that in attempting to address one enforcement issue, another issue has arisen. She agreed that it would be appropriate to review the ordinance in the future.

Commissioner Anderson stated that there will be a similar issue any time there are 80-foot lots or larger abutting a new development.

Chairperson Bauer agreed that it would be appropriate to review this ordinance.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that staff would have time to review that as there are not any anticipated developments in the near future that would require transitioning. She noted that these calculations are estimates based on where a home could be placed on a lot and estimated a distance of 30 to 40 feet between the back of the home to the edge of the outlot. She noted that because the outlot is a shared greenspace amenity, there would be a reduced setback for items placed in a backyard.

Citizen Input

Paul Tabone, Lennar, stated that they have been working with staff and ensured there is sufficient space in the backyards for decks or porches. He stated that they will be cognizant of that as they continue to bring the development to fruition.

Chairperson Bauer asked if the property owners would be made aware that the berm is not their property, and whether there would be something in place to ensure subsequent landowners are aware as well.

Mr. Tabone commented that the outlot would be deeded to the HOA and would be incorporated as a common landscape or maintenance area. He noted that there are comments in the purchase agreement that states property owners should stay out of that area. He noted that the HOA documents and disclosures are recorded against property title.

Kyle Swenson, 15049 Iguana Street, stated that his property is directly west of this property. He commented that he likes the idea of the outlot. He stated that no matter what happens to the field that exists, it will take away from the enjoyment of his property but recognized that change is coming. He stated that there will be several homes in this development and if two homes are removed, this would meet all the City requirements. He recognized that Lennar is attempting to maximize profits, but the City rules should also be followed. He appreciated the 45-foot transition area with the berm and the redesigns that have been done but also believed that the rules should be followed. He stated that it is important for architects and developers to follow the rules that are set by City Code. He stated that he also wants to be reasonable and understands there is some give and take.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he had a similar question. He stated that the developer followed the Code in the original proposal and in the past the transition area would have been done through easement and the underlying land would have been included in the lot size. He stated that because there have been issues in the past with people removing trees or altering the buffer area, the City now requires that transition area to be within an outlot which removes that lot area from the individual lot.

Mr. Swenson acknowledge that fact but noted that he will have six or seven homes along his property line, and the middle two lots are tiny. He stated that there will be a large home on the lot and tiny backyard that takes up almost the entire backyard. He stated that if one of those lots were removed and one additional lot to the north were removed, it would make the lots larger.

Chairperson Bauer referenced the four lots on the west side and asked what size backyard would be anticipated for those homes.

Mr. Tabone commented that the depths of the homes vary, noting that the pads are set to be 60 feet deep therefore the homes are typically 50 to 55 feet deep. He noted that there are some additional options such as a morning room or porch that would be another ten to 15 feet, but not all on the back. He stated that their building footprints do show an outdoor living space. He stated that there have been situations in multiple municipalities where the full lot size is credited to the property line with an easement placed over the density transitioning area. He stated that placing the density transitioning area into an outlot creates a tricky situation. He noted that they have already dropped lots from the original development proposal.

Chairperson Bauer asked if some of the homes would have a second story that protrudes further than the first floor.

Mr. Tabone commented that it would depend on the selections of the property owner. He stated that most property owners would choose a deck option. He stated that there is an option for a four-

season porch which could be on the second story of the home. He explained that would be a deck that is enclosed and typically comes off the middle of the home.

Mr. Swenson stated that it sounds like these homes will stay where they are and there would be the same amount of space between the new home and the existing properties, therefore it is just a matter of whether the outlot is used or the easement. He stated that in that instance he would prefer the outlot to ensure that density transitioning area remains protected and maintained. He stated that if homes are not going to be removed from the plan, he would prefer the outlot option.

Senior Planner McGuire stated that she remeasured the lots and most have 20 to 30 feet from the foundation area to the outlot line. She thanked Mr. Swenson for providing input throughout this process, noting that there were changes made to the plan based on his comments.

Commissioner Walker asked if the property was originally zoned for much higher density.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that the north and west boundary were zoned for 80-foot lots while the rest was zoned for apartment buildings, noting that the zoning was changed to support the townhomes.

