

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CALL TO ORDER ..... 2

2. PRESENTATION..... 2

3. CITIZEN INPUT ..... 2

4. APPROVE AGENDA ..... 3

5. CONSENT AGENDA ..... 3

6. PUBLIC HEARING ..... 4

    6.01: Introduce Ordinance #21-11 Amending Chapter 10 of City Code to Include Requirements for Keeping Cats and Roosters, and to Amend Standards for Agricultural Animals and Beekeeping..... 4

7. COUNCIL BUSINESS..... 7

    7.01: Adopt Ordinance #21-16 Repealing Ordinances #20-11, #20-12, and #20-13 in regard to Franchise Fees on Centerpoint Energy, Connexus Energy and City of Anoka Electric ..... 7

    7.02: Adopt Resolution #21-183 Denying an Easement Encroachment Agreement for an attached accessory structure in a drainage and utility easement at 16206 Sapphire Street NW; Case of William Cowette (Proj. 21-119)..... 12

    7.03: Authorization to Enter Into Negotiations for Design/Bid/Build Services for the New Water Treatment Plant..... 16

    7.04: Adopt Resolution #21-221 Approving Amendment to Development Agreement for COR Sapphire Addition; Case of PSD, LLC ..... 16

    7.05: Adopt Resolution #21-222 Approving Joint Powers Agreement with Anoka County for Interim Bunker Lake Boulevard/County Road 116 Improvements ..... 17

    7.06: Adopt Resolution #21-216 Approving an Abatement of 7009 Highway 10 NW ..... 18

    7.07: Adopt Resolution #21-209 Approving an Abatement of 6336 Highway 10 NW; Case of JAC Auto..... 21

    7.08: Adopt Resolution #21-218 Granting Amended Interim Use Permit for St. Katharine Drexel 23

8. MAYOR, COUNCIL AND STAFF INPUT ..... 24

9. ADJOURNMENT ..... 24

**CITY COUNCIL  
CITY OF RAMSEY  
ANOKA COUNTY  
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The Ramsey City Council conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, July 27, 2021, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Mayor Mark Kuzma  
Councilmember Ryan Heineman  
Councilmember Chelsee Howell  
Councilmember Debra Musgrove  
Councilmember Chris Riley  
Councilmember Dan Specht  
Councilmember Matt Woestehoff

Members Absent: None

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis Ulrich  
City Engineer Bruce Westby  
Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl  
Planning Technician Brian McCain – attended remotely  
Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Bria Raines – attended remotely  
Utilities Supervisor John Nelson

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Kuzma called the regular meeting of the Ramsey City Council to order at 7:05 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance led by Mayor Kuzma.

City Administrator Kurt Ulrich stated a Councilmember requested that Agenda Item 5.16 be removed from Consent Agenda. He added this will be addressed as Agenda Item 7.8.

**2. PRESENTATION**

None.

**3. CITIZEN INPUT**

Liam Steinberg, 15440 Yakima Street NW, stated he is 9 years old. He requested the City Council's consideration of an Ordinance amendment to allow ducks on properties of 3 acres or more, which is the same regulations as chickens. He stated ducks should have the same parameters as chickens. He added ducks are an under-appreciated species, and they do not need much water

or space. They are less destructive to lawns and gardens than chickens, and they help with pest management.

Mr. Steinberg stated ducks make great pets and are adaptable to life with other animals and people. He added the immune system of a duck is better and hardier than a chicken. He noted he hopes the City can change the Ordinance to identify ducks in the same ways as chickens.

#### **4. APPROVE AGENDA**

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to approve the agenda as amended, with the addition of Agenda Item 7.8.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

#### **5. CONSENT AGENDA**

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to approve the following items on the Consent Agenda as revised to remove Item 5:16.

- 5.01: Receive Cash & Investments for Period Ending June 30 2021
- 5.02: Note the Following Boards, Commissions, Committee Meeting Minutes:
  - Park and Recreation Commission Meeting Minutes Dated April 8, 2021
  - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Dated May 6, 2021
  - Economic Development Authority Meeting Minutes Dated May 13, 2021
  - Economic Development Authority Meeting Minutes Dated June 10, 2021
  - Park and Recreation Commission Meeting Minutes Dated June 10, 2021
  - Public Works Committee Meeting Minutes Dated June 15, 2021
  - Environmental Policy Board Meeting Minutes Dated June 28, 2021
- 5.03: Consider Approving Modification for COR Infiltration Basin Pumping Station Inlet
- 5.04: Approve the Following Meeting Minutes:
  - City Council Work Session dated 7/13/2021
  - City Council Regular Session dated 7/13/2021
- 5.05: Approve Business Licenses
- 5.06: Approve Rental Licenses
- 5.07: Adopt Resolution #21-211 Approving Cash Disbursements Made and Authorizing Payment of Accounts Payable Invoicing Received During the Period of July 8, 2021 through July 21, 2021
- 5.08: Adopt Resolution #21-195 Ordering Plans and Specifications for Improvement Project #21-10, Fire Station No. 1 Parking Lot Improvements
- 5.09: Adopt Resolution #21-200 Accepting Bids and Awarding Contract for Improvement Project #21-12, 2021 Additional Pavement Overlay Improvements

- 5:10: Adopt Resolution #21-201 Authorizing Partial Payment No. 3 to Kuechle Underground, Inc. for Improvement Project #21-00, Riverdale Drive Reconstruction, Feldspar Street to Sunfish Lake Boulevard
- 5:11: Adopt Resolution #21-205 Authorizing Partial Payment No. 1 to North Valley, Inc., for Improvement Project #21-05, 2021 MSA Pavement Overlay Improvements
- 5:12: Adopt Resolution #21-206 Authorizing Partial Payment No. 1 to North Valley, Inc. for Improvement Project #21-04, 2021 Neighborhood Pavement Overlay Imp.
- 5:13: Adopt Resolution #21-213 Authorizing Partial Payment #10 to RJM Construction for Improvement Project 20-07 New Public Works Facility
- 5:14: Adopt resolution #21-214 Approving the Abatement of a Fence at 8405 167<sup>th</sup> Lane NW
- 5:15: Adopt Resolution No. 21-217 Accepting Easement Related to Java Properties, O'Reilly Auto Parts
- 5:16: ~~Adopt Resolution #21-218 Granting an Amended Interim Use Permit for the Church of St. Katharine Drexel~~ - **move to Regular Agenda Item 7.8**
- 5:17: Adopt Resolution #21-215 to Hire an Accounting Clerk and Reclassify the Accountant II

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

## 6. PUBLIC HEARING

### 6.01: Introduce Ordinance #21-11 Amending Chapter 10 of City Code to Include Requirements for Keeping Cats and Roosters, and to Amend Standards for Agricultural Animals and Beekeeping

City Administrator Ulrich reviewed a proposed Ordinance amending Chapter 10 of City Code to include cats and roosters and amend standards for agricultural animals and beekeeping. He stated this item has not been reviewed by the City Attorney. He added he would like to continue the public hearing until a date specific recommended on August 10, 2021.

