

**CITY OF COLUMBUS
JOINT MEETING
INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGY MEETING FORMAT
STATUTES SECTION 13D.021
4-19-2023**

The 4-19-2023 Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting for the City of Columbus was called to order at 6:02 PM by Mayor Jesse Preiner at the City Hall. Present were Mayor Jesse Preiner, City Council members Janet Hegland, Rob Busch, Ron Hanegraaf, and Sue Wagamon, Planning Commission members Barb Bobick, Lynn Carver-Quinn, Bethany Barrette, and Judy Huntosh, City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko, City Planner Dean Johnson, City Attorney Bill Griffith, and Associate Planner Frank Koenen. Also present were Jason Pawelsky, Kelly Jordan, Greg Newville, Bryan & Kysa Anglin, and Myron & Cindy Angel.

In attendance via interactive technology were an Unidentified Phone Number and Jennie.

The meeting was held in an interactive technology meeting format.

1. **CALL TO ORDER –CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING** – 6:02 p.m.
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **MOTION – APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA**
Motion Hegland to approve agenda as written. Second Hanegraaf. Carried with Hanegraaf, Carver-Quinn, Hegland, Wagamon, Busch, Barrette, Huntosh, Bobick, and Preiner voting in favor.
4. **MOTION – APPROVAL OF MARCH 15, 2023 JOINT CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION MTG. MINUTES**
Motion Carver-Quinn to approve the March 15, 2023 Joint City Council & Planning Commission Mtg. Minutes. Second Bobick. Carried with Hanegraaf, Carver-Quinn, Hegland, Bobick, Wagamon, Busch, Barrette, Huntosh, Bobick, and Preiner voting in favor.
5. **MOTION – APPROVAL OF MARCH 1, 2023 JOINT CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION MTG. MINUTES**
Motion Bobick to approve the March 1, 2023 Joint City Council & Planning Commission Mtg. Minutes. Second Hanegraaf. Carried with Hanegraaf, Carver-Quinn, Hegland, Bobick, Wagamon, Busch, Barrette, Huntosh, Bobick, and Preiner voting in favor.
6. **PUBLIC OPEN FORUM**
Nothing at this time.
7. **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – PRELIMINARY PLAT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – KETTLE KOVE ESTATES**
Chairperson Carver-Quinn opened the discussion for Planning Commission members. Commissioner Bobick remarked there was a confusion regarding the five acre minimum for Rural Residential residence. Bobick noted that the city allows lot averaging and asked for staff to explain lot averaging.

City Planner Johnson explained that a zoning ordinance amendment started the lot averaging provisions through a Conditional Use Permit for Planned Unit Development. He estimated lot averaging in the city has been in place for ten years. Councilmember Busch asked if Thurnbeck Preserve subdivision motivated the zoning amendment. Johnson replied the ordinance was already in place before the Thurnbeck Preserve. The intention was it would be for very narrow and deep lots. Johnson clarified Conditional Use Permit for Planned Unit Development provision does not change the average lot size which remains at five acres. Johnson stated the biggest misconception about lot averaging is that it would allow more lots. Johnson clarified that it allows for flexibility so a lot could be as low as 2.5 acres, but the 2.5 acre lot must be compensated with lot that is 7.5 acres or greater.

Johnson explained that the average lot size is still greater than five acres based on the size of the land before removing the right-of-way and Anoka County sometimes requires additional right-of-way for plats adjacent to County roads. The county has requested an additional 27 ft. on both sides of County Road 62 for the Kettle Kove Estates plat. Johnson acknowledged that there is an existing home that does not meet the setback requirements because of the widened right-of-way and the nonconformity has been acknowledged in the PUD approval process so the owners do not need to obtain a variance. The Planned Unit Development ordinance does allow lot averaging in the Rural Residential, but it does not increase the density of housing above one home per five acres.

Carver-Quinn noted talking to a neighboring resident about trying to find a solution that balances the interests of the applicant and neighbors. The request for things like screening to be in harmony with the existing neighborhood. She acknowledged that such things likely cannot be required, but wanted to reach out given everyone involved are community members.

Councilmember Hegland asked about the Planned Unit Development process for residential developments and how it compares to the flexibility in the commercial district Planned Unit Developments. Johnson explained that the specific language in the Rural Residential Planned Unit Development provisions are connected to lot sized dimensional standards. Therefore, the provisions are succinct when compared to the Commercial Planned Unit Development provisions. The distinction is that if the city allows a concession of requirements in the commercial district, the city then requires a higher quality of design standards.

Johnson then responded to several questions posed by Kysa Thilgen in an e-mail to Associate Planner Koenen dated March 21, 2023. Johnson stated in response to a question about the city requiring that the new development include screening for existing homes. Johnson noted that in many cases new subdivisions will request that surrounding existing homes are screened. The city has few requirements for our rural developments. In response to the increase of driveways on CSAH 62 (Kettle River Boulevard), Johnson clarified that would be a decision by Anoka County. He noted the project would not impact anyone else's driveway. Responding to a question about moving a mailbox, Johnson stated the resident should contact the post office with the question.

Johnson referenced a letter dated April 12, 2023 about lot size and averaging lot sizes. Hegland asked if there was an update regarding future improvements to the CSAH 23 (Lake Drive), CSAH 62 (Kettle River Boulevard), and Camp 3 Road. Mursko responded that there was no definitive timeline for the project. In response to traffic concerns, Hegland stated that the intersection rebuild will improve traffic issues on Camp 3 Road. Busch asked if the project was approved. Hegland stated they received a grant. City Attorney Griffith stated that the funding was one part of the project, but the design and closure of the road would be a subsequent step.

Wagamon asked about finding of fact #14 which states the wetlands are located on Lots 1, 2, and 6. The wetlands appeared to be on Lots 6 on the map but did not appear to be on Lots 1 and 2. Johnson answered that a sliver of the wetlands are located on the common lot line of Lots 1 and 2.

In reference to a question in Kysa Thilgen's letter, Councilmember Hanegraaf asked why there was no house position on Lot 5. Johnson answered that it is typical that the house site will not be chosen on the plat. Mursko added that the current homeowners would retain Lot 4 (site of the existing home) and Lot 5.

