

EAST BETHEL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
May 24, 2016

The Planning Commission met for a regular meeting at 7:00 pm at East Bethel City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Plaisance, Chair Glenn Terry Tanner Balfany
 Eldon Holmes Sherry Allenspach

ABSENT: Lorraine Bonin
 Lou Cornicelli

ALSO PRESENT: Colleen Winter, Community Development Director
 Tim Harrington, City Council Liaison

1. Call to Order Chair Plaisance called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Before calling for adoption of the agenda, Chair Plaisance noted that both agenda item 7 and 8 are public hearings this evening.

2. Adopt Agenda **Mr. Balfany moved and Mr. Terry seconded to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.**

3. Approval of **Mr. Holmes moved and Ms. Allenspach seconded to approve the 4/26/16**
4/26/16 Minutes **minutes as written. Motion carried.**

4. Farm Animals Owner/Property Location:
IUP/ Public Ms. Stream
Hearing 20856 Kissel St NE
 East Bethel, MN 55011
 PIN: 13-33-23-31-0007

Background Information:

Ms. Stream is requesting an IUP for farm animals for the keeping of six (6) chickens on the 1.99 acre parcel they own. The chickens will be housed in a chicken coop (5 ft. x 12 ft.) and have a 10 ft. x 12 ft. covered run which will be located 51 feet from the property line. This property is zoned Rural Residential. The City of East Bethel recently passed an ordinance related to chickens on properties between .5 and 3 acres in size. Per our City Code NO roosters are allowed to be kept on a property.

Recommendation(s):

Ms. Winter stated City Staff is requesting the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of an IUP for keeping 6 chickens for Ms. Stream, located at 20856 Kissel St NE, East Bethel, MN 55011, PIN 13-33-23-31-0007 and read the requested conditions for the IUP.

Chair Plaisance opened the public hearing at 7:04 pm.

Deanna Kenberg spoke in favor of Ms. Stream having the chickens.

Chair Plaisance closed the public hearing at 7:05 pm.

Mr. Balfany moved and Mr. Terry seconded to recommend City Council approval an IUP for keeping six (6) chickens for Ms. Stream, located at 20856 Kissel St NE, East Bethel, MN 55011, PIN 13-33-23-31-0007 with the following conditions: 1. An Interim Use Permit Agreement must be signed and executed by the applicants and the City; 2. Applicants must comply with City Code Section 10. Article V. Farm Animals and Ordinance 51, Third Series; 3. Permit shall expire when: a. The property is sold, or b. Non-compliance of IUP conditions; 4. Property owner shall have thirty (30) days to remove the approved domestic farm animals upon expiration of the IUP; 5. Conditions of the IUP must be met no later than July 1, 2016. IUP will not be issued until all conditions are met. Failure to meet conditions will result in the null and void of the IUP; 6. The IUP shall be for a term of three (3) years at which time the applicant will be required to re-apply for an IUP; 7. Property will be inspected and evaluated annually by city staff. Motion carried.

5. Farm Animals
IUP/ Public
Hearing

Owner/Property Location:
Ms. Persons
2630 196th Ave NE
East Bethel, MN 55011
PIN: 27-33- 23-22- 0004

Background Information:

Ms. Persons is requesting an IUP for farm animals for the keeping of up to five (5) chickens on her property. In the future, if Ms. Persons wishes to keep other farm animals on her property she will need to apply for a separate IUP.

The chickens will be housed in a chicken coop which will be located 125 feet from the property line. This property is zoned Rural Residential. The lot size is 6.44 acres.

Recommendation(s):

Ms. Winter stated City Staff is requesting the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of an IUP for keeping chickens for Ms. Persons, located at 2630 196th Ave NE, East Bethel, MN 55011, PIN 27-33-23-22-0004 and read the requested conditions for the IUP.

Chair Plaisance opened the public hearing at 7:08 pm. With no one coming forward to speak, Chair Plaisance closed the public hearing at 7:08 pm.

Mr. Terry moved and Ms. Allenspach seconded to recommend City Council approve an IUP for keeping five (5) chickens for Ms. Persons, located at 2630 196th Ave NE, East Bethel, MN 55011, PIN 27-33-23-22-0004 with the following conditions: 1. An Interim Use Permit Agreement must be signed and executed by the applicants and the City; 2. Applicants must comply with City Code Section 10. Article V. Farm Animals; 3. Permit shall expire when: a. The property is sold, or b. Non-compliance of IUP conditions; 4.