Planning Technician Brian McCann stated the Ordinance contains proposed changes to the animal section of City Code, including a summary of changes, as well as the removal of mules, donkeys and burros. Roosters would be allowed on properties of 2.5 acres or more via administrative approval with a 2-rooster maximum, regulated under the City's existing noise ordinance. Beekeeping would be allowable via zoning permit. The number of cats is limited, similar to the number of dogs. Emu, bison and rabbits would be allowed on properties of 2.5 acres in the rural developing zoning district. Other animals can be addressed via special animal license or home occupation permit.

Councilmember Howell stated, under the section related to cats and dogs, a private kennel license is required for 4 or more dogs or cats. She added a bigger kennel would be required if there were puppies. She expressed concern about imposing overbearing regulations.

Planning Technician McCann stated he believes the definition of dogs and cats includes regulation after 6 months or older. He added he can verify that information.

Councilmember Howell asked how City Staff will enforce noise restrictions for properties with crowing hens, and how that will be measured. She expressed concern that this could become a waste of staff time.

Planning Technician McCann stated potential issues can be reviewed by Code Enforcement and addressed as necessary.

Councilmember Henneman stated it is wise to move forward and enact these changes. He asked whether it would be possible to add ducks, as requested by Liam Steinberg, which seems to be a reasonable request.

Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl stated the section of City Code related to be chickens can be amended to include ducks.

Councilmember Musgrove thanked Liam Steinberg for coming in and sharing his comments about ducks. She stated there are a few inconsistencies between Section 2.5 and 3 that should be corrected, including allowing roosters on properties of 5 acres or less anywhere in the City rather than only R-1 districts. She noted she would support a reference to Homeowner's Associations' (HOA) animal regulations, which are more restrictive than City Code.

Councilmember Musgrove stated other cities' regulations could be listed for reference purposes; for instance, Nowthen has a policy on roosters. She added this was discussed by the City Council at a recent work session.

Mayor Kuzma expressed concern about HOA regulations, which could be in conflict with City regulations. He added the HOA policy should be the governing rule.

Councilmember Howell stated the City's goal in terms of strategic planning has been to simplify the City Code. She added she would support requirements based on property and unit size as well as the number of animals, rather than zoning districts. She noted she opposes the section on crowing hens, which would be a waste of staff time, and she would like to see less restrictions for some barnyard animals. She stressed the importance of simplifying the requirements.

Councilmember Specht asked why there is a limit of 3 domesticated animals allowed. He added it is unreasonable if animals are well-kept and this does not harm the City.

Planning Technician McCann stated that regulation arose due to a Code Enforcement case involving a resident who had approximately 100 cats. He added this restriction is to provide support for regulating those types of extreme situations.

Councilmember Specht asked whether the limit can be increased to 10 or more. He added he knows people who have more than 4 animals. He noted raising the limit to 10 would cover more extreme cases.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated existing regulations are just for dogs only. She added a resident who owns more than 3 dogs must obtain a private kennel license. She asked whether Councilmember Specht would like to change the existing Code or the proposed changes.

Councilmember Specht stated his preference would be to change them both to at least 10 animals. He added this could otherwise be a problem for many residents.

Mayor Kunza asked whether a resident could obtain a variance if they wanted to have more animals. Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated a Conditional Use Permit for a private kennel license is required, with formal hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council.

Councilmember Riley stated there have been Code compliance cases where residents have had more than 3 dogs that were harder to care for, and there was too much noise. He added this will give the City a way to make sure that residents have the ability and space to take care of multiple dogs.

Councilmember Specht asked what the process is for getting a kennel license, and whether there are requirements and fees. Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated the resident would submit a formal land use application to the City and public notice is sent to adjacent residents. She added a public hearing will be held before the Planning Commission and formally approved by the City Council via Resolution.

Councilmember Specht asked whether there are State regulations for domestic animals. Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated she is not aware of any State regulations, and most enforcement falls on the City Code.

Mayor Kuzma stated the City should have an adequate process if someone wants to have more pets. He added situations can be addressed individually. He noted he would not be in favor of changing that policy.

Councilmember Musgrove stated, as part of this discussion, the process could be shortened so that not every case would be required to come to the City for an appeal. She added she would support that process.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated City Staff is open to the appeal option. She added the City will be put in a difficult position if residents already have animals and then bring their appeal to the City Council. She noted it would be preferable for residents to apply before they get their animals.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Heineman, to continue the Public Hearing introducing Ordinance 21-11 amending Chapter 10 of the City Code including Requirements for Keeping of Cats and Roosters to the Regular Council Meeting on August 10, 2021.

Further discussion: Councilmember Musgrove requested that this issue be reviewed at a work session. Councilmember Howell agreed. City Administrator Ulrich stated this item can be added to the August 10 work session, although there are already items on that agenda.

Jared Little, 7590 149<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, stated he has been a beekeeper for over 10 years. He added he has taught beekeeping classes for many years and is in the process of getting his Master Beekeeper certification. He added he is in favor of adding beekeeping to this Ordinance to make it easier for beekeepers to obtain a license. He noted this Ordinance is a step in the right direction to provide encouragement and support for beekeepers. He offered to answer any questions the City Council may have about beekeeping.

