

EAST BETHEL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

August 27, 2013

The East Bethel Planning Commission met on August 27, 2013 at 7:00 P.M for their regular meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tanner Balfany Eldon Holmes Lorraine Bonin Randy Plaisance
Brian Mundle, Jr. Glenn Terry Lou Cornicelli

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT: Colleen Winter, Community Development Director
Tom Ronning, City Council Member

**Call to Order &
Adopt Agenda**

Mundle motioned to adopt the August 27, 2013 agenda. Terry seconded; all in favor, motion carries unanimously.

**Public Hearing,
Interim Use Permit
request – Stacie
Arneson, 929 197th
Ave. NE, East Bethel,
MN, PIN
193323440017, R1 –
Single Family
Residential District**

Background Information:

Property Owner/Applicant: Property Location:

Stacie Arneson 929 197th Ave. NE
929 197th Ave. NE PIN 19-33-23-44-0017
East Bethel, MN 55011
Lot 13, Block 1, Kable Country Estates

The applicant, Stacie Arneson, is requesting an IUP to operate a home-based hair salon business.

Stacie Arneson is a licensed cosmetologist and would be working by appointment only. Business is conducted by appointment only so parking needs generated from the home occupation are small and shall be provided on-site, in the designated driveway.

Public hearing was opened at 7:05 p.m.

Public hearing was closed at 7:06 p.m.

Recommendations:

Staff requests Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for an IUP for a home occupation for a hair salon, located at 929 197th Avenue NE, Kable Country Estates, Lot 13 Blk 1, PIN 19-33-23-44-0017, with the following conditions:

1. Home Occupation shall meet the specific home occupation standards set forth in the City Code Appendix A Section 10-18:
 - a. No more than three (3) persons, at least one (1) of whom shall reside within the principal dwelling, shall be employed by the Home Occupation.
 - b. No traffic shall be generated by any home occupation in a significantly greater volume than would normally be expected from a single-family residence.

- c. Any sign associated with the home occupation shall be in compliance with the East Bethel City Code, Chapter 54. Signs. Home occupation signage must be no larger than two (2) square feet (City Code Chapter 54-4.3).
 - d. The home occupation shall not generate hazardous waste unless a plan for off-site disposal of the waste is approved.
 - e. A home occupation at a dwelling with an on-site sewage treatment system shall only generate normal domestic household waste unless a plan for off-site disposal of the waste is approved.
 - f. The home occupation shall not constitute, create, or increase a nuisance to the criteria and standards established in this ordinance.
 - g. There shall be no outdoor display or storage of goods, equipment, or materials for the home occupation.
 - h. Parking needs generated by the home occupation shall be provided on-site.
 - i. The area set aside for the home occupation in the principal structure shall not exceed 50 percent of the gross living area of the principal structure and the area set aside for the home occupation in the attached or detached accessory structures or garages shall not exceed total accessory structure space.
 - j. No structural alterations or enlargements shall be made for the sole purpose of conducting the home occupation.
 - k. There shall be no detriments to the residential character of the neighborhood due to the emission of noise, odor, smoke, dust, gas, heat, glare, vibration, electrical interference, traffic congestion, or any other nuisance resulting from the home occupation.
2. Violation of conditions and City Codes shall result in the revocation of the IUP.
 3. All conditions must be met no later than September 30, 2013. An IUP Agreement shall be signed and executed no later than September 30, 2013. Failure to execute the IUP Agreement will result in the null and void of the IUP.

Stacy Arneson 929 197th Avenue East Bethel.

Holmes asked how long she has lived there. She said ten years. Holmes asked if she has been doing hair at her home. She said no, she currently rents a chair in Oak Grove and prior to that in Andover. Her clients would follow her to her home from Oak Grove salon she is currently at.

Holmes asked if there area where the salon is going to be, if it was going to have to be constructed. She said they have been working on it, as long as it is approved.