Motion Bobick to recommend approval of Preliminary Plat "Kettle Kove Estates" application, based on findings of fact #1-16 and conditions #1-11 of the City Planner's Report dated March 28, 2023 and based on findings of fact and City Engineer's memorandum dated March 28, 2023. Second Huntosh. Carried with Huntosh, Barrette, Bobick, and Carver-Quinn voting in favor.

Motion Bobick to recommend approval of CUP PUD "Kettle Kove Estates" application, based on findings of fact #1-16 and conditions #1-11 of the City Planner's Report dated March 28, 2023 and based on findings of fact City Engineer's memorandum dated March 28, 2023. Second Barrette. Carried with Huntosh, Barrette, Bobick, and Carver-Quinn voting in favor.

8. CITY COUNCIL DISCUSSION – PRELIMINARY PLAT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – KETTLE KOVE ESTATES

Busch stated that with the additional right-of-way acquired by Anoka County and the improvements to the intersection not immediate, the city should reach out to Anoka County to remove brush to improve the sightline to the north.

Mursko asked the applicant if they wanted the request in their letter dated April 18, 2023 to City Administrator Mursko and Anoka County Traffic Engineering Technician Logan Keehr added in the record or as a condition. The letter was regarding Anoka County Highway Department agreeing to not make alternation in the newly dedicated right-of-way before future reconstruction/widening of the roadway. Hegland asked if the motion would need to be amended. Griffith answered the request could be in the developer agreement.

Steve Hursch explained that the Linds recently realized how the new project would impact their home and became concerned. The Linds talked about it with Anoka County Traffic Engineering Technician Keehr. The Linds are willing to dedicate the right-of-way, but asked the county not to remove any trees and not have their home be impacted. Griffith explained that would be an

obligation of the county with the property owners and the developer needing to get approval from the Anoka County Highway Department. The city could put that approval in the Developer's Agreement as a matter of fact.

Greg Newville stated that the Linds want to preserve their tree screening from the road. He doubted the county would remove trees anyway, but the Linds would feel more secure with confirmation. Johnson stated there still needs to be a Final Plat before it is recorded. There is an opportunity for the county to take action in the interim.

Preiner asked if the applicant would go to the county for approval and if received the approval would be added to the Developer's Agreement. Griffith clarified that the item would be added as an exhibit to the Developer's Agreement.

Motion Hegland to approve the Preliminary Plat "Kettle Kove Estates" application, based on findings of fact #1-16 and conditions #1-11 of the City Planner's Report dated March 28, 2023 and based on findings of fact City Engineer's memorandum dated March 28, 2023. Second Wagamon. Carried with Hanegraaf, Hegland, Wagamon, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

City Staff Report from City Planner Dean Johnson, 3/28/23

Findings of Fact

1. The City received a preliminary plat application from Greg and Jill Newville ("Newville") on December 30, 2022. The application was found to be incomplete. Upon receipt of additional materials, the application was found complete on February 27, 2023.
2. The 120-day preliminary plat review deadline is June 27, 2023.
3. The proposed plat is located in the RR Rural Residential Zoning District.
4. The Property is not located within any shoreland or 100-year floodplain area.
5. The Property is currently addressed at 15741 Kettle River Blvd. and is legally described as the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 32, Range 22, except Parcel 17 of Right of Way Plat No. 3 ("Property").
6. The Property is bisected by a 66-foot right of way (ROW) section of Kettle River Blvd. The current net acreage of the Property is 37.12 acres.
7. The Property is proposed to be subdivided into 7 residential lots. There is one existing residence on the property.
8. A PUD CUP application was submitted to allow lot averaging within the Property. Lot sizes range from 3.94 acres to 5.92 acres. The net average acreage of the lots after new ROW dedication is 4.97 acres.
9. All proposed lots will meet minimum lot area and lot width requirements through the PUD CUP approval process.
10. The existing residence on proposed Lot 4, Block 1 is nonconforming with existing and proposed front yard setback requirements. The existing nonconformity is exacerbated with the additional 27 feet of right of way (ROW) required along Kettle River Blvd.
11. Access to the new lots is proposed via two shared access locations on Kettle River Blvd., serving Lots 1-3 and Lot 6, Block 1. Access to Lots 4 and 5, Block 1 is proposed on Camp Three Road. Access to Lot 1, Block 2 is proposed on 159th Avenue.

12. A 16-foot-wide driveway easement is located on Lot 3, Block 1 to serve as the access location for Lot 6, Block 1. The minimum private driveway width is 16 feet.
13. A letter from Anoka County Highway Department (ACHD), dated February 13, 2023, indicates ACHD will require an additional 27 feet of ROW on each side of Kettle River Blvd. (120 feet total ROW width). The letter from ACHD expresses a preference for a new cul de sac off Kettle River Blvd. to serve the easterly lots but will allow the two shared access locations, subject to the relocation of the driveway to the existing residence from Kettle River Blvd. to Camp Three Road.
14. The Property is located in the Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD). The District issued a Notice of Decision for a wetland delineation on December 8, 2022. There are two wetlands on Block 1 of the Property, affecting Lots 1-2 and Lot 6. Minimum wetland buffers of 50 feet have been established around each wetland.
15. The preliminary plat includes standard 10-foot drainage and utility easements along property lines and 20-foot easements adjacent to public rights of way. The existing residence will be partially located within the drainage and utility easement along Kettle River Blvd. The wetlands and buffers are also protected with drainage and utility easements.
16. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed preliminary plat on April 5, 2023.

Conditions

1. Detailed recommendations of the City Engineer.
2. Title review and recommendations of the City Attorney.
3. Approval of the Kettle Kove Estates PUD CUP.
4. Requirements of the Anoka County Surveyor.
5. Requirements of the Anoka County Highway Division.
6. Requirements of the Rice Creek Watershed District.
8. Permanent wetland buffer boundary plaques at intervals determined by the City.
7. Cash in lieu of park land dedication.
8. Reimbursement of all City expenses associated with plat approval.
9. The proposed 16-foot-wide shared driveway easement on Lot 3, Block 1 shall be a minimum 30-foot width.
10. A drainage and utility easement encroachment agreement or exception is required for the existing residence on Lot 4, Block 1.
11. Future development within the plat is subject to all laws and permitting requirements, including but not limited to driveway permits and stormwater management plans.