Sarah Grubner, 9431 176<sup>th</sup> Avenue, stated she and her family live on a 6-acre homestead in Ramsey, which has been a lifelong dream for her. She added her family has chickens and a rooster, and today a baby chick was born. She noted her family has cats and wants to have several dogs. She noted the number of dogs and cats should be separate, and the size of cows should be considered.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

## **7. COUNCIL BUSINESS**

### **7.01: Adopt Ordinance #21-16 Repealing Ordinances #20-11, #20-12, and #20-13 in regard to Franchise Fees on Centerpoint Energy, Connexus Energy and City of Anoka Electric**

City Administrator Ulrich reviewed the second reading and proposed adoption of an Ordinance repealing Ordinances 20-11, 20-12 and 20-13 regarding franchise fees on Centerpoint Energy, Connexus Energy and City of Anoka Electric. He stated this Ordinance would eliminate franchise fees adopted for 2021, as well as part of 2020. He noted the franchise fees would be repealed and revenues would be replaced through tax levy.

Mayor Kuzma stated he is opposed to this Ordinance being repealed as the City does not, in his opinion, have a good path moving forward. He added there have been very few complaints from residents about the franchise fee, and the program has been working. He noted the 2022 budget process has not been completed, and union contracts are not negotiated, and he does not support repealing a process before there is a working plan in place to replace it.

Mayor Kuzma stated a levy increase of 20-27% could be anticipated to replace the franchise fees, while the proposed budget was a 12% increase. He added the City could lose its bond rating if it becomes necessary to tap into reserves. He noted, without a plan in place, it is the wrong time to do this, and he will not be supporting it.

Councilmember Howell stated the tax increase would have been 17% if the previous City Council had added the franchise fee to the levy, but instead, the percentage was distributed inequitably across home values, and some people paid heavily. She added, for instance, a home with a value

of \$172,000 had a tax increase of 40%, while a home with a value of \$450,000 increased 6.6%. She noted the franchise fee simply disguised the tax increase, and she does not support that, as it is not fair for some neighbors to pay higher taxes. She noted she will be supporting the Ordinance.

Councilmember Heineman stated, at the Council's last meeting, he commented that the franchise fee is a regressive tax. He added residents should pay taxes that are proportional to their home value, which is a regressive tax. He noted \$300,000 is the breaking point, and homes with a value of \$336,000 would pay the same as the franchise fee, if a 15% tax levy is added. He noted the vast majority of residents pay more with the franchise fee, because their home value is less than \$336,000.

Councilmember Heineman stated It is inaccurate to categorize this as a big tax increase since the franchise fee for residents with lower value homes was already higher. He added he agrees that the franchise fees should be removed and added to the tax levy.

Mayor Kuzma stated assessments were up to 25%, which could be a \$6,000-8,000 assessment on a lower value home. He added the franchise fee is a more stable source of income for road improvements.

Councilmember Heineman stated it is a misrepresentation of the franchise fee to say that it is a stable source of income, as all but 2 years from now until 2030 will be in the negative, and the City will have to dip into reserves. He added, however, overall total funds will be generated and increased as the tax levy grows. He noted a 15% tax levy will result in a \$1.8 million surplus by the end of 2030 as opposed to a \$712,000 deficit if the City stays with franchise fees.

Councilmember Specht stated he agrees that the franchise fee is better than assessments, but the tax levy is what is best for Ramsey, as it is more transparent, equitable, and provides flexibility in the budget. He added 70-80% of the City's homes would pay more from the franchise fee than the tax levy. He noted there has been fear mongering that the levy would lead to cuts in Police and Fire, but that is not something the City Council would ever allow to happen. He stressed the importance of doing what is best for the City, and he believes that is the tax levy.

Councilmember Riley stated the franchise fee was set up to be equal and easy to understand. He added people need to know that a large increase will be required to cover it.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated the numbers we are talking about are fluid. He added Councilmember Heineman mentioned \$300,000 as being the breaking point, but the new version of a spreadsheet attached to the meeting agenda indicates that the break-even point is approximately \$250,000 in market value. He noted there is not enough data from the County to indicate what the tax levy will cost taxpayers, and there are no specific answers for coming up with a replacement plan although assessments have been discussed.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated it is not appropriate to replace a \$2 million budget gap with a tax levy. He added he has not heard anyone other than Councilmembers say that a levy is a good idea, and there is a discrepancy about the break-even point. He noted residents have expressed concern about taxing non-profit organizations and churches, but there is a marginal impact on these

organizations. He expressed his support for the franchise fee, because it is the best option that is currently available.

Councilmember Heineman asked Councilmember Woestehoff how many residents are behind on utility payments. He stated his point is that numbers continually fluctuate, regardless of what model is being used, and there is no exact number. He added it is not appropriate to suggest that franchise fees are a stable source of income, as numbers fluctuate and are not infallible.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether it is possible to designate specific funding from the levy for roads improvements. She added the City does that with other parts of the levy.

City Administrator Ulrich agreed, stating the City Council can adopt a policy to set aside funding every year for a specific expenditure, that could be changed by a future City Council. He added an Ordinance may be required, which is a cumbersome process. He suggested that the City Council could consider a policy to indicate that this is a budget intent, to set aside funding, and give direction to future City Councils.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she thinks that would be a good policy to have, and should be considered during budget discussions. She added the City has a public improvement fund through the levy for road maintenance, subject to excess or deficit of funds at the end of the year. She noted the City Council tries to make sure the funds are used up as much as possible, but they could be used for other things.

Councilmember Musgrove stated property taxes are governed by the State of Minnesota, and the City has a certain amount of money that can be collected from residents based on property tax restrictions. She added franchise fees constrain City spending, there will be more flexibility when the \$1.9 million in franchise fees is removed. She added this Ordinance will give the City Council the ability to focus on implementation of a roads plan as a priority.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Heineman, to Adopt Ordinance #21-16 Repealing Ordinances #20-11, #20-12 and #20-13 in regard to Franchise Fees on Centerpoint Energy, Connexus Energy and City of Anoka Electric.

Further discussion: Tom Gamek, 16021 Neon Street NW, stated there was a franchise fee in Ramsey years ago, that was scaled down throughout the years and which eventually came down to zero. He added the City's roads are very bad, and he wonders what the assessments will be, which is the only way to get the roads done. He added a slush fund would be left over, and the City could keep things going for a long time.