Holmes motioned to recommend approval to City Council for an IUP for a home occupation for a hair salon, located at 929 197th Avenue NE, Kable Country Estates, Lot 13 Blk 1, PIN 19-33-23-44-0017, with the following conditions:

- 1. Home Occupation shall meet the specific home occupation standards set forth in the City Code Appendix A Section 10-18:**
 - a. No more than three (3) persons, at least one (1) of whom shall reside**

- within the principal dwelling, shall be employed by the Home Occupation.**
- b. No traffic shall be generated by any home occupation in a significantly greater volume than would normally be expected from a single-family residence.**
- c. Any sign associated with the home occupation shall be in compliance with the East Bethel City Code, Chapter 54. Signs. Home occupation signage must be no larger than two (2) square feet (City Code Chapter 54-4.3).**
- d. The home occupation shall not generate hazardous waste unless a plan for off-site disposal of the waste is approved.**
- e. A home occupation at a dwelling with an on-site sewage treatment system shall only generate normal domestic household waste unless a plan for off-site disposal of the waste is approved.**
- f. The home occupation shall not constitute, create, or increase a nuisance to the criteria and standards established in this ordinance.**
- g. There shall be no outdoor display or storage of goods, equipment, or materials for the home occupation.**
- h. Parking needs generated by the home occupation shall be provided on-site.**
- i. The area set aside for the home occupation in the principal structure shall not exceed 50 percent of the gross living area of the principal structure and the area set aside for the home occupation in the attached or detached accessory structures or garages shall not exceed total accessory structure space.**
- j. No structural alterations or enlargements shall be made for the sole purpose of conducting the home occupation.**
- k. There shall be no detriments to the residential character of the neighborhood due to the emission of noise, odor, smoke, dust, gas, heat, glare, vibration, electrical interference, traffic congestion, or any other nuisance resulting from the home occupation.**
- 2. Violation of conditions and City Codes shall result in the revocation of the IUP.**
- 3. All conditions must be met no later than September 30, 2013. An IUP Agreement shall be signed and executed no later than September 30, 2013. Failure to execute the IUP Agreement will result in the null and void of the IUP.**

Mundle seconded; all in favor, motion carries.

This will go before City Council on September 4, 2013.

Interim Use Permit request – Scott and Kari Brazinsky, 1623 229th Lane NE, PIN 323423440008, R1-Single Family Residential District – DISCUSSION ONLY

Mundle asked if this was more for the residents benefit or our benefit to have a discussion. If it is for the resident, he would motion to table this. Cornicelli asked if they stated they wouldn't be at the meeting. Winter said they may have thought this was a public hearing and we cancelled the public hearing, so they may have thought we weren't going to be discussing it. She said let me go through it and it may clear things up.

Background Information:

Property Owners/Applicants: Property Location:

Scott and Kari Brazinsky 1623 229th Lane NE

1623 229th Lane NE PIN 32 34 23 44 0008
East Bethel, MN 55005
Lot 8, Block 1, Cedar Creek Meadows

The applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Brazinsky, are requesting an IUP for the keeping of two (2) horses at their residence. East Bethel City Code Section 10, Article V. Farm Animals, requires that no animals that are regulated by the code can be kept on a parcel of land located within a platted subdivision unless 80 percent of the lots within that subdivision are larger than 3 acres. The parcel (owned by Mr. and Mrs. Brazinsky) totals 13 acres, but only 51% of the lots in Cedar Creek Meadows are greater than 3 acres. I explained this to the Brazinsky's, but they would still like an interpretation from the Planning Commission. Brazinsky's lot and all of the other lots on the same side of the street are well over 3 acres – ranging from 6 – 13 acres in size.

However the platted lots across the street are smaller than 3 acres and range in size from 1.9 to 3.26. None of the smaller lots have any houses, or have been sold for residential lots. The Brazinsky's also reside in an area that is part of the Significant Environment Overlay District and if farm animals were approved they would need to submit a plan to Anoka County SWCD for final approval.

I have enclosed several pictures. This was originally scheduled as a Public Hearing and was pulled as a Public Hearing and is just before you as a DISCUSSION ITEM ONLY.