Memorandum from City Engineer Kevin Bittner, 3/28/23

- On the civil plan, indicate the minimum building elevations for all lots based on City Code 7A-603.
- On Lot 4, the alternate septic site is very close to the water-supply well. By well code, a minimum of 50' of separation is required from the SSTS. In addition, the relocated driveway is aimed directly at this alternate septic site. The alternate SSTS site may need to be relocated to provide adequate distance from the well and the new driveway may need to be relocated so it does not interfere with the alternate SSTS site.

- On Lot 5, the proposed building pad location is not indicated, although the driveway off Camp Three Road indicates the pad would be on the south end of the lot. This could be problematic in that the south end is the lower elevation side of the lot and drainage might be directed at the building location, depending on where it would be located. The building pad may be better situated on the north side of the lot, which is higher ground. The shared driveway currently indicated for Lots 3 and 6 could be utilized for access if the building pad is on the north half of the lot and the Camp Three Road access could be reduced to a maintenance access or eliminated altogether.
- The shared driveway for Lots 3 and 6 (and potentially Lot 5 as indicated above) should be wider to allow for two-way traffic, factoring in winter conditions when plowed snow may narrow the driveway even further. A minimum 20' driveway is recommended, along with a 30' wide driveway easement as recommended in the Consultant City Planner report.
- There should be a clearer indication of what will be platted as Camp Three Road right-of-way and CSAH 23 right-of-way.

Motion Hegland CUP PUD "Kettle Kove Estates" application, based on findings of fact #1-16 and conditions #1-11 of the City Planner's Report dated March 28, 2023 and based on findings of fact City Engineer's memorandum dated March 28, 2023. Second Hanegraaf. Carried with Hanegraaf, Hegland, Wagamon, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

City Staff Report from City Planner Dean Johnson, 3/28/23

Findings of Fact

1. An application for a Planned Unit Development Conditional Use Permit (PUD CUP) was received from Greg and Jill Newville ("Newville") on January 31, 2023. The application was found to be incomplete. Upon receipt of additional materials, the application was found complete on February 27, 2023.
2. The 60-day review deadline is April 28, 2023, and the 120-day review deadline, if necessary, is June 27, 2023.
3. The purpose of the PUD CUP is to allow lot averaging within the proposed Kettle Kove Estates preliminary plat.
4. The Property is currently addressed at 15741 Kettle River Blvd. and is legally described as the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 32, Range 22, except Parcel 17 of Right of Way Plat No. 3 ("Property").
5. The Property is zoned RR Rural Residential.
6. The Property is bisected by a 66-foot right of way (ROW) section of Kettle River Blvd. The current net acreage of the Property is 37.12 acres. At an average density of one home per five acres, the proposed subdivision is entitled to seven lots.
7. The PUD provisions of the Zoning Ordinance allow new subdivision lots to be a minimum of 2.5 acres in area with varying lot width dimensions, provided the density within the development is maintained at one home per five acres.
8. The proposed lot density and lot dimensions within the Kettle Kove Estates preliminary plat are consistent with the PUD provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

9. There is an existing residence on proposed Lot 4, Block 1 which is nonconforming with existing and proposed front yard setback requirements. The existing nonconformity is exacerbated with the additional 27 feet of right of way (ROW) required along Kettle River Blvd.
10. Anoka County Highway Department (ACHD) is requiring that the existing access drive to Lot 4, Block 1 on Kettle River Blvd. be closed and relocated to Camp Three Road. While front yard setbacks are required on all street frontages, those frontages that eliminate right of access are often viewed as side yards or rear yards on a parcel.
11. The existing residence is also located within the proposed 20-foot drainage and utility easement required by the Subdivision Ordinance. The location of this easement affects the residence because of the expansion of the County ROW.
12. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed PUD CUP on April 5, 2023.

Conditions

1. The PUD CUP is contingent upon approval of the Kettle Kove Estates preliminary plat.
2. The PUD CUP is contingent upon the recommendations of the City Attorney.
3. The PUD CUP authorizes the density, lot layout and lot access provisions illustrated on the approved preliminary plat.
4. The PUD CUP recognizes the location of the existing residence on Lot 4, Block 1 as legally nonconforming with Zoning Ordinance setback requirements.
5. The PUD CUP authorizes an encroachment of the existing residence on Lot 4, Block 1 within the proposed drainage and utility easement along Kettle River Blvd., subject to the recommendations of the City Attorney.
6. Newville shall reimburse the City for all costs associated with the review and approval of the PUD CUP.

Memorandum from City Engineer Kevin Bittner, 3/28/23

- On the civil plan, indicate the minimum building elevations for all lots based on City Code 7A-603.
- On Lot 4, the alternate septic site is very close to the water-supply well. By well code, a minimum of 50' of separation is required from the SSTS. In addition, the relocated driveway is aimed directly at this alternate septic site. The alternate SSTS site may need to be relocated to provide adequate distance from the well and the new driveway may need to be relocated so it does not interfere with the alternate SSTS site.
- On Lot 5, the proposed building pad location is not indicated, although the driveway off Camp Three Road indicates the pad would be on the south end of the lot. This could be problematic in that the south end is the lower elevation side of the lot and drainage might be directed at the building location, depending on where it would be located. The building pad may be better situated on the north side of the lot, which is higher ground. The shared driveway currently indicated for Lots 3 and 6 could be utilized for access if the building pad is on the north half of the lot and the Camp Three Road access could be reduced to a maintenance access or eliminated altogether.
- The shared driveway for Lots 3 and 6 (and potentially Lot 5 as indicated above) should be wider to allow for two-way traffic, factoring in winter conditions when plowed snow may narrow the driveway even further. A minimum 20' driveway is recommended, along with a 30' wide driveway easement as recommended in the Consultant City Planner report.

- There should be a clearer indication of what will be platted as Camp Three Road right-of-way and CSAH 23 right-of-way.

9. PRESENTATION AND CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – FRACTIONAL TOYS, NON-BINDING CONCEPT REVIEW

Jason Pawelsky of Fractional Toys thanked everyone for the opportunity to present his concept plan. He explained he wants to use the building 15161 Feller St. NE, currently occupied by Exercise Guys and Country Loft Quilts for his Fractional Toys business.