Mr. Gamek stated the City Council must decide what they want to do about the roads before shutting down the franchise fee, and there will be many problems without the franchise fee, including an increase in taxes of approximately 43%, according to the League of Minnesota Cities. He urged the City Council to take more time to really look at this before eliminating something. He noted he favors the franchise fee because he knows the money will go toward roads, and Ramsey is growing.

Randy Bauer, 14942 Quintana Street NW, stated he is speaking for his church, St. Katherine Drexel, which is already paying taxes. He added some Councilmembers were against the franchise fee and were elected, some ran in favor of the franchise fee and were elected. He requested that this issue be put on the next voter's ballot so people can vote, like in the referendum for schools.

Commissioner Howell stated she was vocal about the franchise fee in her campaign, and a resounding number of people supported her campaign for that reason. She added many residents are upset about the franchise fee. She noted some people just found out about it, because it is a hidden tax on the electric bill.

Darrell Smithwick, 8353 168<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, stated he is very much in favor of the franchise fee. He added it will need to be replaced with something, if it is taken away. He noted it is a very stable source of income for roads. It was my understanding that this was going to be approved for a certain length of time. We should let it ride itself out, and then see where we stand.

Kim Upsall, 16360 Chameleon Street NW, stated she asked the engineers in her family about franchise fees, and was told that Ramsey is the perfect situation for a franchise fee because there are no big box stores or related tax base. She added road improvements will have to come from assessments and residents will have to pay for the roads. She asked why the City is not looking at supplementing the franchise fee through the State of Minnesota's LRIP for local roads.

Maria Buchholz, 14621 Neon Street NW, stated she comes to a lot of meetings, and she has opposed the franchise fee from the beginning, as the levy is the fair way to go. She added it is fairer for residents to pay taxes based on the value of their home, which will bring in more money than the franchise fee. She reiterated that she has been opposed to the franchise fee from the beginning.

Derek Steinberg, 15440 Yakama Street, stated he is actively involved in my church council, and he has a budgeting background. He added some Councilmembers ran for office based on support for the levy. He noted those funds are not a sure thing without a solid plan in place, and the levy is not a guarantee. He noted constituents that are not fans of the franchise fee are also not fans of levies that increase their taxes.

Chris Nelson, 7630 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW, stated the issue tonight is not franchise or levy, but the fact that the City Council is cancelling a funding source with no plan going forward. She added she has lived in Ramsey for 23 years, and she is disgusted at the thought of leaders doing something with no plan. She noted this looks like the City Council is doing this because of their campaigns.

Councilmember Heineman thanked everyone that spoke. He stated one resident indicated that taxes will go up if this goes on the levy. He added there is a misrepresentation about what is being discussed, and taxes have already gone up. He noted the issue is whether to change the tax rate to be proportionate to the value of homes.

Councilmember Heineman stated the franchise fee provides a safety net, as the City Council can remove it at any time. He added it is a false narrative that the franchise fee is safe, but the levy is

not. He noted it is disrespectful to insinuate that Councilmembers are hearing about this issue for the first time, which is definitely not the case.

Councilmember Heineman stated he appreciates the resident who spoke for his church, but added he does not speak for all churches, which are individual communities with their own narrative.

Councilmember Heineman stated assessments have not been discussed at this point. He added many plans were drawn up as an alternative to the franchise fee, and they are still on the table.

Councilmember Heineman stated residents stated it is irresponsible to consider a levy before the 2022 budget is finalized. He stated there is no better time to plan for how the City will spend its money than before the budget is finalized.

Councilmember Heineman stated he is not voting in support of the levy because he wants to get re-elected. He added he is voting for this regardless of whether people like it or not, because he wants to be consistent, and because the levy is the best plan.

Councilmember Howell stated she would like to make a second to Councilmember Musgrove's original motion. City Administrator Ulrich stated a second was already made by Councilmember Heineman.

Mayor Kuzma stated there was a plan in place for assessments which proved not to be the best option. He added the franchise fees were debated for 7 years and seem to be successful. He noted there is not an alternative plan in place, and that is a mistake, in his opinion, as the tax levy amount is unknown, and he cannot support it.

Councilmember Specht thanked all the residents for their feedback. He added, to clarify what is on the levy, the majority of homes in the City will be paying less and will be saving money. He added it is unfair to charge everyone the same amount regardless of the size of their house or property.

A roll call vote was performed:

Councilmember Heineman	aye
Councilmember Woestehoff	nay
Councilmember Specht	aye
Councilmember Musgrove	aye
Councilmember Howell	aye
Councilmember Riley	nay
Mayor Kuzma	nay

Motion carried.

**7.02: Adopt Resolution #21-183 Denying an Easement Encroachment Agreement for an attached accessory structure in a drainage and utility easement at 16206 Sapphire Street NW; Case of William Cowette (Proj. 21-119)**

Bria Raines, Zoning Code Enforcement Officer, reviewed an easement encroachment application for an attached accessory structure in the drainage utility easement at 16206 Sapphire Street NW. The applicant is proposing to keep an existing deck in its current placement, which has been discovered to be in violation of work without a permit and encroachment of a drainage and utility easement.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Raines stated the applicant applied for a building permit in 2017, which was denied due to the easement encroachment. A survey was included in the permit documentation that provided an option for a deck that would be located outside the easement area, but the applicant continued to build the deck without a permit and against City Staff recommendations. In the survey, a staff note indicates “no part of a future deck can encroach on the drainage and utility easement”.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Raines stated City Staff are not supportive of approval of a deck that was built inside the easement encroachment without a permit, as it could set a precedent. She added the deck does not meet the standards of the City Code to which the rest of the neighborhood is held. She noted City Staff recommends adoption of Resolution 21-182 denying an easement encroachment agreement for an attached accessory structure at 16206 Sapphire Street NW.

Bill Cowette, 16206 Sapphire Street, stated the deck was already built before he realized that he needed a permit. He added he purchased the home at 16206 Sapphire Street NW after it was completed, and the property has a very small and irregular shaped backyard, with an easement line only inches from the house. He noted the wetland buffer was repealed and he was able to grade and sod to get a reasonable sized back yard but still not a lot of space.

Mr. Cowette stated they decided to add a deck in 2017, and due to the layout of the home and its windows as well as the small usable yard space, there were very few options for placement of a deck. He added the deck was completed, with the exception of one railing section, before he received a correction notice that a building permit was required. He noted City Staff were helpful and wanted to help him resolve the issue, and he was told this would require a vote from the City Council.