Attachments:

1. Location Map
2. Application
3. Site Plan
4. Pictures of property

Winter said she assumed all the lots were over 3 acres. She did make a mistake and thankfully she had a great support person who clarified it for her. She said the change made it go to 51%. On their side it is from 1.69 - 3.18 and the other side goes from 6-13 acres. So then it doesn't meet our subdivision requirements. They still wanted the interpretation of the Planning Commission. Their contention is the smaller lots are not developed. They are advertised as residential lots and have not been sold.

Mundle said they have been developed and plotted but not sold. Winter said yes.

Winter wanted to show the pictures of their yard. This is the front of their yard and what is developed. She showed their front yard. Cornicelli asked if it was pasture. Winter said no, it is grass and trees. Woods and wetlands can be qualified as pasture. This picture shows you where it drops off and goes down to the lake. Cornicelli asked how much of the property is wetland. Winter said a significant amount. Cornicelli asked how much is upland. Winter said about four acres. So they have room and meet the requirements. They could do one.

There are two questions, this is black and white and this is how our ordinance

reads. If you want to allow you would have make a change to the ordinance. Cornicelli said they pitching that their children will grow up better with horses, but how do you pull an IUP after three years. Winter said this is where the ordinance is very grey. If they were a meets and bounds lot, they would have met the qualifications. If they were not part of a platted subdivision, they could have done it. We do have rural residential and meets and bounds. What is interesting, just to the west of them, is someone who has an IUP for many years. She does feel and respect where they are coming from. In her mind it didn't fit, and she had told them she would bring it before the commission. Balfany said it is black and white and doesn't fit. He wishes he could say otherwise, but it is pretty clear. Terry said what the rule about the subdivision is. Winter said it is to protect the integrity of the neighborhood. She said she wishes it was a little clearer. In some cities, they have it if you have 5 acres whether you are in a development or not you can have a horse. It is a bit simpler. Mundle said it is determined by acreage. Winter said yes, and it is much cleaner. Balfany asked if that is something we should look at changing. Winter said you might want to. Cornicelli asked how many subdivisions have a large discrepancy in size. Winter said most are from 2-5 acres.

Mundle said there are about 4 acres of highland; essentially those four acres equal the three or four acres of another piece of land. There is only three to four acres of usable area. That is why this development was designed this way. Other developments it is how the lay of land allows development. How the streets fit in. The closer you get to the metro, the smaller the lots get.

Plaisance said we are talking about this particular ordinance which is talking about an area that is using these lots as the information to apply this particular piece is arbitrary, rather than looking at the impact of having animals on this property would have. He thinks they are separate pieces. Balfany asked if Plaisance was looking at directing staff to investigate other ways to view this as we talked about. Plaisance said yes, that is the way he would like to go.

Plaisance motioned to direct staff to look into an alternate description instead of looking at subdivision as a reference to the City Code to be more in line with the impact of the animals on the area in question. Terry seconded; all in favor, motion carries. (Holmes and Cornicelli opposed.) Balfany apologized he forgot to allow discussion. Holmes said you can buy 70 acres of land and only 4 acres are above water level. The problem with East Bethel is we have so much low land. Mundle asked if the land had to be inspected for pastureland. It has to be grazeable. Balfany said for more clarification, exactly what Winter talked about how many horses for five acres. Winter said you would still need to have grazeable acreage. She had someone who wanted to purchase ten acres and had a thick tree line. The rest of the subdivision, that you wouldn't know the 10 acres were part of it. It was clearly a parcel that could have horses but it was part of the subdivision. She thinks there is a way it can be made clearer.

Balfany said that is what you were trying to address with looking into things, correct Plaisance. Terry said we are trying to preserve a rural community. Do we think horses do that? He thinks so. Plaisance said he doesn't want to take away their responsibility to the neighborhood around them. He doesn't want to take

away the requirements they would have to make to have horses. He thinks the language doesn't meet what we want people to have in using their property.

Cornicelli said the bottom line is why they were platted this way in the first place. Are there fundamental issues with the ordinances or are we trying to shoehorn people. It is bigger picture. This isn't a good place to put horses.

Balfany said if there is a 10 acres strip, and that might look more rural, it would be great for horses. But this property wouldn't be good for horses. Cornicelli asked if when the developments are laid out, there are discussions like this with the developers.

