

From: [The Michels](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Chickens in residential districts - Chanhassen
Date: Monday, May 24, 2021 10:26:03 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chanhassen City Council -

I've lived in Chanhassen for thirty (30) years. We've won numerous awards for best places to live, and of late, Council is either pandering to a few lame requests, or simply caving, as one Council member is quoted - we can't possibly handle all the complaints (boats). As I recall he also stated it's something like two-three complains per month. Why are we proposing going backwards?

It is a really bad idea to allow chickens to be raised/housed in the City of Chanhassen. I grew up in agriculture, I work in agriculture and work with epidemiology and veterinary medicine. Rather than Council saying, oh we have to look at what other communities allow - how about we follow logic, common sense and science.

The human health risks (to all of us, not just the resident that wants a backyard flock) are real and significant.

<http://www.idph.state.il.us/health/infect/Poultry.htm>

<https://www.health.state.mn.us/diseases/animal/backyard.html>

Perhaps the one (1) acre minimum that Council is looking at overturning is justified. Most lots are less than .25 acres. Perhaps the links I've included would compel a science based decision to say, raising chickens in a city/suburb is not safe, period (not even with a acreage minimum).

Is Council prepared to limit the number of hens/chickens? Wait, if the City can't enforce the current boat ordinance, how will City ever enforce a chicken ordinance? Double standards. Is the discussion about one or two laying hens? A dozen? Will it allow residents to raise broiler chickens all summer and then butcher them in the fall? Do not open up an ordinance that has served Chanhassen - since it was a very small suburb. Housing density increases do not lend to backyard farming.

What about manure/litter disposal? True farmers have to present manure management plans to the State. Why would backyard flocks not have to do the same?
Flies? Stink? Rodents? Predators?

What's next? Goats? Rabbits? The requests are potentially endless.

Please stop the pandering and focus on bigger issues and strategies.

For the record, the City Councilman that said he'd like the boat ordinance loosened, because he has a boat, has never answered the two emails I sent to him/Council. Pretty cowardly. He knows who he is.

Todd Michels
612-819-2229

From: [Walker, Jim](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: comment on RV's and chickens
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 3:19:13 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I believe property owners should have freedom of action as long as it does not unduly burden other nearby property owners.

As such, I believe property owners (or renters with the owner's permission) should be able to park boats and RVs in their driveway.

I also believe property owners (or renters with the owner's permission) should be allowed to raise backyard chickens as long as

- the chickens are treated humanely (particularly with respect to weather).
- the chickens do not place a burden on neighbors in the form of noise (for example, if chickens are considerably louder than barking dogs then perhaps that is too noisy. If chickens are less noisy than barking dogs (which we already have) then the noise burden of the chickens is acceptable...or at least certainly nothing new.
- The chickens do not place a burden on neighbors in the form of noxious odors.
- The chickens do not place a burden on neighbors in the form of noxious run-off (chicken poop dissolving in rainwater flowing onto someone else's property).

So, with some concerns, I am in favor of both changes.

Thanks for this opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

Jim Walker
Resident

Jim Walker, CT
Holy Family Catholic High School
Science Teacher, Knowledge Bowl Coach, Quiz Bowl Coach
Walkerj@HFCHS.org
952 443 4659 ext 1148
www.hfchs.org

although unlikely...

Notice: This communication and any files attached with it may contain privileged or other confidential information and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or believe that you have received this communication in error, please do not print, copy, retransmit, disseminate, or otherwise use any information contained therein. Also, please indicate to the sender that you have received this email in error, and delete the copy you received.

From: [David Ehmler](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Recreational Vehicle Parking
Date: Sunday, May 23, 2021 9:41:30 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I wanted to share with you my thoughts on this topic because I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting. I own a camper trailer and would appreciate the option of parking it on the driveway between our summer trips. I am unable to take advantage of the current code due to the configuration of my lot. Taking up driveway space is not my preferred option, but my only option outside of taking it back and forth to an expensive storage lot. I keep my trailer in like new condition and my lot in a similarly kept fashion. I do understand the argument of unsightly lots where things are left in disrepair or not moved all summer. I would hope these issues could be dealt with on a case by case basis though.