Pawelsky explained that the company Fractional Toys is a recreational vehicle agency and membership club. The Membership Club allows the company to buy new vehicles and serve people and also offers traditional rentals.

He stated the locations are chosen for accessibility and visibility and continued explaining the company currently has two locations in Oakdale and Coon Rapids. Fractional Toys recently bought a boat rental company in Cape Coral, Florida.

Pawelsky is very involved in the Stillwater and Woodbury Chamber of Commerce and charitable programs like Campers for Cause. He continued how they could become a stronger part of the community. Pawelsky stated they also work with first responders, including during Covid-19 with front line workers.

Pawelsky described the site plan to include highway frontage view and does not want vehicles scattered across the front lot. He is willing to meet ordinance design requirements and willing to work with the community. Pawelsky noted that on the site plan there is over a quarter acre of land where vehicles will be parked out of view in the rear of the property. Pawelsky explained the nearby businesses are complimentary to his business. He acknowledged there is a neighboring resident, and the existing tree line would help block the business from the home.

Pawelsky explained Country Loft Quilting would be moved to the space currently occupied by the Equipment Guys business. The existing accessory building would be used by Equipment Guys for inventory surplus, and then become a part of the Fractional Toys. Pawelsky stated the business would add an entrance to the north end of the building helping with traffic flow and making turnarounds easier. Additionally, they would add screening to the fence line.

Pawelsky explained a number of property improvements that current owner Tim Mackenzie would make, including connecting to city sewer and water, repaving the parking lot, updated signage, and roof improvement (removing exercise equipment display).

Pawelsky mentioned that he has been looking for a location for three years. The company does not do sales, but the rentals can be affordable or help people supplement what they currently use. He is not trying to compete with dealers in the area.

Hanegraaf asked about servicing and whether they only service their own equipment or if they would do additional vehicles. Pawelsky clarified they may do servicing and would be willing to do quick repairs but would not have vehicles remaining on the lot waiting to be serviced. Hanegraaf asked if the repairs would be RVs or motorhomes. Pawelsky replied both. Hanegraaf asked if it would be in the accessory building. Pawelsky stated that is ultimately what they would

do. Hanegraaf asked if the services would be advertised, and the public would know. Pawelsky confirmed that the services would be advertised, and the public would know.

Mursko asked what the existing Conditional Use Permit is for on the property. Koenen replied it is for the Exercise Guys business. Mursko stated it a new Conditional Use Permit would be necessary. Mursko clarified the concept plan was to discuss the use of RV Rentals and Membership Clubs.

Bobick asked if the back lot would be paved. Pawelsky says they would not be paving the back lot. Bobick asked how many vehicles would be parked in the area. Pawelsky answered 10-20 vehicles. Bobick asked if the building would stay the current color. Pawelsky replied affirmatively.

Preiner asked Johnson to walk through his report. Johnson stated the concept review is about judging if the use is compatible with the zoning district. Johnson then reviewed the discussion items from his report.

1. Is the proposed use of the property consistent with the purpose of the HC Highway Commercial District?

Johnson then read the Highway Commercial district description to remind the Planning Commission what the intent of the district is. Johnson believed it was consistent with the purpose of the district. Johnson talked about what the satellite view drawing included, and it showed what sort of businesses are currently in the district including several legally nonconforming vehicle sales businesses. Johnson stated that without an ordinance amendment the use cannot proceed. Johnson stated this business is strictly leasing vehicles and the business will have vehicles behind the building. Johnson commented that they may open to service as Commissioner Hanegraaf pointed out earlier.

2. Are the proposed uses of the property allowable in the HC Highway Commercial District? If not, is a zoning text amendment an option for consideration?

Johnson reiterated there would need to be a zoning ordinance amendment. Johnson noted there are some unique areas within the larger Highway Commercial district that are all the same or similar use, such as the vehicle sales business in that area. Johnson stated that consideration could be given to a new zoning district or subdistrict. Johnson stated that the details of a new district or subdistrict must be agreed upon.

Johnson noted that Hanegraaf had asked what share of storage each business on the property would receive. The allowance of more than 50% storage limit could be a part of a conditional use permit for planned unit development. Johnson asked if the 50% storage limit would be easily overcome, or does the City Council have no interest in moving forward?

Hegland stated that when creating the new zoning ordinance in December 2021, the city was trying to avoid parked RVs along the freeway, but she does not have an issue with the business as described. Rental businesses were something added to the Lake Drive corridor during the recent C/I Zoning Amendment. Hegland stated she believes the lack of rental was not an intentional omission from the Highway Commercial district.

Commissioner Barrette stated she thinks the business fits the district and appreciated Pawelsky had preemptively addressed where the RVs would be located.

Wagamon stated she had an issue with simply agreeing to a zoning amendment after going through the zoning code revisions in her previous two years on the City Council. Wagamon had concern the city council may create a precedent where others will complain if the city makes another exception. However, Wagamon stated she did not feel like the business would impact the community. Wagamon stated the business seems like a good fit and is fine with the storage in the back. Wagamon stated she is willing to consider the business but did not want to send the message that the city would allow any proposed change.

Carver-Quinn stated she understood how Fractional Toys in Oakdale is successful but believes in Columbus that everyone has their own equipment. Carver-Quinn wanted to clarify if other services would be offered, such as the repairs stated earlier, and if oil changes would be included. Pawelsky replied they would not do oil changes on the premises.

Hanegraaf stated he felt the business fits in the location, due to the surrounding businesses with trailers in the area and believes the city can work with the concept. Busch stated after talking with Pawelsky at the ColumBiz event, he likes the idea, and he is for it. However, Busch noted he would want conditions regarding outdoor storage. Pawelsky stated he wanted to keep outdoor storage behind the building for safety reasons.

Hanegraaf stated he wanted to make sure the business would not have a motorhome with a sticker as a display at the front of the building. Pawelsky replied their business does the opposite and makes it look like everyone is an owner and does not use big rental stickers.

Bobick stated she was concerned that the use is not in the existing zoning ordinance and did not want to set precedent approving an amendment. Hegland explained that when going through the process of revising zoning ordinances, it is impossible to think about every potential use in a district. Hegland stated the use was not something that they purposefully did not include. Hegland clarified the city would not be setting precedent by agreeing to the zoning amendment. Hegland stated the city during the zoning ordinance revision did not want to include RV sales because of parking near the freeway. However, she agreed that the city does not want to set precedent, but staff could help in ensuring that would not happen.