Winter said there have been quite a few building permits issued, so we may have more discussions like this. She is saying it would be nice to have a simpler way to calculate it. If you have subdivisions that are all 5-10 acre lots and they had pasture land, it would probably be ok to have animals on it. The other thing you have to keep in mind is everything that gets developed in the City from now on is 1 per 10 acres, unless it is in the sewer and water district.

Cornicelli said he is perfectly fine with revisiting overall, but it is not ok to look at it for one person. Balfany said he doesn't think that we would have had the discussion if Winter hadn't provided the example she did. Cornicelli said he would change his vote. Balfany said he doesn't think that is necessary because the motion passed. But he is sure Jill will note that in the verbatim minutes. Which you can review next month. Cornicelli said he is going to start talking New York fast so she won't be able to get it.

**Comprehensive
Plan/Zoning/Ordinan
ce Changes
A. Travel Trailer
Regulations**

Requested Action:

Make a recommendation to City Council to adopt Travel Trailer Regulations per City Attorney

Background Information:

Ms. Krueger appeared before the City Council at a public forum on July 17, 2013 and the Council requested that the City Attorney look in to this. Below is an excerpt from the Council meeting and the Attorney's response.

Mundle asked if this was a full size trailer. Winter said no, it is a travel trailer.

Winter stated a summary of what occurred at the last City Council meeting. Nancy Krueger, "I live in Blaine, 515 98th Avenue. My address in East Bethel is 18467 Lakeview Point Drive NE. I don't reside there. It is a small camping lot. In 2003 I purchased 50 feet of lakeshore on Coon Lake. It had on a boat house and combination storage shed and outhouse. It was advertised in the Anoka Shopper as 'a camping lot.' I have been there for 10 years; put a camper on it, put in a nice new dock. I bought a pontoon. I use it for my family, and my kids live in Ham Lake so they are close by. This spring there was some local people that started parking pontoons illegally and the sheriff came and made them take them out. The inspector came and made sure they took them out. In doing so, he had to pass by my property. This was Nick Schmitz and I got a letter from him that

neither campers nor outhouses were allowed in East Bethel and I had to move my property. It is not actually on a City street. I worked with Jack Davis and Nate Ayshford to keep the road open. I went into the City Ordinances and it seems to me that the intention is more for people not to come in and park a mobile home or camper on a lot and reside in it. Which I understand. You wouldn't want your neighbors turning your neighborhood into a trailer park."

"But, my lot is not visible from the street. I only have one neighbor and there is a tree line between us and they have no objections to me being there. I read through the entire City Code and Ordinance and it doesn't reference outhouses, their legality or use. On the letter I got it doesn't reference any code. It just says I can't have an outhouse in East Bethel, so I would like more clarification on that. Because it was on the property when I bought it, I didn't know there was an issue. I thought it was grandfathered in. I take good care of it. I have fixed it up a lot, as it was in disrepair. I try to be responsible with the use of the outhouse. I use organic to break down the waste and neutralize it before it goes in the ground. I am a chemist at Aveda, so I kind of know about these things and I try to be a good citizen. Last fall my batteries and propane tanks got stolen off my camper, so I got electric brought in this spring. For me to just have to move everything off... We don't sleep there. I live in Blaine and my kids live in Ham Lake. We come for the day and go out in the boat. We don't reside there. We don't have water there.

Mark Veiling, City Attorney's response – At the last council meeting a lady appeared raising the issue of the city's enforcement of its ordinances to her circumstances and her placement of a travel trailer onto an unbuildable lot. As she appeared to the council to have an issue they were sympathetic to having a well maintained lot and cared for travel trailer. I have reviewed the ordinance and attach my thoughts as to a possible solution yet not opening the door to widespread use of the provision.

Recommend City adopt regulations per City Attorney, provided it is not a permanent resident, there is a means to dispose of waste, and it is classified Seasonal Recreational under property tax classification.

Winter reference section 134. The attorney is suggesting adding language. If you look at the script that is before you, look at the lighter gray area. Essentially what he is saying is travel trailers are exempt if they are in section 134B and comply with the paragraphs. If it is located on lot, owned by the property owner, meets setback requirements as measured to the travel trailer, has a lawful onsite disposal of waste and doesn't provide a nuisance can exist on the site.