Commissioner Walker asked and received confirmation that the zoning for the area where the variance is requested was never changed.

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Walker, Anderson, Dunaway, Gengler, and Peters. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:48 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy stated this is unique because of the change in City policy in attempt to protect the density transitioning area.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to adopt Resolution #21-273 granting a variance to minimum lot size for Lots 3-4 and 8-11, Block 1 of the proposed Lynwood Subdivision.

Further discussion

Commissioner Walker stated that it seems that residents request a variance, and it is a fight, but developers request a variance, and it is granted without a fight. He stated that if the City would not have created the problem requiring this variance, he would not have supported this. He stated that because of the change in City policy that created this hardship, he would support the request. Chairperson Bauer commented in the last two meetings staff recommended against a resident

variance, but the Commission ultimately approved those requests. Commissioner Anderson stated that the density transitioning area provides protection to the existing homeowners and therefore he would rather have the 45-foot corridor protected rather than having the new homeowners have the land to the property line. He believed that the protected corridor provides more protection to the existing property owners. Commissioner Walker stated that he agrees that the protected corridor would provide more benefit to existing property owners. He stated that if the transitioning area is to be done through outlot, perhaps an amendment is made to the ordinance to prevent the situation where a variance continues to be requested. Senior Planner McGuire Brigl agreed that the ordinance does need review and staff can bring something back to the Commission. Commissioner Gengler stated that the density transitioning area done through outlot also protects the new homeowners as they are aware from the beginning that the area is not part of their lot. Chairperson Bauer noted that easements are not always disclosed at the time of sale and that is why he asked the developer how the outlot would be recorded. Commissioner Walker stated that perhaps markers could be placed prior to the sale of the home to identify the property/outlot line. Mr. Tabone stated that typically the lot lines are staked so that it is clear in the field where the boundaries are. He stated that there are thorough HOA documents disclosed to buyers that must be signed but acknowledged that not all homeowners choose to read the documents. He described the process they follow to inform homeowners of the lot size and all other details. Councilmember Woestehoff stated that as someone that purchased a Lennar home, he was provided that information but did not pay attention to that. He stated that he does favor the outlot being owned by the HOA as that same information is not disclosed to the second property owner.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Gengler, Anderson, Dunaway, Peters, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

7. COMMISSION BUSINESS

7.01: Consider Ordinance #21-15 Creating Additional Requirements for Driveways and Parking Pads

Presentation

Planning Technician McCann presented the Staff Report stating that staff recommends forwarding Ordinance #21-15 to the City Council for adoption.

Commission Business

Commissioner Walker stated that he agrees with parcels under two acres, but is unsure on the two to 4.99 acres, and does not support the requirements for five acres or more. He stated that he has ten acres and does not believe the proposed regulation would be appropriate for large lots. He stated that this would be a slippery slope where the City dictates what can be done on large properties. He understood the need to have this type of regulation on smaller lots in neighborhoods, as there should be requirements on where parking can occur in those situations. He noted that once a lot is over two acres, he did not believe the same regulation would need to exist.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there could be restriction on smaller lots without restriction on larger lots.

Planning Technician McCann stated that the current proposal could be altered to be more accommodating for larger lots, should the Commission desire. He noted that any changes could be made.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that distinction could be made, but it would need to state there is no restriction on larger lots if that is the desire.

Chairperson Bauer stated that perhaps there is language stating the restriction for lots under 2.5 acres but then language stating no restriction for lots over 2.5 acres.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that could be done. She stated that the larger lots could also be based on the 35 percent building coverage restriction, noting that larger lots will not typically exceed the 35 percent building coverage.

Commissioner Anderson referenced the requirements shown for Andover. He believed that a line should not be drawn on lots over 2.5 acres as long as the parking is not occurring in the front yard. He agreed that there should be limited or no restrictions for lots over 2.5 acres.

Commissioner Gengler commented that even if a property is a large space, there are still neighboring properties. She believed the 35 percent building restriction would provide adequate guidance.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that in reviewing the regulations of other cities, Andover is the only city that mentioned lot size whereas other cities only allowed driveway parking. He stated that Ramsey would then be accommodating in allowing additional parking on a parking pad.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that Ramsey is generous in its parking allowances and accessory building sizes.