Mr. Cowette stated he was notified later that the City Council had not approved the encroachment agreement, but he never heard anything more about it. He added he recently received a letter in the mail that the issue was never resolved.

Mr. Cowette showed photos of the elevated deck, including approximate location of the utility easement line. He added the deck was built with 2-foot pillars on diamond pier fittings located either on or over the easement line. He noted the pillars have no impact on the area’s drainage and should not affect utility lines.

Mr. Cowette stated City staff notified him that this encroachment would set a precedent for other opportunities for people to not be held to the same standards. He added there are no other properties in his neighborhood that are as close to the easement as his home, which is 9 inches. He noted he did not have any other options to make the deck work on his property other than encroaching on the easement.

Commissioner Woestehoff stated the Planning Commission reviewed a similar case last week in this same neighborhood regarding a drainage and utility easement. He added this case will be reviewed by the City Council at their next meeting, and Mr. Cowette's property situation is not unusual. He asked whether the width of the easement, which appears to be large, is related to the fact that it is wetland, or is it due to utilities.

City Engineer Bruce Westby showed aerial views of the back yard, showing the deck, graded yard and established turf, as well as the line of vegetation. He added the encroachment coincides with the wetland. He noted he is not aware of any public utilities in the back lot line, and he is unsure whether there are private utilities. He agreed the easement is related to the existing wetland.

Councilmember Heineman asked whether it would still be considered an encroachment if any portion of the deck hangs over the easement but does not touch the ground, and if the footings are out of the easement area.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated any portion of structure overhanging an easement is considered an air easement, and is still an encroachment.

Councilmember Heineman stated the home seems to be very close to the easement to begin with. He asked whether there is a required setback for how close a house can be built to an easement.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated building can occur right up to the easement line. She added City Staff are seeing many tight properties in Ramsey with similar compliance issues.

Councilmember Heineman stated the applicant indicated that the deck was already built before he was notified that he needed a building permit. He added City Staff have indicated that the work began after the applicant was notified that a building permit was required. He requested clarification on these two different accounts of the situation. He asked whether City Staff believes the resident is recalling events correctly, and that the work had already been done before it was brought to their attention.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Raines stated there was a lot of staff turnover beginning around 2017, and she was not on staff at that time. She added she has based her understanding of this case from written reports. She noted it is possible that the applicant has correctly presented the sequence of events.

Councilmember Heineman stated, while it is important to avoid setting a precedent, the applicant has completed research with regard to wetland delineation and buffers and has put in the effort in terms of due process and due diligence to comply with City requirements. He added, due to the size and nature of the lot, the 5 footings that were placed in the easement will not divert water or

become an issue. He noted the resident showed up and presented his case, and there is no distinctive proof that he is wrong. He noted he is not in favor of denying the encroachment agreement.

Councilmember Musgrove stated, in her time with the City Council and Planning Commission, there have been numerous similar cases and it has been necessary to be proactive in terms of development and planning. She added she agrees with Councilmember Heineman, and the City is now approaching these types of issues to mitigate at the front end.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether there is any chance the drainage easement would ever be used, due to the presence of the wetland. She asked whether the purpose of the easement is to protect the wetland from new development.

City Engineer Westby stated the easement in this case is a drainage easement protecting the wetland area. He added he is not aware of plans to run utilities through that corridor. He noted any borings that would need to be done would not disturb the wetland, and the applicant's footings would not be in the way.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether it would be appropriate to vacate the easement for the drainage portion, as the footings would not impede drainage.

City Engineer Westby stated easements are typically set at the edge of a known wetland or a 100-year flood high water level area. He added he would not recommend vacating an easement without further analysis.

Councilmember Specht stated good points were made by both the applicant and City Staff regarding the wetland delineation and the size and constraints of the property. He added the City Council can act with common sense and flexibility. He noted he supports the encroachment agreement.

Councilmember Specht stated he would like to make a motion approving the easement encroachment agreement for 16206 Sapphire Street, for the deck as currently built.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked whether the City Council can review the Planning Commission's recent evaluation of a similar case in this vicinity. He added it would be helpful to re-evaluate the entire easement and its boundaries, as it seems larger than the natural line of where the properties are.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated City Staff can do that. She added, however, the other case reviewed by the Planning Commission was related to a side yard property line which is a different issue. She added a buffer is recommended to protect a wetland, and the City has seen an overall reduction in the size of natural wetlands.

Councilmember Howell stated the City recently worked with a resident on encroachments on a property in Oak Terrace Estates. She added she is happy to work with this applicant as well.

Councilmember Heineman stated he would like to second the motion.

City Administrator Ulrich stated it would be appropriate for the City Council to direct City Staff to rewrite the Resolution and develop findings of fact, to be reviewed by the City Council at their August 10, 2021 meeting. He added findings of fact would include establishing that the footings do not impede the wetland, and that there is no anticipated impact to the drainage and utility easement. He noted the Resolution would be based on due diligence and established facts, and would not set a precedent for other situations.

Councilmember Specht stated the motion should give the applicant confidence that this item will be approved pending the outcome of specific a review by City Staff.

Motion by Councilmember Specht, seconded by Councilmember Heineman, to postpone the easement encroachment agreement to the City Council's August 10, 2021 meeting and direct City Staff to develop findings of fact supporting an easement encroachment.

Further discussion: Councilmember Heineman thanked Ms. Raines for investigating this issue and following up on the requirements of the City Code. He commended his colleagues for using their discretion and creating a win/win situation. He thanked the resident for showing up and doing due diligence on this issue.

Councilmember Riley asked why footings are not allowed in a drainage and utility easement. He asked whether it is a safety concern, or a drainage concern.

City Engineer Westby stated constructing something within an easement is an encroachment on the setback and buffers that are in place to protect the easement area. He added this issue has come up a lot in this development and should decrease when the development is built out.