Property owner shall have thirty (30) days to remove the approved domestic farm animals upon expiration of the IUP; 5. Conditions of the IUP must be met no later than July 1, 2016. IUP will not be issued until all conditions are met. Failure to meet conditions will result in the null and void of the IUP; 6. The IUP shall be for a term of three (3) years at which time the applicant will be required to re-apply for an IUP; 7. Property will be inspected and evaluated annually by city staff. Motion carried.

6. Private
Kennel IUP/
Public Hearing

Owner/Property Location:
Stacey Persons
2630 196th Ave NE
East Bethel, MN 55011
PIN: 27-33- 23-22- 0004

Background Information:

Ms. Persons is requesting an IUP for a private kennel license for the keeping of six (6) dogs on the 6.44 acre parcel she owns. Currently, she has one (1) Great Dane and one (1) Golden Retriever. The dogs are kept in a fenced in area in the backyard. The dogs have proof of rabies vaccinations and are currently licensed with the city.

East Bethel City Code Chapter 10, Article II. Dogs, allows up to six (6) dogs on parcels five (5) acres or more but less than ten (10) acres with an approved private kennel license. Code requires dogs be confined to the property, outdoor housing facilities must not encroach on any setbacks, housing and shelter must be provided, feces shall be removed in a timely manner, and accumulation of feces must not be located within 200 feet for any well.

The following conditions are mandatory for the issuance of a private kennel license:

1. Housing enclosures shall be located as not to create a nuisance and shall not encroach upon any setback area.
2. Dogs shall be confined to their own property by a provable means.
3. Housing and shelter must be provided which will keep animals comfortable and protected from the elements.
4. Accumulations of feces shall be located at least 200 feet from any well.
5. All accumulations of feces shall be removed at such periods as will ensure that no leaching or objectionable odors exist, and the premises shall not be allowed to become unsightly.
6. All dogs shall have access to indoor housing from the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.
7. The city council reserves the right to issue additional conditions on a case-by-case basis in order to maintain the public repose.
8. Kennels shall be considered an accessory structure for setback purposes.

Recommendation(s):

Ms. Winter stated City Staff is requesting the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of an IUP/Private Kennel License for no more than

six (6) dogs for Ms. Persons, located at 2630196th Ave NE, East Bethel, MN 5501; PIN: 27-33- 23-22- 0004; Zoning Rural residential and read the IUP/Private Kennel conditions.

Chair Plaisance opened the public hearing at 7:12 pm.

Mary Arellano next door neighbor to Stacey and Frankie, said she had a good relationship with her neighbors and would like to keep it that way. Her main concern is the number of dogs that will be allowed on the property. Ms. Winter clarified that the maximum is six (6) dogs. Ms. Arellano is also concerned with her sightline to the dogs, how it will be kept, noise, and clean-up of feces. She currently does not hear Ms. Persons' two dogs, but if more dogs are kept outside there could be a noise problem. When the owners are not present will the dogs be kept outside? Will having a kennel next to her property affect her ability to sell her property? Will traffic increase with the sale of dogs?

John Stebe, 19539 Rochester Street, was terrorized by dogs that lived next to him for 17 years; the City did nothing to abate those dogs. There were only supposed to be two dogs, sometimes there were four. When a sheriff was at Mr. Stebe's property and a dog charged him and the sheriff grabbed his gun. The barking was constant; the City did nothing about it. The neighbor's finally moved and Mr. Stebe can have his windows open at night. He can't believe the City is going to allow a kennel, as they do nothing to keep it in compliance. Until the City deals with dog problems, he cannot support a private kennel IUP. He has seen loose dogs and heard barking dogs from that area. Mr. Stebe asked what the process is for handling dog problems and waited for a response from the Commissioners. Chair Plaisance explained that this is a public hearing for residents to be heard and that the Commission will address any items they deem as a concern. Chair Plaisance said that he himself doesn't have all the answers; they will have to come from staff and the property owners themselves. Mr. Stebe stated that the law is subjective. The City does nothing to protect peoples' rights.