The reason it is before you tonight. As staff we had an opportunity to review it and we wanted Planning Commission to review it. This lot is classified as seasonal recreational from a tax standpoint at the county level. That would be one of the addendums that she would want added. Otherwise what you could have happen is if someone tore down, like on Maple Street, that property is not classified as seasonal recreational by Anoka County. We certainly don't want to open this up so we have travel trailers on lots all over East Bethel.

Cornicelli asked if there was an outhouse on the parcel. Winter said yes, and she doesn't know a lot about that. Mundle asked if it was a Jimmy John type of outhouse. Balfany said it sounded like it already existed on the property. Winter said it is not a hole in the ground. It has a tank that can be pumped. Balfany said it is addressed in the documents, as long as it is conforming. Holmes said this struck home for him. He just wants to go through some of it. The State of MN has a grandfather clause that started in 1927. An outhouse is an item with no definite septic system. So that means, that Jimmy Johns, so if we are not supposed to have outhouses, we should take them out of our own parks. If she bought the house with the outhouse on it. What is actually an outhouse? Mundle asked if it would be grandfathered if the house changes possession. With the grandfather clause, yes it would be.

Holmes looked at the website for the codes and the codes that are on our website are muni codes and not our actual codes. Someone should review that, because it isn't our code. Balfany said we will be meeting next week and we can review that. Holmes said he couldn't find what the attorney has and it wasn't on the website. Winter said our code is on Municode and it should be there. Holmes said he read the whole thing and couldn't find what the attorney was referencing. That is something else that should be change. The Municode is just for cities without code and they just adopt it. Winter said the Municode is a company that we have all our codification done and it includes our zoning. Holmes said no that is where they have codes you can adopt if you don't have any. Plaisance said I thought they had our actual code on there. Winter said they do. Balfany said we can address that. Holmes said he couldn't find it. If other people can't find it, and I can't. Some cities have adopted the truth in housing section in the State. That would help on people buying properties in East Bethel. He thinks the City Council should look into it. Even the guy that in Coon Beach it would have helped. He went and looked at this property and he thinks it has a boat house on it. There is a structure close to the water. Cornicelli said it is a dock. Holmes said no, it is a boat house. Balfany said it is identified here "it had a boat house, combination storage shed and outhouse".

Holmes said it was there when they bought the property. It is a very small lot. The State of Minnesota says there are three types of lakes – recreational (Coon Lake). Winter said it might be general development. Holmes said anyways there are different setbacks for different types of lakes. The DNR makes those rules. Before the City Council makes a decision, they should determine what type of lake it is. Mundle said it is general development. Holmes said there are different prerequisites on that, which we need to abide by. The biggest thing to look at is the grandfather clause. Putting the travel trailer on, they have to abide by the setbacks and clearances. That trailer is not 100 feet from the lake shore. That is a minor item. He has been through this a couple times before. There are so many entities that have to look at this. On the travel trailer, most communities have this, a travel trailer is considered 400 feet or less. Bigger than that is considered a mobile home. And if they are over that, it is a considered a modular home. We should put those definitions in our ordinance.

Winter said our zoning ordinance is under an appendix in Municode. She was going to look up the definition of travel trailer, we should add it. She is assuming

it would fit. Holmes said with general development, you would have to look and see if a travel trailer is allowed. A recreational lake you can have a travel trailer. If that is the case, no matter what they can't have it. It is something you have to balance out by a whole lot of areas. Balfany said it is good that we put this back up through Council. Holmes wanted everyone to know all the problems there is with this. We need to know setbacks, what type of lake it is, grandfather clause, outhouse, etc. before a decision is made.

The recreational lake we have in the community is Menard Lake and the general development lake we have in the community is Coon Lake.

Balfany said Holmes is recommending prior to a recommendation going forward to Council that the general development rules be reviewed. Holmes said they have to be reviewed. That is something that the City Council will have to look into.

Ronning said his recollection is that it is an unbuildable lot. The Council seemed sympathetic.