Councilmember Riley stated he feels a strong obligation to support the recommendations of City Staff. He added, in this case, a permit was not obtained. He noted maybe the rules need to be changed, specifically in this development, so the policy supports the recommendations of City Staff and flexibility can be applied.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether a requirement could be included in the findings of fact that there will be no further building in the easement near this property or in this development. She added the City Council is generous in supporting this request with footings located in the easement. She thanked Ms. Raines for her work on this issue, as there are many such cases coming forward related to City Code.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the proposed Resolution for this application cannot be expanded to include all properties in this development. He added City Staff can discuss policy and review some general solutions that would allow more flexibility, as suggested by Councilmember Riley.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

**7.03: Authorization to Enter Into Negotiations for Design/Bid/Build Services for the New Water Treatment Plant**

Utilities Supervisor John Nelson requested City Council consideration of authorization to instruct AE2S to begin construction of the new Ramsey Water Treatment Plant. The scope of the project will include design, preparation of documents, participation in bidding and awarding phases of the project. AE2S will work closely with City Staff to oversee construction of the plant.

Utilities Supervisor Nelson stated the water treatment plant was added to the City's 2004 Capital Improvement Plan, and land was secured in 2008. SEH was hired to complete a feasibility study and it was determined that the plant capacity would be 10 million gallons per day. A gravity filtration process was decided upon as the best system for removal of high concentrations of magnesium and iron from drinking water.

Utilities Supervisor Nelson stated the City issued a request for proposals on May 20, 2021, and 5 firms submitted proposals. City Staff reviewed the proposals on July 14, 2021, and selected 3 firms for interviews: AE2S, SEH and WSB. A decision was made on July 20, 2021 to move forward with AE2S for final consideration by the City Council.

Utilities Supervisor Nelson stated AE2S's proposal fee is not to exceed \$1,198,600 for services outlined in their proposal. Funding for this project will come from the Water Fund.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether the training room area, the size of which was previously in question, will be addressed now or at another time.

City Engineer Westby stated tonight's action is to get the engineer under contract, and there will be many opportunities to get clarification and feedback on aspects of the plan.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she supports function over flair in terms of building design. Utilities Supervisor Nelson agreed, adding the new water treatment plant will be similar to the public works facility in an industrial park.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to authorize City Staff to enter into negotiations for design/bid/build services for the new water treatment plant, with AE2S selected as the provider with proposal fee not to exceed \$1,198,600.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

**7.04: Adopt Resolution #21-221 Approving Amendment to Development Agreement for COR Sapphire Addition; Case of PSD, LLC**

City Engineer Westby reviewed a proposed amendment agreement for COR Sapphire Addition, which is the Sapphire Apartments. The subject site is located on Center Street which was constructed in 2014 as a temporary road section to improve a gravel road. The City constructed improvements needed for the apartment site, without having a clear idea of what amenities would

be added. The developer was instructed to construct the building and add a foot-high retaining wall on the west so the city could complete concrete curb and gutter and pavement reconstruction.

City Engineer Westby stated the amendment would allow for addition of a 10-foot cement sidewalk and grass boulevard with 3 parallel parking bays, as well as rain gardens along the corridor. Improvements will mirror what has been done on the south side of Center Street, with design that was used through to Ramsey Parkway. The total estimated project cost of \$154,000 includes the developer's portion of \$12,400 and the City's portion of \$142,000, which is proposed to be paid from TIF-14.

City Engineer Westby stated the developer is supportive of the amendment, and the developer's contractor would do the improvements. City Staff is confident that costs will be lower than anticipated.

City Engineer Westby stated City Staff recommends adoption of Resolution 21-221 approving an amendment to the Development Agreement for COR Sapphire Addition.

Councilmember Musgrove stated this is a great use of TIF dollars for this area. She asked whether the project will be complete before Happy Days.

City Engineer Westby stated the developer has been directed to complete the work before September 3, 2021, which is one week before Happy Days.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Howell, to adopt Resolution #21-221 Approving Amendment to Development Agreement for COR Sapphire Addition; Case of PSD, LLC.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

#### **7.05: Adopt Resolution #21-222 Approving Joint Powers Agreement with Anoka County for Interim Bunker Lake Boulevard/County Road 116 Improvements**

City Engineer Westby reviewed a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) with Anoka County for interim improvements due to pending work on Highway 10 between 2022-2025. Traffic is expected to increase on Bunker Lake Boulevard and improvements are needed to accommodate that. The County conducted traffic studies and developed interim improvements that will be in place for at least 15 years, but modifications may be needed when the permanent section is completed. Anoka County has requested the adoption of this JPA.

City Engineer Westby reviewed the proposed improvements: a full lane as well as left and right turn lanes at major intersections on Armstrong Boulevard to Ramsey Boulevard; a right turn lane to Connexus Energy on Ramsey Boulevard and Sunwood Drive; Sunwood Drive signal system and intersection improvements; raised concrete median in the center of Bunker Lake Boulevard south of Sunwood Drive; and a driveway onto 143<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW for Altron with protected left turn lanes.

City Engineer Westby stated the City's portion of the project of \$357,000 is intended to come from TIF-14, but State Aid funds may also be used. Anoka County's portion of the project is \$2.1 million. There is some flexibility with dates if the City Council requires additional information. City Staff recommends adoption of the JPA.

Councilmember Specht asked whether City Staff have heard comments or feedback from local businesses. City Engineer Westby stated Anoka County contacted all the businesses and they are in agreement in general, and do not have any concerns.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether this issue will come back before the City Council for review. City Engineer Westby stated bills and invoices will be reviewed by the City Council. He added City Staff's position is to use TIF-14 with MSA funds as an alternative.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she supports the use of TIF dollars for this project in the COR.

Motion by Councilmember Heineman, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to adopt Resolution #21-222 Approving Joint Powers Agreement with Anoka County for Interim Bunker Lake Boulevard/County Road 116 Improvements.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

#### **7.06: Adopt Resolution #21-216 Approving an Abatement of 7009 Highway 10 NW**

Planning Technician McCann reviewed a Code enforcement issue for Star Auto at 7009 Highway 10 NW involving violation of off-street parking requirements related to a trailer and plow parked on grass, as well as additional vehicles that may be for sale. The trailer is being used as a storage structure, which is not an approved use. City Staff have not been on site to verify these violations but there have been off-street parking issues at this property dating back to 2004.