Thank you for your time,

Dave Ehmler

1030 Barbara Ct, Chanhassen, MN 55317

From: [Robert Kline](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Fwd: HOA's Perspective Regarding Recreational Vehicles & Chicken's Amendments
Date: Sunday, May 23, 2021 3:52:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please review this forwarded email sent to Mayor Ryan by our HOA Board regarding the (2) Proposed Amendments pertaining to Recreational Vehicles and Chickens.

Thank you for allowing us to share our perspective.

Sincerely,

Lakeview at Pineurst HOA Board

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Robert Kline** <rjkline123@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, May 23, 2021, 3:39 PM
Subject: HOA's Perspective Regarding Recreational Vehicles & Chicken's Amendments
To: Ryan, Elise <eryan@ci.chanhassen.mn.us>, Steven Mueller
<stevenemueller@gmail.com>, Mark Wagner <MAWagner@olwklaw.com>

Dear Mayor Ryan,

Thank you for your "Message From The Mayor" sent to us via email on Friday May 21, 2021, regarding the Recreational Vehicles and Chickens in Residential Districts Proposed Amendments. We (Lakeview at Pinehurst HOA Board) appreciate your desire to receive and listen to feedback from residents of the City.

We the Board, would like to provide you with our perspective regarding the (2) Amendments and how they are in conflict with our HOA Declaration of Covenants. Our Association's Covenants address both of the Proposed Amendments and are in direct opposition to their position.

Regarding Recreational Vehicles in our HOA, NO "other vehicles" may be parked on a driveway and may ONLY be stored inside an enclosed garage. These "other vehicles" include, automobiles not operational, trucks, buses, vans, recreational vehicles, all-terrain vehicles, ambulances, hearses, motorcycles, motorbikes, bicycles, snowmobiles, jet skis, canoes, boats, and other watercraft, aircraft, house trailers, motor homes, camping trailers, other trailers, lawn mowers, lawn tractors, over-the-road tractors, and other tractors. We include this list to show what someone could "interpret as a recreational vehicle".

The Proposed Recreational Amendment, as it is written, does not clearly define a recreational vehicle and what is going to qualify as acceptable within this Amendment. It seems far to "open ended" with the potential of abuse. For example, how will the City address the home owner who parks a motor home or camper on their driveway and someone lives in that "vehicle" from April 1st to November 1st?

Regarding the Chickens in Residential Districts Amendment, again our HOA does NOT allow "uncommon animals", which includes chickens, without prior consent of the Board. There is currently nothing in the Proposed Amendment that states an HOA may have more restrictive regulations than the City. Again, the opportunity for potential abuse seems very "open ended".

For Example, what recourse will a "non chicken" homeowner have against a "legitimate nuisance" they are experiencing that is caused by their neighbor who has chickens? There is nothing in the Proposed Amendment that addresses how a "legitimate nuisance" will be handled.

As an HOA Board, our main role is to uphold the guidelines of our Covenants. The vast majority of our members want those guidelines to be enforced. However, there are a few members who will try to "take advantage" of the (2) Proposed Amendments, as they are currently written.

Our HOA Board believes as the (2) Proposed Amendments are currently written, there will be confusion between what is allowed by the City and what is allowed in our Covenants.

WE BELIEVE FURTHER CLARIFICATION IS NEEDED AND A PROVISION MUST BE MADE IN BOTH AMENDMENTS THAT CLEARLY STATES, "HOA COVENANTS CAN BE MORE RESTRICTIVE THAN CITY RULES AND MUST TAKE PRECEDENCE".

Thank you for the opportunity to share our perspective. We would welcome any further discussion or questions you may have.

Please let us know you received this email, as we believe it contains important information you would want to know before the City Council meeting Monday (5/24) evening.

Regards,

Lakeview at Pinehurst HOA Board
Bob Kline - President 952-975-0960
Steven Mueller - Vice President 612-802-9122
Mark Wagner - Treasurer 612-578-5228

From: [Peggie Zoerhof](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Outdoor Storage of Recreational vehicles
Date: Saturday, May 22, 2021 7:05:53 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City City Council Members,

Our preference for outdoor storage of recreational vehicles is to LEAVE IT AS IS AND ENFORCE IT. There are recreational vehicles parked in driveways and on the street in our neighborhood all summer.