Phil Olson, 19406 East Bethel Blvd., lives in back of the property and has noticed a few roaming dogs since the house is being built. Mr. Olson has a dog, is he required to have a permit for a kennel? Chair Plaisance stated, no, two dogs are permitted. Mr. Olson has noticed a golden retriever roaming in his yard and now knows where it is coming from; he understands that a fence is not yet built. Initially he thought this was to be a commercial kennel, but understands that it is a private kennel. He agreed with Mr. Stebe that dog noise is a problem in East Bethel. He asked what is a private kennel if the statute is not enforced and maintained to ensure it stays private. The City will need to follow-up if it is to become a breeding establishment. His primary concern is barking dogs. He lives a small distance from the property, so he will not be as affected as others that live closer. He is concerned with roaming dogs and having young kids, toddlers, in the neighborhood. No more concern with Ms. Persons' dogs than a neighboring dog, but if this develops into something bigger and is no longer a private kennel, then he is concerned about it. The City needs to enforce both the noise and nuisance ordinances.

Max McCullough 19509 Rochester St. NE, lives across the sod field from the resident and he can hear dogs barking at night and does not want to hear more. He moved from Minneapolis to have peace and quiet. He understands people move here with ideas of what they want to do, but believes people should read City ordinances to know what is allowed before they purchase property. He has no problem with people wanting to have kennels, but he doesn't understand how they will keep six dogs from barking at the chickens. He doesn't want to hear barking nor have to call the sheriff to deal with mundane dog issues; sheriffs shouldn't be bothered with barking dogs when they should be protecting people.

Ms. Allenspach asked if the applicant could respond to the comments made.

Ms. Persons stated her dogs are house dogs and mainly go outside to go to the bathroom. Since the fence is not yet installed, her dogs are on a cable lead while they are outside. She too has heard dogs barking, but it is not from her property. She too has had a golden retriever wander onto her property, so she keeps her dogs inside for that reason also. There is a lab that is coming to her property too and that has been constant since she moved in.

Mr. Terry asked about her intention for six dogs. Ms. Persons would like to have golden retrievers. She currently has a female great dane that is spayed and a male golden retriever that is neutered. Eventually, it would be nice to have a pair of golden retrievers that would have a litter, but that is many years down the road, as there is a lot of testing, health certifications, etc. that goes into the breeding process. Her intention is not to suddenly have six dogs, but to allow for eventual breeding to have six dogs.

Chair Plaisance asked for clarification that Item 2 of the City Code Chapter 10, Article II will be met by having a fence built? Ms. Persons said the fence is to be built this week, depending on the weather conditions. It will be approx. 350' of fencing. Her dogs do not stay out at night. Chair Plaisance noted that Ms. Persons does work during the day and asked if the dogs will be kept inside and if there is someone at the residence during the day? Ms. Persons said she stops by the house throughout the day and that her significant other works 3rd shift, so he is there during the day.

Mr. Balfany asked if she has had any previous problems with neighbors and/or noise complaints. Ms. Persons said none. Mr. Balfany also noted concerns with sightline, what type of fence will be installed? Ms. Persons said a chain link fence will be installed. However, if Ms. Arellano wants a wooden privacy fence on her side, Ms. Persons would be willing to have that installed. Ms. Persons wants to have a good relationship with her neighbors.

Ms. Allenspach clarified that neighbors should call and report if there are dogs running around the neighborhood that look like Ms. Persons' dogs. Ms. Persons said yes, because they are not her dogs.

Mr. Holmes asked if Ms. Persons read and understands the City Code regarding animals, that there is a barking ordinance, and a leash ordinance for confinement on the property, and that if there is a problem with any of these ordinances that the IUP could be revoked. Ms. Persons said yes.

It was clarified that the public hearing was still in session, so the resident in the audience was allowed to speak.

Mary Arellano, mentioned that the term kennel made her think of raising many, many dogs. She did speak positively on behalf of Ms. Persons and her neighborhood; is very quiet with having about eight dogs around and that she doesn't hear barking. She has never heard Ms. Persons' dogs bark and confirmed that the dogs are kept inside and when outside are watched.

John Stebe, 19539 Rochester Street, asked now that this is going to be a commercial kennel for breeding, raising, and selling dogs, does it require a business license. Chair Plaisance said this is not a commercial business, but that the application is for an IUP/Private Kennel.

Ms. Winter clarified that according to City Code, if a dog is under four months old it is not considered to be part of the number of dogs that can be on a property. She thought that there are residents whose dogs have litters, but the puppies are gone before reaching 4 months.

Chair Plaisance closed the public hearing at 7:38 pm.