Holmes said even on a non-buildable lot, it depends on the lake designation. Balfany said Winter would be looking at the lake designation. Terry asked on 3B number 2, asked why it would matter. Winter said they are exempt; a campground on Coon Lake would have that privilege. Terry asked why a new campground wouldn't have that privilege. Winter said due to the new rules, a campground wouldn't be allowed on the lake. Balfany said it would be a grandfather clause. Winter said the shoreline ordinance, basically would not allow something like that to go in.

Balfany asked if anyone had any other questions. Winter thanked Holmes for his information. Balfany said in summary we like the way it looks, but we need a travel trailer definition, outhouse definition, and what the general development lakes rules are. Balfany asked if they wanted the seasonal lot on a County level. Mundle said if it is not marked as a seasonal lot on the County level, would having this on here, would allow anyone to put a travel trailer on a lot. Winter said that would be her concern. Balfany said yes that would create rules so someone couldn't just tear down there house and put up a travel trailer. Mundle said that is what he wanted to clarify. Holmes said we should have more say so than the City or County. That is another reason the City Council should look into the Truth in Housing. It would fix a lot of issues ahead of time. It is basic stuff. Winter said in order to get a loan, don't they have to do it. Holmes said no, only 16 cities have it so far. This would provide an inspection prior to a house closing. Mundle said he wouldn't agree with that. The paperwork they get at closing tells them they can do that, but to require it, he would be opposed to that. They can either do it or not. Balfany said it is something we might want to take a look at in the future. Winter said anything in the shoreline district; they must pass inspection before selling a home. She would imagine a high percentage of people would ask for an inspection. Mundle said it is about 50/50. Winter said she will provide the City Council with the information.

Cornicelli asked how many lots are like this. Winter said this is the only one we

know of. Cornicelli asked are we changing code for one individual, or all. Balfany said it is for both. So it is taken care of for the future. Winter said it could be that we will have others of these. If they tear down an old house, and then pull in a travel trailer. Mundle said you are going to add a number four, on the County designation. Winter said you might want to put it all into a motion and direct staff.

Balfany motioned to direct staff to send to City Council with Planning Commission's recommendation Section 34, 183 amended by the City Attorney with the additions of a clear travel trailer definition, the seasonal property designation of the Count, the definition for the outhouse and the general development rules. Seconded by Holmes; all in favor, motion carries.

B. Special Meeting of City Council, EDA, Planning Commission on Monday, September 23, 2013 at 7:00 PM

Winter asked Ronning if the Council discussed it at the City Council meeting. Ronning said there was minimal discussion on it. His recollection was more like why. What are we doing? Winter said the reason we were going to have the meeting. Ronning interrupted Winter and said he was wondering what prompted it. Where did it surface from? Balfany asked if that was the opinion of the Council. Ronning said there was minimal discussion, just opinions. Balfany said then the Council had no desire to meet with the two groups, or was it why. Ronning said it was more like why. Winter said there were two main. Ronning interrupted Winter and said there should be a purpose and not necessarily an agenda, or some topics. Winter said it would be the Hwy 65 Corridor and MIDS. Balfany said we all know what they mean. Just to address why, for me, it would be an excellent idea. That is what we have discussed for the past few months, trying to get together with EDA and Council, so we are all on the same page when it comes to the Hwy 65 Corridor. We are talking about the MIDS; this group has spent an abundant amount of time on. So we can all be on the same page and so the other groups can understand where we are coming from, and likewise we can understand the direction of City Council and also hear from EDA and staff. To him the question isn't why, but why not. We shouldn't we be getting together and making sure we are acting as one body. So we can move forward in the same direction.

Winter said the Council has said before the Planning Commission and EDA are recommending bodies and the Council has the final say. So this would be a way for the Council to hear from the other groups and move forward in the same direction in regards to the Hwy 65 Corridor.

Balfany said the date works for the majority of us. Consensus was it worked for the Commission. Winter said she will forward it to the City Administrator to take it to the Council.

Approve July 23, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Terry said they were well written minutes. Holmes motioned to approve the July 23, 2013 minutes. Mundle seconded, all in favor, motion carries unanimously.