On amending the code, if that was the direction, Griffith clarified, that would mean someone else could use the same use anywhere in the district. Griffith used Lake Drive as an example of how the city had those kinds of conditions for uses. Griffith stated that Bobick was correct in stating someone else under the same circumstance could do the same business. He suggested several ideas for the Oxford Subdivision, which already contains many similar uses. Griffith gave potential options of creating a subdistrict, an overlay, or a carve out.

Hegland noted that this non-binding concept review and the city would not be approving the business to be allowed that night and the review as about giving the applicant feedback. Griffith clarified that this would be an applicant driven text amendment.

Carver-Quinn stated she understands the hesitancy about setting a precedent. But if the City Attorney can make the conditions tight, did not foresee a huge repercussion from the business. Bobick stated she does not want more vehicles as she feels like they are polluters. Carver-Quinn noted that customers will be immediately getting on and off the highway.

Bobick noted that things businesses can morph and gave some examples from Love's Travel Center including unoccupied cabs and truck repairs in the lot. Hegland noted in the case of occupied cabs, the driver may be sleeping in the cab. Hegland continued explaining the city scheduled an interview with a Code Compliance officer. Busch mentioned in the case of truck repairs they might have been working on something that needed to be fixed immediately.

Hanegraaf mentions it is a rental place and it is not allowed there. Griffith noted that use is one aspect, the amount of outdoor storage would also need to be addressed. Griffith would want to know what the percentage of outdoor storage is, where things are stored, and where it is displayed.

Preiner asked if the next step would be a recommendation. Griffith answered that this was a non-binding concept review, and the Planning Commission and City Council takes no action. The discussion is to give the applicant, who would then apply. Johnson stated he feels like there are some gaps and understands there are concerns about setting precedent. He asked to continue with the final two discussion items.

3. Is the existing design (site layout and architecture) of the property consistent with ordinance performance standards (or easily remedied)?

Johnson stated he felt that this discussion item was not applicable to this project. Johnson explained the project was using an existing building, so it is not like other non-binding review where a potential applicant would need direction. He concluded by noting the building was 100% masonry.

4. Are the proposed outdoor storage and screening components consistent with ordinance performance standards (or easily remedied)?

If the applicant wanted to do outdoor storage based on 60% of building size instead of 50%, the process would be done via a Conditional Use Permit for Planned Unit Development. That would create a unique situation. Johnson explained that there would be no exposure of the business and the first thing seen is not the equipment. He mentioned that the quilting business was going to expand. The building would drop from 100% retail to 60%. He felt like the uses fit in the area but must carefully craft the detail.

Johnson asked Mackenzie if he will be the owner and applicant. Mackenzie stated Pawelsky will have an option to buy. Johnson clarified that all the conditions of the permit would be the responsibility of Mackenzie for the duration of his ownership. Mackenzie confirmed that he would accept responsibility for the conditions on the property. Mackenzie stated that he is cautious as to who a potential renter would be.

Griffith clarified that the conditions would be on the site and the owner must be the applicant. Johnson stated would create certain conditions at the beginning, and that may change. Johnson gave the example that the use for the storage building would first be for the Equipment Guy's overstock and then be used for Fractional Toys' own repair service. Johnson stated that activity

will need to be a part of it. Johnson noted that the question about whether the business would be members only or a general rental facility has not been answered. Johnson continued that the businesses that are legally operating in the area are some of the uses that they were trying to eliminate. Johnson acknowledged Bobick's concern that allowing similar uses would make it more likely that the other businesses would be more difficult to eliminate. Johnson stated that the existing uses are not going away in the immediate future. Johnson believed that they will proceed as carefully as possible.

Hanegraaf asked Griffith if a text amendment is approved, and the permit states the property is going to be leased, would that property stay that way? Griffith explained the Conditional Use Permit runs with the land, unless it can be determined the use was abandoned, the owner would be able to allow a similar use on the property. Johnson stated that if conditions are too tight and there was a new tenant Mackenzie would need to find a similar business with a potential Conditional Use Permit amendment or do another text amendment.

Preiner asked Pawelsky that with no displays in the front, how the businesses would advertise and gain visibility. Pawelsky answered that his business primarily uses word of mouth, trade shows, and Google searches.

Hegland asked about the red Xs depicted on the picture on the Highway frontage view. Pawelsky responded the red Xs indicate the items shown will not be there. Mursko asked how many pieces of equipment would be on the lot at one time. Pawelsky answered that during summer weekends most campers and motor homes will be gone, and winter would be when the most campers are on site. Hegland asked if each location of Fractional Toys had its own inventory and if there was crossover. Pawelsky answered that each location did have their own separate inventory. Johnson asked if there will be seasonal onsite storage. Pawelsky replied there would be. Johnson asked if that area could have snowmobiles on the property during that time of year in the same area. Pawelsky stated that was correct. Johnson stated there will need to be a rigid condition in the permit as to how much area can be used for outdoor storage.

Johnson stated the most likely thing that will happen is a change in ownership and that will need to be a condition. Mackenzie clarified if Pawlesky wants to buy the property, he will have the opportunity to buy it.

Preiner noted the number of vehicles that would be stored was not answered. Pawelsky answered he does not have a concrete number of vehicles, but it would be within the square footage allowed. Johnson stated there will be a formula to ensure the amount of space for vehicles is clear. Johnson stated a Conditional Use Permit for Planned Unit Development application could be a part of that process and a tradeoff.

Johnson clarified that Fractional Toys will not be ready by Memorial Day weekend and explained the minimal time that text amendments and CUP PUD applications take to process due to reviewing, publishing public hearing notices, and the Planning Commission and City Council meetings.

Griffith clarified that the business would likely be a conditional use, but interim use would be possibility.

Busch asked if the repair work would be behind the screening. Pawlesky confirmed that it would be.

Preiner asked what the next steps for Pawlesky would be. Griffith explained that there would be submittal for an application for the text amendment and conditional use permit. Mursko explained that the Conditional Use Permit and Text Amendment could be submitted concurrently. If the applications are completed, then the process takes about 45 to 60 days due to the necessity of posting public hearing notices.

10. CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – ORDINANCE 23-02 - COMMERCIAL DESIGN STANDARDS

Johnson discussed his memo to the Planning Commission & City Council dated April 14, 2023. He elaborates that the memo describes the discussion items that were not discussed at the previous meeting. Johnson then reviews the items discussed at the last meeting that were agreed upon.

BUILDING MATERIAL AND COLORS

Johnson stated he wanted to simplify two things - building materials and color scheme. Johnson stated there was agreement to avoid corrugated steel and confirmed there was agreement regarding simplifying the rules for building materials. The draft ordinance will also simplify the rules on colors, so as not to allow brilliant colors, neon colors, and other distracting colors. Johnson stated there two other items discussed at the previous meeting, but staff was not given direction.

DRIVE-THRU ONLY USE

The first item that needed further direction was whether the city would allow or disallow accessory drive-through only use. Johnson noted there are Taco Bells drive-thru restaurants without sit-down areas (Taco Bell Defy). He also gave the example of a less car dependent area such as Minneapolis trying to remove drive-thru restaurants. He asked if the City Council and Planning Commission's intention was to deny drive-thru only with the intention of gaining sit down only. Johnson explained that not having drive-thru only businesses as a use will not bring a sit-down restaurant, but it will stop other businesses from coming into the city.

Preiner stated that he has no issue with the drive-thru. He explained the drive-thru only plan with Caribou Coffee came up because they changed their plan too quickly. The city could have said no. Caribou noted at the time that drive-thru business is how they make the most money because of limited staff and limited seating.

Hegland stated she does not have a problem with drive-thru only facilities. Hegland reiterated Johnson and stated that not allowing drive-thru restaurants would not bring a sit-down restaurant, and the market would have to support a sit-down. Huntosh agreed with Hegland and that the trend is for drive-thru only. Carver-Quinn stated that the only sit-down restaurant in the city is Running Aces and feels that the city needs another sit-down restaurant. Carver-Quinn stated that the city should address it now, due to limited developable land in the city that is suitable for a sit-down restaurant.

Preiner echoed what Johnson stated earlier and that if the city eliminated drive-thru restaurants, that would not bring a sit-down restaurant. Barrette asked Carver-Quinn if her concern was that a drive-thru being developed in that would preclude a future sit-down restaurant from taking that space. Carver-Quinn stated her concern was the development of a drive-thru because of the space requirements for buildings, parking, etc. could potentially take up real estate that would otherwise be taken by a sit-down restaurant.

Wagamon agreed with Johnson that the city is not rejecting sit-down restaurants, but she is not in favor of eliminating drive-thru only. Wagamon stated she is concerned it could lead to more instances of needing to do zoning amendments in the future and feels like the city should be more flexible.

Carver-Quinn pointed out that drive-thru restaurants in Forest Lake are closing, but there are sit-downs opening in the city. Wagamon stated if that is the way the market is going, the potential ordinance would not affect sit-downs ability to start in Columbus. Instead, it would hinder the city from getting new businesses with a drive-thru only model. Wagamon stated the city is trying to be more proactive than reactive on development in the city. Barrette asked how much undeveloped land is available in the freeway district. She said if there is more available, that would lessen the ordinance's potential impact.

Johnson said he wanted to discuss a potential minimum building area with the Planning Commission and City Council and questioned if the city would want to have a required minimum building size. Johnson noted he was not at the very first meeting when Caribou first applied. Johnson stated that the original belief was that the Caribou applying would be a more traditionally sized location. Johnson explained he is unsure of the exact square footage of the Taco Bell Defy in Brooklyn Park, but it is larger than the 670 sq. ft. of the Caribou Cabin. Johnson stated both the minimum square footage and drive-thru only should be considered together.

Johnson mentioned that when the city bought properties adjacent to the Interstate 35 and Minnesota Highway 97 freeway interchange, there was initially a large area expected to be suited to retail and entertainment. In later projections that area was cut in half. Johnson stated that the city has a low population, but the interchange has large traffic counts and is a gateway to northern Minnesota.

Johnson stated it would be nice to have another restaurant and the trend toward closures might change. Johnson stated that the new apartments are not going to satisfy what the market wants for a sit-down restaurant. Johnson stated that is the reality of the situation.

Busch stated that he agreed with what Carver-Quinn stated earlier about sit-down restaurants. Busch recalled that there had been an intention of creating a downtown and community area. The city wanted to create a district for people in places like the planned apartments, who probably would not want to walk to Taco Bell. Busch stated that his feeling was the city needed a sit-down restaurant.

Bobick noted the recent higher prices for drive-thru restaurants and sit-down restaurants have become cheaper by comparison to drive-thru restaurants. Bobick noted that the property tax the City of Columbus receives from the drive-thru only coffee shop is \$3,000 a year. Bobick

stated that the city should not go with drive-thru only restaurants just because they are fashionable and sometimes patience is needed for development.

Hegland wanted to answer the question about building size. Hegland explained the city initially wanted to utilize the area near the freeway interchange effectively and the thought was not to screen out drive-thru restaurants. She noted that Running Aces' may potentially have a restaurant as part of their expansion and others have had similar ideas. Hegland stated the city's market and biggest asset is the freeway traffic and that the customer base will prefer drive-thru restaurants.

Griffith commented that the city owns prime land with proximity to the interchange. Griffith explained that the City Council and Planning Commission could wait to sell the land and make the choice to wait for the correct use.

Hanegraaf stated that part of the reason KFC left is because of a new location in North Branch. Hanegraaf gave examples of a few local businesses affected by worker shortages (including delayed openings, closing for an evening, etc.). Hanegraaf noted that in Blaine, there are locations where several drive-thru restaurants are concentrated. Hanegraaf stated the owner of the local KFC appreciated the existing nearby restaurants, because they brought additional potential customers to the area.

Carver-Quinn shared her belief that if drivers get off a highway, they would not stop for one reason, instead the drivers utilize multiple services in the business. Busch stated it should be kept in mind that Forest Lake has many businesses, particularly chain fast food locations.

Hegland stated that the Caribou Coffee is only sitting on 0.77 acres. She noted the drive-thru restaurants are not very land intensive and thinks there is benefit with Forest Lake, the more of those things that are clustered together the more people will come off the freeway. Hegland stated that she believes there is room for both.