We are glad there is such an ordinance to prevent clutter and theft in our neighborhood. Please enforce the existing ordinance of NO recreational vehicles to be stored in driveways or on the street. Owning such a vehicle comes with proper storage responsibilities.

Thank you,
Peggie and Curt Zoerhof

Sent from my iPhone
Peggie Zoerhof

From: [Tom Diedrich](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed amendments
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:23:43 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Regarding the proposed amendment of outdoor storage of recreational vehicles, boats, and trailers, I oppose this amendment.

I would, however, support a trailered boat or a trailer in a driveway.

Unfortunately, I have neighbors who store their 20' Ice Castle ice fishing camper often in their driveway directly opposite my picture window, and that's what I have to look at year round. Other neighbors store their campers summer-long in their driveways, too, without regard for what their neighbors have to look at. Ironically, these items, being in their driveway, are out of their own sight, and they don't have to see them. Campers in driveways for a sustained period, and directly in my sight, detract from me enjoying my property and neighborhood.

Thanks,
Tom

From: [Randal Fingarson](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Ordinance Code Change Amendment Regulating the Outdoor Storage of Recreational Vehicles, Boats, and Trailers on Residential Properties.
Date: Sunday, May 23, 2021 7:43:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Chanhassen City Council

We are Linda and Randal Fingarson and live at 8371 West Lake Drive in Chanhassen, Minnesota. We have lived in Chanhassen for the last 30 years. We wish to provide our comments on the proposed ordinance code change Amendment Regulating the Outdoor Storage of Recreational Vehicles, Boats, and Trailers on Residential Properties.

We believe the the proposed change should be rejected. Chanhassen is a special city to live in. Residential property is well taken care of and everyone works hard to insure that their property is properly maintained. Approving the proposed ordinance change that would allow a recreational vehicles, boats, and trailers to be parked or stored on a residential property would have a significant negative impact on the appearance of each neighborhood. It would detract from to beauty of our city. Home owners made purchasing decisions on were to live and what property to buy based on the city ordinances and what would be allowed to take place in their neighborhood. This proposed change would have a major negative impact on the appearance of each neighborhood and not respect the desires of their neighbors.

Over the past years, we have owned both a sailboat and power boat. We never once stored either outside on our driveway. We did not want to impose on our neighbors and detract / take away from the appearance of our neighborhood. Owning a recreational vehicle, boat and trailer should not allow one to negatively change and detract from your neighborhood appearance. We would not like to have a recreational vehicle, boat and trailer in the driveway next to us. We believe that owning a recreational vehicle, boat, and trailer carries the responsibility of insuring that it is stored in a manner that is respectful of your neighbors.

Thank you for your consideration,

Linda and Randy Fingarson

From: [Neil Reiersen](#)
To: [Krystel Reiersen](#)
Cc: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Upcoming approval for city ordinances
Date: Saturday, May 22, 2021 10:45:21 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I strongly agree on both points. As a heavily involved family in the community i hope you take these recommendations seriously.

Best,
Neil
612-991-7968

Sent from my iPad

On May 21, 2021, at 4:40 PM, Krystel Reiersen <krystel.reiersen@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello!

I would like to express my opinion on the upcoming city ordinances.

1. Outdoor Storage of Recreational Vehicles, Boats, and Trailers

Being a boat owner myself, I really feel it is best that boats and other recreational vehicles are not stored on driveways. Chanhassen has always been an aesthetically pleasing place to live. Homeowners take great pride in their property. Having recreational vehicles of any kind parked on driveways provides such an eye sore! There are many other options for storing recreational vehicles. When purchasing such a vehicle it is a cost we put into consideration knowing the current ordinance was in place. Recreational vehicles are a luxury and the associated cost of storing them out of site should be maintained. We are too pretty of a city to have this eye sore throughout.