Planning Technician McCann stated gravel parking is allowed on this property as it is grandfathered in, but there is no gravel on the property, only asphalt and grass. City Staff have spoken with the business owner and requested an inspection which was denied by the business owner. City Staff had a meeting with the business owner in 2020 to resolve these issues and request removal of the trailer. City Staff is sympathetic to the business owner's situation due to the pandemic but the trailer has not been removed, and Code enforcement action is proposed.

Planning Technician McCann stated City Staff consulted with the City Attorney regarding a possible variance, as requested by the business owner. He added a variance would have to be granted for off-street parking, and the trailer does not meet the definition in City Code.

Planning Technician McCann stated City Staff worked with the businesses' previous owner in 2018 in an attempt to remove the trailer in 2018, which was placed outside in 2005, according to aerial photos. City Staff met with the current owner on June 24, 2020 to discuss this issue, after which the business owner indicated he would look at alternatives for the semi-trailer. The trailer

has not been moved to date, and the City Attorney does not recommend a variance due to issues with State building Code.

Planning Technician McCann stated City Staff recommends adopting Resolution 21-216 approving abatement of 7009 Highway 10 NW.

Jim Frampton, owner of JCF Auto Inc., dba Star Auto and Truck, 7009 West Highway 10, stated he purchased the property in April 2019. He respectfully asked the City Council to grant a variance for the semi-trailer that has been parked on the property for 30 years and is not a storage unit. He added he has been unable to get a title for the trailer so he can remove it.

Mr. Frampton stated this is the first notice of violation that he has received, and he had 14 days to respond. He added he requested information from Mr. McCann about getting a variance but did not receive a response. He noted he was informed the item was placed on the Consent Agenda to automatically approve abatement.

Mr. Frampton stated City Code states that businesses in the H-1 Highway 10 Business District can utilize gravel, recycled concrete or recycled asphalt and with the issuances of an Interim Use Permit. He asked why the City wants to penalize his business rather than figure out a solution. He added his business has had numerous auto thefts and property damage in the last 12 months and has filed police reports but apparently this is considered a low-level offence. He noted everyone has come through very difficult economic times, and now his business is faced with disruption from the City, County and State with Highway 10 improvements and reconstruction.

Mr. Frampton stated many other businesses on this corridor park vehicles on unimproved surfaces. He asked the City Council to approve a variance for the trailer and work with him to obtain an Interim Use Permit.

Councilmember Howell stated it is hypocritical for the City to work with Oak Terrace Estates to resolve violations that far exceed Mr. Frampton's issues. She added Mr. Frampton's case was on the Consent Agenda two weeks after he received a violation notice. She noted she would like Ramsey to be a City that works with its businesses and resolve issues amicably.

Councilmember Heineman asked why the issue was placed on the Consent Agenda only two weeks after the first date of issuance. He asked whether there is generally a second notice.

Planning Technician McCann stated Mr. Frampton contacted him after receiving the July 9, 2021 notice of violation, and he requested alternative solutions. He added he contacted Mr. Frampton to set up a meeting to discuss the issue further, but Mr. Frampton indicated he would seek legal counsel. He noted City Staff decided to put the abatement on the Consent Agenda for tonight's meeting with the knowledge that there was still an additional time frame to be considered, and additional notice of abatement would be sent, giving the property owner another 14 days.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated typically there is a second notice, but in this case, this is a repeat offender with 10 violations going back to 2013, and the threat of a lawsuit. She added City Staff sought advice from the City Attorney and decided to bring this issue to the City Council for

feedback and comment. She noted Mr. Frampton received a notice and City Staff met with him on June 24, 2020.

Councilmember Heineman stated the City wants to work with its businesses and has done so with other companies. He added he does not see why the City would go right to abatement without further discussion. He noted he would like to see this pushed back until a plan of action can be considered and an agreement reached.

Councilmember Riley stated City Staff relies on the City Code to determine how these types of issues should be handled. He added that Mr. Frampton stated he would not move his items and threatened legal counsel. He noted City Staff can work with Mr. Frampton to resolve this issue. He asked Mr. Frampton whether they can all work together.

Mr. Frampton stated his statement was that he needed to seek legal counsel because he does not know his rights and the laws of the city of Ramsey regarding parking on the grass. He added his statement to Mr. McCann was not a threat. He noted he would love to work with the City to get this resolved.

Councilmember Howell stated it seems counter-intuitive for City Staff to put this item on the Consent Agenda when the intent was to have a conversation about it. She added, as in the case of Oak Terrace Estates, they brought their attorney, but they were not moved to abatement. She noted all businesses on Highway 10 should be held to the same standards.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated the City does towing through Northstar Towing as part of the abatement process and would not be charged or assessed to the property owner but rather charged at pick-up. She added that could be an option to have the semi-truck towed on behalf of the property owner.

Councilmember Heineman expressed his support for City Staff, as well as residents and businesses. He added it may have been premature to move to abatement. He requested that this issue to be tabled until a meeting can be arranged with Mr. Frampton, or an Interim Use Permit is granted. Councilmember Specht agreed.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated a time parameter should be added to the motion, that would be an acceptable amount of time for all parties to figure something out.

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to postpone action on abatement of 7009 Highway 10 NW for 60 days and direct City Staff to meet with the property owner and bring back the results of those discussions to the City Council.

Discussion during motion: Councilmember Specht stated he would support a time period of longer than 60 days.

Councilmember Musgrove stated a plan of action can be formulated within the next 30-60 days.

Councilmember Specht asked Mr. Frampton for his feedback and comment.

Mr. Frampton stated he feels like he is being railroaded. He added he inherited the trailer, and he is not sure what the issue is, unless perhaps someone has a vendetta against the previous owner.

Councilmember Musgrove stated the City Council has expressed an interest in having Mr. Frampton work with City Staff to come up with a plan and resolve these issues.

Councilmember Howell asked whether the issue is the parking of vehicles on grass or removal of the trailer.

Mr. Frampton stated the vehicles are parked on gravel, not grass.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated a plan could be presented back to the City Council involving both items.

Councilmember Howell stated she believes this is a fair process, which was also used with Oak Terrace Estates.

Motion carried 5-2. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Musgrove, Riley, and Woestehoff. Voting No: Councilmembers Howell and Specht.

Randy Bauer, 14942 Quintana Street NW stated he appreciates Councilmember Riley's comment about City Staff and allowing them the freedom to carry out their duties. He added there are Code violations all over the City, but enforcement is complaint-based. He noted there will be more cases coming forward if the City gets more aggressive with addressing Code violations, and the City Council might want to review this issue in a work session.