Preiner noted the city only has 8-10 acres of property remaining in the interchange area. Preiner stated the city should designate some of that land for optimal use. Preiner reiterated he believed that drive-thru restaurants should be allowed. He agreed with Griffith's earlier point that the city could designate the land for a building pad for a strip mall or sit-down restaurant.

Wagamon asked if the proposed rules would apply to the Running Aces area. Johnson explained that Running Aces area is zoned as HR - Horse Racing. Griffith explained the property Running Aces recently purchased had not been rezoned. Wagamon asked if Running Aces wanted to do drive thru and sit-down restaurants, would they be disallowed from any drive-thru if the city changed the district. Johnson explained that the question was whether a drive-thru would only be allowed as an accessory use to a sit-down restaurant.

Mursko explained the part of the issue with the situation with Caribou was that the company did not initially present a drive-thru only concept, the plans were changed after the company applied for a Conditional Use Permit. Griffith stated that the lesson learned is that the city can be patient and have leverage when selling city-owned property. Busch stated that was originally part of a master plan with Ebert Construction to do the Caribou and apartments, but eventually it led to Ebert retaining only the Caribou parcel. Busch noted that the drive-thru has created

extra traffic and additional drive-thru restaurants will contribute more traffic. Hegland agreed, but noted the intersection was designed to accommodate additional traffic.

Johnson explained the Planning Commission and City Council had several options regarding drive-thru restaurants. The first was to keep the status quo, which would allow further drive-thru only. The second was to create ordinance language to allow drive-thru facilities only as an accessory use to sit-down restaurants. Johnson suggested an informal poll among the Planning Commission and City Council regarding whether they would allow a drive-thru without sit-down facilities.

Barrette asked if there was an application for a listed conditional use in a district would the Planning Commission have any flexibility in denying an application. Griffith explained that the Planning Commission does not have that discretion and they must legally approve any conditional use in the code.

Griffith clarified that the main question is to answer whether the Planning Commission would allow drive-thru only restaurants as a conditional use the commercial districts that already allow drive-thru restaurants.

Carver-Quinn asked what districts the city would be proposing to rezone. Griffith clarified there are several commercial retail districts in the freeway district. Carver-Quinn stated she was concerned that limited land was left to develop other businesses. Johnson and Mursko pointed out that in the NE Quad there is still room for sit-down restaurants. Johnson gave the city many options for development in the area, but the issue is the market.

Johnson took an informal poll as to whether to allow drive-thru only restaurants. Hanegraaf in favor. Carver-Quinn against. Preiner in favor. Hegland in favor. Bobick against. Wagamon in favor. Busch against. Barrette in favor. Huntosh in favor.

MINIMUM BUILDING SIZE

Johnson began discussing whether the city would require at least 3000 square footage per acre in the commercial district. Huntosh expressed concern that this requirement would de facto eliminate any drive-thru only businesses by requiring a minimum 3000 square feet (about the area of a tennis court). Hegland and Mursko clarified it would be per acre, so a business would not have a full acre lot. Hanegraaf and Carver-Quinn stated they were in favor.

Preiner began to state being in favor, but then asked if this could be detrimental to future development in the city. Johnson explained that minimum square footage is a standard residential zoning tool and not unheard for commercial. Johnson explained the Planned Unit Development process could be used for building that does not meet the minimum size requirements. He stated staff could develop a standard that 15% of the lot must be developed as part of the development.

Hegland said the percentage was the initial intent of the Planning Commission and City Council. Hanegraaf clarified the city would now be utilizing a minimum building percentage instead of minimum building square footage. Johnson stated that the percentage would do what they are trying to accomplish with a minimum building square footage. Hegland clarified that they want a

minimum building area. Mursko mentioned that Lino Lakes told Caribou they needed to meet a minimum building area requirement.

Johnson stated that after Caribou was built, the builders began to think what future use for the building would be if the lease ended. Huntosh asked how much impermeable surface is allowed on a ¼ acre. Johnson answered there is a 50% lot coverage standard, but there are exceptions such as regional ponding. Huntosh pointed out the Caribou property has a lot of asphalt. Mursko explained due to the adjacent regional ponding lot to the south and double lane drive-thru they can maximize the use of the lot. Busch asked if the group was voting to require a minimum square footage for building size. Hegland clarified they are doing a ratio. Griffith clarified the group was agreeing to a minimum building size percentage. All Planning Commission and City Council members indicated that they were in favor.

MASONRY PERCENTAGES

Johnson asked if the existing masonry percentages were what the Planning Commission and City Council desired. Hegland stated she felt like the city needs to be more flexible in the percentages and wants to have some of the percentages go down. Hegland stated she did not want to get into the debate about whether composite material should be considered masonry. Johnson stated they should clarify that composite material is not masonry. Hegland then expressed concern that not allowing composite material would make it difficult to meet an 80% requirement.

Griffith stated what he heard at the last meeting is the city needs to simplify the standards. Hegland stated her main concern was the percentages in each district, and that the differences were arbitrary. Mursko explained that a lower percentage of the building will use allowed metal materials for most of the other parts of the building percentage. Johnson stated the proposed language is that the building would allow up to 50% metals and other non-masonry materials, but the remaining 50% must be masonry that is not composite. Hegland then asked why it must be 50% masonry. Busch stated most of the masonry construction is not structural and fastened to the building. Hegland stated if something is structurally sound, has curb appeal, etc. why would the city not allow it to take up a greater portion of the building. Griffith stated that the masonry construction is generally stronger, fireproof, higher cost, etc. He continued by stating that the city would need to specify a certain quality of materials.

Bobick stated the city does not want a proliferation of pole barns. Mursko clarified that pole construction is not taken off, because it could be covered in veneer and composite material could be used. Hegland agreed that the main point was not allowing the district to be filled with corrugated metal pole structures and to increase its curb appeal.

Busch mentioned regarding metal panels, ribbed, or corrugated should be eliminated, but standing seam should be allowed. He mentioned that they will use that on wall panels, as it can be an attractive look.

Johnson stated they could say the city encourages a mix of materials and produce a minimum percentage of different categories. Johnson stated that no one on the Commission or Council objects to too much stone, brick, etc. However, if there is a minimum percentage for brick, stone, and other masonry materials then there would not be companies utilizing too much LP siding. The Planning Commission and Council could also take the opposite approach and limit

the percentage of composite materials. Johnson explains that the ordinance must be specific as to whether the city should still have a masonry standard exist or lower the standard.