Mr. Terry commented that he too had to deal with a neighbor's dogs and that police were involved many times. He believes the issue lies with the person raising the dog, rather than the dog with no training. He appreciated the testimony Ms. Arellano regarding the quiet and control of Ms. Persons' dogs.

Ms. Allenspach said she too had to deal a neighbor's bad dogs and has a bite mark on her leg. If Ms. Persons is controlling her dogs, she is supportive.

Chair Plaisance noted that it is always a concern when bringing other animals to your neighborhood and that it is key to work with your neighbors.

Mr. Holmes moved and Mr. Balfany seconded to recommend City Council approve an IUP/Private Kennel License for no more than six (6) dogs for Ms. Persons, located at 2630 196th Ave NE, East Bethel, MN 55011, PIN 27-33-23-22-0004 with the following conditions: 1. An Interim Use Permit Agreement/Private Kennel License must be signed and executed by the applicants and the City; 2. Applicants must comply with City Code Chapter 10, Division II, Dogs; 3. Permit shall expire when: a. The property is sold, b. The IUP expires, or c. Non-compliance of IUP conditions; 5. Property owner shall have thirty (30) days to remove dogs upon expiration or termination of the IUP/Private Kennel License; 6. The IUP shall be for a term of three (3) years at which time the applicant will be required to

re-apply for an IUP; 7. Property will be inspected and evaluated annually by city staff. Motion carried.

7. Review
Zoning
Ordinance –
Light Industrial,
Exterior Storage,
and Screening

Ms. Winter reiterated that this is a public hearing.

Requested Action:
Review and comment relating to proposed changes

Background Information:

In January 2016, City Staff met with Chad and Megan Toft, CST Companies, LLC to discuss their interest in relocating and consolidating their business operations in East Bethel, Minnesota on the Mike Wyatt property, 23805 Highway 65 NE in an area zoned Light Industrial. Based on the information provided by CST at that time, the business fell under the following categories in the Light Industrial District:

- Office
- Warehouse and Distribution
- Manufacturing

In 2016-2017 the City of East Bethel will be completing a Comprehensive Plan update and as part of that process there will be an update to the Zoning Ordinance. In the meantime, City staff is requesting that the Planning Commission review and consider changes to the following areas of the Zoning Ordinance.

- Light Industrial – permitted and conditional uses
- Exterior Storage – additional clarification and changes
- Screening – additional language
- Definitions – additional language

The changes as proposed do not change the overall Comprehensive Plan for the City, but are intended to align the existing Zoning ordinance with the existing Comprehensive plan. These items are discussion only at this time and will be the background and framework for a proposed work session with the City Council on June 8, 2016. Any changes that are made will be interim in nature. As we begin the discussions related to the upcoming Comprehensive Plan, other categories such a Medium Industrial, Transition Industrial, Mixed use Industrial/Commercial may all be considered as part of the Comprehensive Plan update.

City Code, Appendix A, Zoning, Section 48, Light Industrial was adopted in 2007. Due to a previous City Moratorium on all development in the Hwy. 65 Corridor, the recessionary period of 2009 -2012 accompanied by the associated slow recovery from this economic downturn and the City’s geographic location in relation to the surrounding and immediate market areas of Blaine, Forest Lake and Cambridge, commercial and industrial development in East Bethel has been dormant since 2008.

As a result, the application of the Light Industrial section of the City Code has never been used to evaluate a proposed use within this zoning designation. A

proposal by CST Companies to locate in the City has been the first test of this section of the City Code and, as such, revealed a number of material weaknesses in our Ordinance.

Staff is of the opinion that amendments are needed to this section of the Zoning Ordinance to remove the existing ambiguities that currently permit most any activity. A proposed revision would only be an interim modification and a final review of this section would be performed during the 2017 preparation of the Comprehensive Plan. This change would provide protection from uses which may be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and beyond the objective of the intended goal of this portion of the Ordinance.

The proposed changes include but not limited to:

Section 48 – Light Industrial District

Purpose – Added language better defining uses in this zoning category.

Permitted Uses – Added Manufacturing, light; Brewery/taprooms, Retail sales, Repair services

Permitted uses eliminated – eliminated Medical Science uses, Recreation Public, Wholesaling, Adult uses, Self-service storage, Construction sales and services

Accessory Uses, added as category – included fuel tanks

Conditional Uses – Adult uses, Construction sales and services, Maintenance facilities, Exterior storage, Telecommunication facilities, Mining.