Commissioner Anderson stated that there are cases where people park nine or ten vehicles in their backyard and turn it into a salvage lot.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that those types of complaints are often received by City staff from neighboring property owners. She stated that it would be nice to have this concrete direction to provide to property owners.

Commissioner Walker stated that he looks at this different than other members because he has ten acres on which he has three large trucks, a horse trailer, and another large trailer. He stated that he parks his items in an orderly manner. He stated that all the properties in his area are five to ten acres in size, many of which have tractors and other equipment. He did not feel that the City should tell him he would have to get rid of a trailer because his maximum square footage for parking is exceeded.

Commissioner VanScoy was unsure the City would dictate that would have to be removed.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that if there were a complaint, staff would tell him that pavers are needed along with a \$25 permit. She stated that if the parking regulation, as proposed, were exceeded, a conditional use permit or variance would be needed.

Commissioner Walker stated that he did not see the reason to make homeowners go through that process.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that perhaps additional space is allowed through conditional use permit. He stated that when it gets out of hand and complaints are generated, it becomes an issue.

Commissioner Walker referenced a case the Commission recently reviewed related to code enforcement where a neighbor received a violation and then turned in other neighbors because they were mad. He stated that is what he is worried about. He stated that if someone has a junkyard, he supports making that person clean it up. He stated that on the other hand, he has multiple vehicles to complete the work that is necessary on his property and to support his horses. He noted that is not unique when you are in rural Ramsey. He stated that he does support the regulation on smaller lots but would not want the same regulation on larger lots.

Commissioner Anderson asked if a pad is designed as a shed or building. He asked if a lean-to shed that vehicles are parked under considered a pad.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that a lean-to would count as a structure. She stated that this would apply to parking pads. She stated that perhaps they start with the regulation on lots under 2.5 acres and then complete a review in one year.

Commissioner VanScoy asked the parking guidelines currently and whether they are by acre.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl reviewed the current parking regulations.

Commissioner Walker asked the lot sizes that are creating the current issues.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that there are issues on all sized lots. She stated that there are parking issues on tiny lots, huge lots, and everything between.

Commissioner Walker stated that if small lots of account for 75 percent of the problem, it would make sense to deal with that now and leave the larger lots.

Commissioner Anderson agreed that they should start small and work their way up.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the Code currently does not have a limit on parking pads and therefore people are paving and putting down a lot of gravel.

Chairperson Bauer stated that when looking at the zoning districts there are districts with 2.5 acre lots but not two acres. He suggested that the regulations apply to 2.5 acre lots and lower, placing

requirements in conjunction with the lot sizes in the different zoning districts. He summarized that the proposed ordinance is too restrictive, and the Commission would favor regulation of lots 2.5 acres and smaller with no restriction on lots larger than 2.5 acres at this time.

Commissioner Walker asked how many vehicles could be parked on a 2.5-acre lot or less.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that six vehicles could be parked outdoors and no limit on indoors.

Commissioner Walker commented that he did not believe a 300 square feet would be enough to cover that. It was noted that some of those six vehicles would be parked in the driveway.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that four vehicles parked on a pad would be 1,000 square feet which would be 1/10 of the lot.

Commissioner Walker stated that he would like to see 500 square feet.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that a standard parking space is nine feet by 18 feet.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that 500 square feet could be a nice round number to start with and see if that works for what people need. She stated that they would still intend to review this in one year to determine if the changes work.

Chairperson Bauer summarized the direction of the Commission to allow one pad of 500 square feet on lots of 2.5 acres or less. He stated that staff will bring back the proposed ordinance for review again at the next meeting.

Commissioner Dunaway asked if there would be anything regulating the distance from the property line.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that currently parking pads following setbacks for accessory use.

7.02: Consider Allowing Accessory Dwelling Units on Single-Family Residential Properties

Presentation

Planning Technician McCann presented the Staff Report stating that staff recommends directing City staff to draft an ordinance to be presented to the Planning Commission during its regular meeting on October 28, 2021 with edits as discussed during the meeting.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy commented that he is a little uncomfortable with the concept of allowing rental of these units. He noted that many regulations require a familial connection. He stated that

it seems to make sense to allow these units in those instances where a family member needs additional care but was unsure of allowing these to be used as rentals.