2. Chickens in Residential Districts

Would love to see this ordinance lifted. There are so many benefits to having chickens - eat insects, produce eggs, free fertilizer, great hobby for the kids to get involved, outside and in the garden. By placing restrictions on the number of chickens (4) and only allowing females instead of roosters, you avoid the loud cockadoddling and over populated area. Consider giving homeowners a limit based on their lot size. More and more people are looking for a way to live healthier, sustainable lives and owning chickens a wonderful way to start. Edina, Chaska, Minnetonka, along with many other cities allow their residences to own chickens. Would be nice if we could do the same!

Thank you for putting my opinions into consideration!

Krystel Reiersen
7540 Fawn Hill Road
Chanhassen, MN 55317
612-968-6957

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Don & Holly Loberg](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Rec Vehicle Storage Amendment
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:11:20 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Our household strongly supports storage of one vehicle in driveway. Chanhassen is such an active community so I feel this is a match with core values. It would allow us to bring our boat home from the cabin and use it in the cities.

Thanks

Holly and Don Loberg
6915 Lake Harrison Cir
Chanhassen MN 55317
(612)964-9239

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Herb LePlatt](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Recreation Vehicle Parking...
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:18:33 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The ordinance doesn't mean much if it is not enforced. There are hundreds of recreation vehicles being parked in driveways at this time with out threat of violation to the owner. It doesn't really matter if the ordinance says they can park one recreational vehicle if enforcement of the ordinance doesn't exist.

Herb LePlatt
eherb22@msn.com
7012 Cheyenne Trl.
952-949-3404

From: [Jerry clair](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Recreational vehicle parking
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:21:26 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My question and feedback on this is how does this new ordinance co-exist with neighborhood covenants recorded in a deed of trust with Carver County prohibiting parking of recreational vehicles. Which takes precedence? Does a new ordinance supersede the existing covenants that are recorded, or do they still exist and are binding?

Are you opening Pandora's box by giving people a perceived right that perhaps they don't have and at the same time upsetting a neighborhood whose covenants prohibit this when it starts to happen?

Jerry Clair

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Sean And Tanya](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Response to RVs and Chicken Coups
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:46:02 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

In response to The Mayor, Elise Ryan's email message I am ok with the chicken coup proposal for properties less than 1 acre as long as the immediate neighbors have a chance to give a thumbs up or down. Absolutely no roosters! They are an unfortunate alarm clock.

I am not ok with RVs being parked in driveways.

Sean Sommerfeld
6862 Manchester Drive
Chanhassen

From: [Bo Andersen](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: RVs and Chickens and burn permits.
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 3:38:57 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

1. Any roadworthy, registered vehicle or boat should be allowed to be parked in people's driveway permanently. It is private property after all and we are supposed to be a democracy. The city has no business dictating otherwise. I do not own such a vehicle myself.
2. Roosters are VERY noisy at 5 am. The 1 acre minimum lot size for chickens may not be enough and should certainly not be reduced. We have no chickens and no neighbors with chickens.
3. I continue to want you to reverse your unjustified and arbitrary restriction on burn permits, even for very large properties like ours. Less than 30 such permits were issued annually. It is an undue burden for residents like ourselves with large, rural properties to suddenly, arbitrarily implementing such restrictions.

Sincerely,

Bo Andersen
1695 Steller Court
bo1andersen@aim.com

From: [Ann Kathryn Miller](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Tonight's mtg
Date: Monday, May 24, 2021 2:48:19 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, 1) no recreational equipment or trailers in drive ways for more than 2wks in Spring, in autumn, in winter: so 2wks each for those designated seasons 2) if you have 3 acres, you can store behind wood fence so that items cannot be seen 3) whatever is ruled upon, whom enforces? 3) Pleasant view is a connector street so whom is responsible for eradicating buckthorn? The city or the private party? There are city ordinances for invasive species but obviously the city cannot 'keep up'. Also on the south side of Lotus Lake(which I request be changed to it's original name: Long Lake or be given an Indigenous name) Pleasantview Rd has 2 counties; 2 different jurisdictions. All arterial streets and driveways to this road are 'blind'-very unsafe for many reasons. Ann Miller, 6561 Fox Path, 55317

Sent from my iPhone