Busch asked if the standard could be drafted as a mix of materials with masonry at X percent. Busch then explained that most building will utilize masonry at the base to prevent rainwater from rotting it.

Hanegraaf asked if the apartment in the NE Quad was 80% masonry materials. Johnson explained the standard was 30% masonry materials at the time which they met. They allowed less masonry in the back, because the front of the building included 80% masonry materials. Griffith explained that was an example of the minimum requirements of a higher standard allowing the city to negotiate down.

Hegland asked Johnson regarding mixed products, what would happen in the case of a builder wanting to do tip up panels. Johnson clarified that builders are currently allowed to do 100% tip ups. Johnson explained that what was objected to previously was plain panels. Johnson stated that was the main issue with Bahr Homes, and in addition the white color of Bahr Home was the thing that made to go towards avoiding white buildings.

Johnson reiterated Busch's earlier point regarding tip up panels are typically the top part of the building, with masonry at the bottom and that multi-story buildings necessitate a higher amount of masonry to use tip up panels.

Griffith stated that after the discussion, he was asking for direction for staff. He stated the feedback he had from the meeting was the code should be simplified from the previous draft and that there were certain materials the Planning Commission and City Council did not want. Griffith asked the Planning Commission and City Council if there are things they want to promote? Griffith stated that if there were materials, they wished to promote there should be a percentage for the type of material. Hegland stated she wants some suggestions to say yes or no. Wagon agreed.

Hegland asked Busch for his opinion on the subject. Busch asked if the City Council and Planning Commission could set this aside, so they can continue the discussion later. Busch said he would like to send pictures of building materials as examples of what was discussed. Griffith stated both could be done with pictures sent and staff could move forward on a draft. Griffith stated he likes the 50% standard Johnson had suggested.

Hegland stated the concern she has is with small buildings is the existing high masonry requirement can still produce buildings that are not aesthetically pleasing using one of the original designs for Caribou as an example. Griffith mentioned the city did still have the flexibility in that case to negotiate on design due to the standard.

Griffith stated that what he likes about what is being proposed is that by having a 50% requirement for the materials that the city finds desirable, that would set a bullseye on what are quality materials. Staff will get advice on what quality materials are. Griffith stated the ordinance can give a straightforward design.

CORRUGATED METAL ELIMINATED

Johnson also suggested eliminating corrugated plastic as a building and fence material.

ALTERATIONS FOR FENCING APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Johnson discussed allowing administrative authority for the alterations of fences and screening after approval of a CUP. Johnson suggested putting it in the City Administrator's duties section instead of Section 7A-800. He noted it was not needed for the applicant or public.

LIGHTING PROVISIONS

Johnson mentioned the proposed lighting provisions. Johnson mentioned that the proposed provision included a half a foot candle at residential property lines. Johnson stated there was an added provision regarding porch lighting for unshrouded lamps. Johnson stated drafted ordinance had lumens that were lower than a one-watt lightbulb and that staff would draft a standard closer to a 75-100 watt lightbulb.

ALTERATIONS FOR LANDSCAPING APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Johnson stated the proposal was the City Administrator could approve landscaping changes administratively should the alterations meet code. Johnson stated this could also be added to the Zoning Administrator's duties.

Johnson stated that he would work with Griffith to draft an ordinance. The Planning Commission and City Council thanked Johnson for his presentation.

11. CITY COUNCIL DISCUSSION – CITY ENGINEER TO RICE CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT LETTER: ANOKA COUNTY DITCH 10-22-32

Hegland began a discussion regarding Anoka County Ditch 10-22-32. The 100-year-old ditch begins near the Waldoch subdivision and ends at Marshan Lake. There has been discussion by nearby property owners that the ditch is not draining properly, and property owners are flooding. There was additional concern about a newer subdivision on Jodrell St. NE and culverts being too high. There was speculation as to what is causing the issues, and Rice Creek is looking into the matter. Hegland stated Rice Creek Watershed District has asked for the city to state its position on the discussion. The city has been reviewing records, plats, engineering reports, and complaints to the city. Hegland explained based on the review of the information, City Engineer Kevin Bittner drafted a memo, which was included as part of the meeting additions. Hegland stated that the City Council are not engineers, so the City Council will vote whether they are comfortable or not comfortable with the memo drafted by Bittner that would be sent to Rice Creek Watershed District. Several members of the City Council planned to attend the Rice Creek Watershed District on Wednesday April 26th where the ditch will be a discussion item.

Busch asked about another ditch in the area that was cleaned out and asked if something similar would happen. Hegland answered there has been some debate about whether the ditch was cleaned and maintained properly. Busch asked if the discussion is about Anoka County Ditch 10-22-32 or the entire area of Rice Creek Watershed District. Hegland answered the discussion is specifically about Anoka County Ditch 10-22-32, and it the part of the ditch that runs through Columbus.

Hegland noted that the Wednesday April 26th meeting will also discuss saving wetland credits. There were wetland credits from Browns' Preserve, and Rice Creek Watershed District still have 60 credits and they have only used 20 credits.

Motion Preiner to direct staff to direct Bolton & Menk to send City Engineer's memorandum dated April 19, 2023 to Rice Creek Watershed District. Second Hegland. Carried with Hanegraaf, Hegland, Wagamon, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

12. INFORMATION – PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Bobick stated she went to West Iverson St. this weekend and a particular property has getting worse. Hegland explained that it went through the criminal courts and a bench warrant was issued. Hegland then asked what the city would do with the bench warrant issued. Griffith answered that part of the problem is that the courts were not doing zoning. Griffith answered they need to talk to Joe Murphy about where that stands. Busch stated the property owner or renter would leave a dog in a truck during the summer. Hegland stated that Animal Control or other measures should be taken if the dog is left in the truck.

13. INFORMATION – ASSOCIATE PLANNER'S REPORT

Nothing at this time.

14. MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion Preiner to adjourn. Second Hegland. Carried with Hanegraaf, Wagamon, Hegland, Busch, Carver-Quinn, Bobick, Barrette, Huntosh, and Preiner voting in favor.

Frank Koenen

Respectfully Submitted by Recording Secretary Frank Koenen