Prohibited Uses – Added in category

Clean up and clarification of other language

Section 23 – Screening Regulations

Changed Item H to make it clearer

Section 24 – Exterior Storage

Exterior Storage is a Conditional Use permit in both the Light Industrial (I1) and Highway Business (B3) Districts

Proposed changes to the amount of square footage for exterior storage and height regulations; Language included for construction yards

Exterior Display, Prohibited Storage, Parking all separate categories.

Added language for semi-trucks and construction yards

Section 9 – Definitions

Added language for Manufacturing, light

Ms. Winter stated this is for discussion only, however, it is a public hearing as well. Chair Plaisance noted this is about City Code and light industrial proposed changes – this is not about any issues pertaining or specific to CST and its application. He asked that all comments be kept general, rather than specific to complaints about CST in particular.

Chair Plaisance opened the public hearing at 7:48 pm.

Bud Flagstad, 3200 229th Avenue, asked for clarification on Item 23 mining. Is mining considered light industrial? Ms. Winter said mining was added under Conditional Use Permits in light industrial. There are two different definitions for mining – minor permit and major permit, each is dependent on the amount of dirt taken out; 1,000-5,000 cubic yards is considered a minor permit and over

5,000 is considered a major permit. Mr. Flagstad asked if hauling salt onto a site is considered part of a mining process. He understands the permitting is concerned with dirt leaving a site or coming onto a site, not salt coming in per say. He wondered who labels a business as light industrial.

Dave Landis, 1747 237th Ave. NE, said these proposals sound appealing to him and that they sound like desirable changes. He asked that if they are good that the past be measured against these desirable things and that whatever is pending in the past be measured against this. He begged the Commission to not allow past proposals to become a big blight that the residents pay the price for; the deficiencies of the past that the City is now trying to address.

Bill Lappin, 22970 Sandy Drive, asked if something was brought up about trucks and road conditions, i.e. how many hours a day trucks can go through a neighborhood, if trucks are required take the most successful way out, if a route is slow can trucks go through neighborhoods any hours of the day or night. He stated he is partially deaf, so he may have missed what was said.

Ms. Winter asked the Chair if she should address these questions now or to wait. Chair Plaisance said the public hearing is to listen to public input. When the hearing is closed, the commissioners will address issues and concerns as best as possible.

Mr. Lappin stated he hears trucks on Hwy 65 when sitting on his deck. He is from Manhattan and knows noise, that's why he moved to East Bethel. He has grandchildren is concern with having trucks driving on neighborhood roads when young kids are present.

Karen Krepis, 23050 Gopher Drive NE. Page 58 it states screening should not be less than 5' in height. She does not believe 5' is tall enough to screen and hide something.

Chair Plaisance closed the public hearing at 7:55 pm.

Ms. Winter addressed the question about trucks. One item being proposed as part of a designation of light industrial is prohibited use of truck terminals – truck terminals would not be allowed. There will need to be more of a balance and more discussion on how to define distribution and warehouse. Potentially, distribution and warehouse would be a good business. In regard to truck traffic, it can be addressed somewhat, but it has to be kept in mind that if it is light industrial use it is going to have a higher intense use. Traffic is something that could be difficult to legislate, however, that is a discussion the City Council and Planning Commission need to have, so nothing specific was put in the ordinance as far as how the City would deal with traffic. The City depends on Anoka Highway Department to address traffic and those types of concerns when permits are provided for different businesses.

Mr. Terry asked why mining is included as light industrial. Ms. Winter said that because mining is part of the current ordinance and there are specifics set aside

for mining and it's defined in the ordinance. However, if the Commission does not want it included under light industrial, it does not have to be included. Chair Plaisance asked if a building is built on a site, wouldn't the removal of dirt need a mining permit. Ms. Winter stated that would be exempt from requirements of mining. If one is actually building it's considered construction and a mining permit is not required. A mining permit is required when dirt is actually being taken off the site. Six to seven months ago the Planning Commission had a mining permit come before it, that was a minor mining permit to allow someone to put a pond on their property. If someone were to dig a pond as a storm sewer holding pond, a permit would not be required.

