

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, October 23, 2025, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Cheri Gengler
 Commissioner Bruce Anderson
 Commissioner Nichole Bauer
 Commissioner Randy Bauer (remote attendee)
 Commissioner Jeffrey Lubarski
 Commissioner Debra Musgrove

Members Absent: Commissioner Gary VanScoy

Also Present: Planning Manager Todd Larson
 City Council Liaison Eric Peters

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS (Agenda Item 6)

7.01: Public Hearing: Amendments to Chapters 2 and 106 Pertaining to Variances (Agenda Item 6.01)

Public Hearing

Chairperson Gengler called the public hearing to order at 7:37 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Manager Larson presented the staff report stating that staff is presenting the ordinance at the direction of the City Council.

Councilmember Peters commented that it was the consensus of the Council that the final decision on a variance should be of the Council, as they are the elected body.

Chairperson Gengler asked for clarification on the process that would be followed under this scenario and whether residents would need to attend both the Planning Commission and City Council meetings.

Planning Manager Larson confirmed that this process would add a step for residents, as they would also need to go before the City Council. He stated that if the recommendation from the Planning Commission were unanimous, the item would be placed on the consent agenda for the Council, and if there were a split vote, the item would be its own case.

Chairperson Gengler asked if the resident would have an opportunity to speak at the City Council meeting or whether that input would only be allowed at the public hearing conducted by the Planning Commission.

Planning Manager Larson replied that applicants do have the right to make their case, and while items before the Council are often not public hearings, the Mayor and past mayors have allowed residents to comment.

Commissioner Musgrove stated that she appreciates the thought of the Council but disagrees with the proposal. She stated that in the process, as presented, an appeal would go before a judge through the court, which would be additional time and expense for residents. She noted that in the current process, the Commission makes a decision, and the resident can appeal that decision to the City Council.

Planning Manager Larson commented that currently, anyone can appeal the decision of the Planning Commission within ten days. He commented that the decision of the Council could then be appealed through the courts.

Commissioner Musgrove commented that she believes the time and process as it exists today is better for residents, and it still provides the opportunity to appeal to the Council if it is denied.

Commissioner R. Bauer agreed with Commissioner Musgrove. He stated that this process is fairly efficient and quick, without many problems, as only a few cases have been appealed to the Council. He stated that the process works well, and it is to the benefit of the residents that they only have to attend one meeting, or could appeal that decision and go to the City Council. He believed that the proposed process would add extra steps and delays and would not be best for the residents.

Commissioner N. Bauer stated that she disagrees with the recommendation of the City Council. She stated that she believes in checks and balances, and the job of the Planning Commission is not political. She stated that the current process is tried and true, and the proposed process would complicate that and bring detriment to the residents.

Chairperson Gengler asked if there were any concerns with the 60-day review for this process.

Planning Manager Larson stated that all land use applications follow the same process, with the exception that variances currently fall off earlier in that process, so there would be no concerns with the review period.

Commissioner Musgrove stated that perhaps the ten days should be clarified as business days within the current ordinance if the Council could be convinced to keep the current process.

Planning Manager Larson commented that there is a paragraph related to time in the City Code, but the definition of a day has not been provided. He stated that there has only been one instance where the definition of a day could have been an issue.

Citizen Input

No comments.

Motion by Commissioner Musgrove, seconded by Commissioner N. Bauer, to close the public hearing.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Musgrove	aye
Commissioner N. Bauer	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner Lubarski	aye
Commissioner R. Bauer	aye
Chairperson Gengler	aye

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Gengler closed the public hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Musgrove, seconded by Commissioner R. Bauer, to recommend that City Council deny the proposed ordinance pertaining to variances.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner R. Bauer	aye
Commissioner Lubarski	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner N. Bauer	aye
Commissioner Musgrove	aye
Chairperson Gengler	aye

Motion Carried.

It was noted that this item will move forward to the City Council at the November 10, 2025, meeting.