**7.07: Adopt Resolution #21-209 Approving an Abatement of 6336 Highway 10 NW; Case of JAC Auto**

Planning Technician McCann reviewed a long history of code enforcement violations for JAC Auto, 6336 Highway 10 NW, with some recent activity in 2019 related to public nuisance and off-street parking violations. He stated gravel is grandfathered in for parking or auto sales, but grass is not allowed. He added he met on-site with the property owner, and all vehicles are now parked on concrete or gravel. He noted all public nuisance items have been resolved, including inoperable vehicles and a damaged fence.

Planning Technician McCann stated the only outstanding item is a \$75 citation, which the property owner has agreed to process.

Staff's recommendation is to adopt resolution 21-209 abatement of 6336 Highway 10 NW. Abatement is not needed at this time, but resolution lays out future action and council support for code enforcement process.

Councilmember Howell stated she will not support the adoption of this Resolution as she does not agree with the abatement in any capacity.

Councilmember Riley requested clarification from Councilmember Howell regarding her position on abatements.

Councilmember Howell referenced Oak Terrace Estates, stating the City should apply standards consistently across the Highway 10 businesses. She added she does not support enforcing standards for some Highway 10 businesses but not others. She noted maybe the standards need to be relaxed.

Mayor Kuzma stated the city has historically been very strict about businesses with unpaved and gravel areas, and there have been cases where businesses have been forced to pave their lots. He added it would not be appropriate to relax regulations and let people park on their grass when previous standards were more restrictive.

Councilmember Specht asked whether the applicant has come up to Code standards, and this amendment is to have something in place in case they violate the Code again, and they will go straight to abatement. Planning Technician McCann agreed that is the intention.

Councilmember Specht stated he does not support having a Code violation go immediately to abatement without first working with the business.

Councilmember Heineman stated there has to be a standard, and the City Council should use their best judgment to navigate these nuances. He added this applicant is already in compliance, and the abatement will not happen. He asked what will happen if the amendment is not approved and the business violates the code again.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated, without abatement, conditions would still apply. She stressed the importance of having a document to support findings and show that the City Council is taking the matter seriously. She noted, in this case, there have been 10-12 violations since 2013.

Councilmember Riley stated he would support removing the first two bullet points related to expedited compliance. He stressed the importance of remembering that when there is a Code enforcement issue, there is also a resident or neighbor who made a complaint.

Councilmember Riley stated Highway 10 historically has been an eyesore for the City, and the EDA has battled for years to make Highway 10 a more welcoming gateway to bring in businesses. He added parking on improved surfaces was an item of importance that was often considered. He expressed concern that if the City Council backpedals on these improvements to help local businesses, all that hard work will be undone.

Councilmember Riley stated the mobile home park is not a good template for how to deal with businesses, since most of the Code violations are residential in nature set in place in the 1960s.

Councilmember Musgrove requested clarification regarding Councilmember Riley's comment about removing the first two steps of abatement from the Code update.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated the City Council adopted a Code enforcement policy that would be helpful to discuss at an upcoming work session for potential amendment.

Councilmember Musgrove stated the City Council should review the appeal process again, to improve communication.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether City Staff will keep a record of the plan verifying the number of violations during a specific time frame. Ms. McGuire confirmed this, adding there is a lengthy record in the permit system.

Councilmember Musgrove stated the past year has been difficult for local businesses, with Covid restrictions, business limitations and financial issues. She added it is reasonable to take into consideration the business climate over the past year, with Covid restrictions, Covid-related limitations, and struggling businesses.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Heineman, to postpone abatement of 6336 Highway 10 NW indefinitely as the property owner appears to be in compliance, and no action is required.

Motion carried 6-1. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, and Woestehoff. Voting No: Councilmember Specht

**7.08: Adopt Resolution #21-218 Granting Amended Interim Use Permit for St. Katharine Drexel**

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl reviewed an Interim Use Permit (IUP) that has already been granted to St. Katharine Drexel Church for a storage building on their site, to be constructed prior to construction of the new church. She added restrooms are proposed to be added to the storage building, which will require a water line. She noted City Staff recommend that the IUP be amended to clarify and include details about the new water line.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated, at the Planning Commission meeting, the IUP was approved with two Planning Commissioners abstaining as their involvement in the church construction project. She added this is another reason to amend the IUP rather than handle it administratively, in the interest of transparency.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether the location of the proposed storage building has changed. Ms. McGuire stated the location was not specified as the site plan was not refined.

A resident, representing St. Katharine Drexel Church, stated the exact location of the storage building was not finalized. He added the building was originally proposed to be located closer to Central Park but was moved east of the tree line to keep development options open.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether the IUP is for the water line. The applicant stated the IUP amendment is being recommended by City Staff to show the restrooms on the inside of the storage building, since the buildings were empty on the original drawings.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to adopt Resolution #21-218 Granting Amended Interim Use Permit for St. Katharine Drexel.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht and Woestehoff. Voting No: none.

## **8. MAYOR, COUNCIL AND STAFF INPUT**

City Administrator Ulrich stated the Ramsey Business Expo will be held again this year, and the EDA is looking for people to put out booths. He added it will be great to get back into it and invite the public. Mr. Ulrich stated National Night Out is Tuesday, August 3, and many neighborhoods are holding parties and events. He added Police and Fire Department representatives, as well as City Councilmembers, will be visiting parties.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City Council's next regular meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 10, 2021.

Councilmember Riley stated today is his 30-year wedding anniversary. He wished his wife, Brenda, a happy anniversary.

Councilmember Musgrove stated today is the last day that public comment will be taken on the Lower Rum River 4<sup>th</sup> Generation Plan. She added residents can visit the Watershed Management Organization's website to make comments.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Howell, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the City Council adjourned at 10:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Kurtis G. Ulrich  
City Administrator

ATTEST:

Katie M. Schmidt  
Deputy City Clerk

Drafted by Mary Mullen  
*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

A recording of this meeting is available for viewing online at [www.qctv.org](http://www.qctv.org)  
<<http://www.qctv.org>>. Recordings are available for 36 months after the date of the meeting.