Mr. Terry asked if there is another zoning classification that mining is acceptable under. Ms. Winter thought minor mining could be in some rural residential areas. Mr. Terry clarified that he is asking if there is a regular industrial or heavy industrial classification. Ms. Winter stated at this time there is only light industrial. Mr. Holmes said he believed there was a mining permit for the northwest corner of Cty. Rd. 22 and Hwy 65 at one time, so that would have been for commercial use. Mr. Terry questioned this because if someone is buying a property to create a mining operation that would be a lot of truck traffic as its whole purpose is to have trucks distribute the product from mining. This would be fine in some locations, but not in others in terms of the traffic impact. Therefore, if the City is going to permit mining in light industrial, it seems there should be some stronger language regarding traffic so that there is a mechanism to protect neighborhoods where traffic could have an impact and still be allowed in other areas where that wouldn't be such a problem.

Mr. Terry stated he didn't understand why on page 2 a number of conditional uses were crossed out. Chair Plaisance said those were recommendations for removal. Mr. Terry asked the reasoning behind removing them. Ms. Winter stated that in most cases, as part of the light industrial, the City is saying B2 and B3 uses are permitted uses and are addressed under those categories.

The Planning Commission will have a joint work session with the City Council on June 8.

8. Review
Ordinance for
Subdivisions

Ms. Winter noted this is a public hearing. The City is looking at changes to Administrative subdivision requirements – Chapter 66, Article V.

Background Information:

Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission consider changes to Chapter 66, Article V as presented in Attachment 1. The changes include the addition of language to allow someone to complete a simple lot split for their property. Currently, a lot split can only occur under the Zoning Ordinance, Section 12, or by going through the complete subdivision process. For a simple lot split that can meet the requirements of the underlying zoning district, the subdivision process is not necessary and is expensive for the homeowner. It is also an impractical application of the subdivision ordinance.

Ms. Winter gave this example: Last month the Commission had the Medelberg concept plan for review. To be approved for subdividing her property into two separate parcels, Ms. Medelberg will have to go through a preliminary plat and a final plat, and incur all the costs associated with getting those plats. It doesn't make sense to have to do that for many cases when subdividing. The City does have the ability right now through a metes and bounds process to do a metes and bounds division, however, the staff is asking this language be added under the administrative subdivision.

Chair Plaisance called a five minute recess at 8:04 pm; the meeting resumed at 8:09 pm.

Ms. Winter reviewed the main points of the proposed changes for a simple lot split: Allows the division of a lot where there is an existing home on a metes and bounds described property and no new public roads are required. Subject to the following conditions:

1. The lot split will result in no more than two lots, one of which has an existing home on it.
2. The lot split does not require the creation of new roads
3. Each resulting lot has the minimum road frontage for the applicable zoning district and meets all other underlying zoning requirements
4. Adequate access to public roads must be provided for future development.
5. A lot split can only be created one time. If at a later date someone wishes to further subdivide their property they will need to meet all of the requirements of Chapter 66, exempting Article V.

In addition, it is recommended that the following be added:

7. Drainage and utility easements as required by the City.
8. Road right of way dedication as required by the City.
9. Soil report to determine buildable lot area.
10. Lowest floor elevation for newly created lot(s).
11. Known flood elevation if it exists.

Chair Plaisance opened the public hearing at 8:06 pm. With no one coming forward to speak, Chair Plaisance closed the public hearing at 8:06 pm.

Ms. Allenspach moved and Mr. Terry seconded to recommend the City Council accept the proposed changes as recommended by staff to the Administrative Subdivision Requirements – Chapter 66, Article V. Motion carried.

9. City Council Report

Mr. Harrington, City Council liaison reported:

- Congressman Tom Emmer was at the May 4 Council Meeting for a Q & A session.
- Council approved Oskar Granquist as an EDA member.
- City Council has request CST do an EAW.
- Parks Commission 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Plan passed.
- Castle Towers decommissioning has saved about \$300,000 by removing a lot of the sludge.

- Parks Commission 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Plan passed.

Mr. Harrington reminded residents that the City of East Bethel does have an animal control person and to call City Hall before calling the Sheriff's Department. The animal control person is readily available to help with animal issues.

10. Other Business Ms. Winter noted that Update of the Comp Plan will be another agenda item for the special meeting on June 8.

Met Council's grant application was received today with the City receiving approximately \$32,000 for their participation in East Bethel's update. Requests for proposals should be sent out this week.

11. Adjourn **Mr. Holmes moved and Ms. Allenspach seconded to adjourn at 8:13 pm. Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Gessner, Recording Secretary
Submitted 5/28/16