Other Business/City Council Report

Holmes said he got this about the minutes, and how they are being taken. The actual ruling from Rebecca Otto, the State Auditor, there is a synopsis on how the meeting should be written up. He has that all right here. Well one thing is they talk about not being, there are so many items here. He wishes he would have had something for everyone. In the matter of motions, how they are done, there has to be a roll call vote. That should be in the minutes. Whether it was defeated. The description of the motion. If the minutes need to be recorded word by word by word, they tell you forget that. They shouldn't be so particular. We want to go and revise our minutes. Where is this, the general idea it is fine. Balfany said one verb can change the meaning. Holmes said if it comes to a court situation, picky minutes, you might as well kiss your options goodbye. Holmes said we do a lot of the stuff right now, this also is a law and how the minutes should be taken for the City Council too. It describes parks and roads and everything. He provided it to Winter. The minutes need to be approved by the governing body and signed by the Committee Chair. Those minutes should be signed. Otherwise they aren't legal. It also states that audio and visual recordings are not meeting minutes and not a substitute for meeting minutes. There are some communities that do it that way. They should be signed and dated by designated member. There are some things that we should be doing and we aren't. He thinks that going word by word, is a bad deal. We should put down the minimum per se. We would be doing it legally and he thinks it is the way to go. Cornicelli said you are preaching to the choir. The Council doesn't agree with that. Our recommendation was to do it the right. Ronning said it is to be recorded and maintained for indefinite. Holmes said it shows about motions and readings. Ronning said he is not interested in having the beginning and the end. There is the reason you have a majority. The majority decided the way things are especially we want to keep verbatim minutes. The minutes are the official recording of the meeting. You have reaffirmed that. Holmes said since he has been in the City, he doesn't know any meeting that is according to the State. None of them are legal. Ronning said to have verbatim minutes, you have to have a court reporter and we don't. He said he probably shouldn't say this but, there is a reasonable facsimile as you can get as close as you can to verbatim minutes.

Holmes said the minutes do not have to record the discussion, but a summary thereof. Minutes should not be cluttered with unnecessary detail that will hamper finding information at a later date. So, he is just bringing it up. Let it fall where it may. Balfany said it goes in hand with other discussions by this Commission and forwarded recommendation to the City Council. This Commission wanted shorter summary minutes, since we are not exactly at verbatim. As it was described, the clutter, we don't need every minute detail. Holmes said other Planning Commission minutes we have looked over, like Terry or others will say change them to say, I said such and such. That is pretty technical. It states in here, you should probably say in here, you agreed to the position. Not verbatim word for word. Balfany said we are all in agreement on that. Holmes said he is just bringing it up and will give it to winter

Ronning said food for thought, the way the process runs, if you have a disagreement with the legislative litigation, there is a disagreement to what the words mean, then it gets down to intent. The only way you establish intent is by going to the background. What created it to begin with? After people are dead

you do that. You go to the minutes. We all have opinions.

Terry said he was looking at a campground for sale and was trying to find it on the internet. He was doing a Google search. He has been here since 1997, and he has been on the Planning Commission since then. He didn't know we had Minnesota's largest nudist colony here. Mundle said you are just finding that out now. Holmes said why do you think there are so many airplanes flying over our City? Terry said it is a forty acre property. Cornicelli said we need to review the zoning ordinances. Thank goodness for verbatim minutes, they will all know it now. Tanner will inspect it tomorrow.

Ronning said you have read in the paper about the budget and levy. It is 17.3%. We met yesterday looking at finite areas to trim the budget. They looked hard and at the point you get deeper into things, you're going to have to cut this and services as well. What it boils down to, what you want to keep for the City. We have a rough thing to work with. Balfany said we were at that point where we are going to start losing services. Ronning said that is what most of what was meaningful from the last meeting. He knew what he was getting into. It is what it is. You get dealt one hand of cards and you have to play it. This is the main thing right now. Nothing else comes to mind other than that. That is going to be a lot. There is a Town Hall meeting and this will be one of the topics for the meeting – the levy. It should be interesting.

Adjournment

Holmes made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m. Cornicelli seconded; all in favor, motion carries.

Submitted by:

Jill Anderson
Recording Secretary