Chairperson Bauer commented that he has a 97-year-old mother-in-law that lives with them. He stated that he could see the benefit of having this type of structure for her but asked what would happen with that structure when she is no longer using it, or when they sell the home.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that staff considered that as well, noting that there have been concerns with rentals. She noted that they are attempting to be generous with the ordinance and there is a regulation that requires the property owner to live in the main home or accessory dwelling unit, which should ensure there are not problems. She agreed that in most instance a family member is using the unit and used the example of a college student whose parents perhaps charge rent in order to prepare them for the world.

Commissioner Walker stated that he likes the regulation Dayton has on attached versus detached and the required lot sizes. He stated that he is in favor of this action as people will do it anyways and the City would be able to capture license revenue.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that in addition to revenue this also provides quality control to ensure the structures are safe.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he started in favor of this action, and commended staff on the research completed. He stated that after reading the research, he is against this action as it would create two houses on a single-family lot. He asked what would happen when the people are gone that needed the accessory dwelling structure, noting that the next owner could use it for purposes not intended. He did not believe Ramsey should do this at this time and he felt it would open the City up to having more buildings. He asked if the accessory dwelling unit would be taxed as another home.

Commissioner Peters stated that a person is taxed on livable space, and therefore this would increase the taxes paid on the property as the property value would increase.

Chairperson Bauer commented that when looking at the demographics and the increase in the aging population, there is and will continue to be, a need for people to care for their aging family members. He noted that not everyone has space for that in their home and this would create another opportunity to care for an elderly parent or family member.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that this would bring more people to Ramsey and allow people to age in Ramsey without increasing density. She noted that accessory dwelling units can also be an opportunity for a fun Airbnb experience which opens more people to the beauty of Ramsey. She stated that they are attempting to make it easy for people to do as typically these units are expensive to build. She noted that this will be an investment in properties for those that choose to do so.

Commissioner Gengler stated that she is very much in favor of having this ordinance in place as more requests will most likely come forward for this type of unit. She also believed that this makes

sense. She commented that it is expensive to build these units and therefore she did not believe there would be a rush of applications.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he also liked the Dayton ordinance which separated detached and attached units and would like to see that in the Ramsey ordinance.

Chairperson Bauer stated that he was a bit concerned with the clause that the Dayton ordinance included related to an expiration as the building would still remain.

Commissioner Walker stated that he thinks the idea would be that if he built the unit and obtained the proper license, that would expire when the property is sold, but the new property owner would be able to apply with the City to obtain their own license.

Chairperson Bauer noted that Dayton uses an Interim Use Permit, which he does not favor using. He believed that an ordinance should address subsequent ownership.

Commissioner VanScoy noted that the Dayton ordinance only allows familial occupation. He stated that Ramsey would allow rental and therefore that would be irrelevant.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that a lot of cities in Iowa were previously challenged on the definition of family and did not believe that is something Ramsey wants to get in the business of; regulating who is or is not family. She stated that if the units are desired, she would suggest they be allowed and not dictate who lives in the unit.

Commissioner Walker commented that he would like to see a draft following the Dayton model, without the IUP. He stated that for attached units he would like to limit the lot size that it could be on.

Commissioner Gengler stated that she believed that internal units are already allowed without permitting.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that as long as the unit can access the front door from the interior, it is currently allowed.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl summarized the input from the Commission and noted that staff will prepare a draft ordinance for the Commission to review at its October meeting.

Commissioner Gengler asked if the Commission would support these units on lots under 2.5 acres.

Commissioner Walker commented that he believed the direction was to allow attached on lots under 2.5 acres and detached would be allowed on lots over 2.5 acres.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that she did not believe there would be many requests on smaller lots because of the required setbacks and maximum lot coverage requirements.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

Chairperson Bauer noted that at its next meeting the City Council will consider the hiring of a new Community Development Director/Deputy City Administrator.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if moving the Commission meeting to the fourth Thursday of the month is working as intended.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that the date change is working and noted changes to the meeting date that would occur in future months to avoid holidays.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Peters, Anderson, Dunaway, Gengler, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chloe McGuire Brigl
Senior Planner

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Planning Division Secretary

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.