

CITY OF GRANT
MINUTES

DATE : August 4, 2026
TIME STARTED : 6:34 p.m.
TIME ENDED : 8:40 p.m.
MEMBERS PRESENT : Councilmembers Cornett, Rog, Cremona,
Anderson and Mayor Giefer
MEMBERS ABSENT : None

Staff members present: City Planner Jennifer Haskamp, City Attorney Amanda Johnson, and City Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer Lacey Smieja.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m. by Mayor Giefer.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**PUBLIC INPUT**

Lisa Dau, 7611 Jamaca Ave. N. Strongly objects to the statement in the packet that indicates the complaint regarding the business next to her home is unfounded. She stated that they are in violation of the CUP and that the CUP needs to be re-evaluated.

Jeff Schafer, 8688 Jamaca Ave. N. Requested that the Council re-instate the Planning Commission to review CUPs, etc., and also review and update the Code of Ordinances. He stated that the Planning Commission also introduces new residents to local government.

Theresa Urbaniak. 11595 Grenelefe Ave. N. Requested that the Council deny the CUP for the cannabis retail business and gather more information.

Wayne Sarappo, 8770 105th St. N. Also requested they re-instate the Planning Commission.

Alicia Schaal, 2919 Buchanan St. NE, Minneapolis. Speaking on behalf of the cannabis dispensary, and she is a nurse and has a background with medical cannabis. She said that people in Minnesota, and Grant, are already using medical cannabis, the issue is just how far they have to drive to get it. She said the goal is to work with the community, not against it, and to provide reliable, tested products.

CONSENT AGENDA

- A. July 2026 Bill List, \$269,761.55 – pg 1-4
- B. July 2026 Receipts, \$382,292.60 – pg 5-9
- C. Partial Pay Application #2 Winberg Companies, 2026 Street Project, \$28,144.72 (included in bill amount above), check #17102 – pg 10-11, 14
- D. Final Billing – County/City Cooperative Agreement CSAH 12 Trail, \$38,199.65 (included in bill amount above), check #17098 – pg 12-13

- E. July 7, 2026 City Council Work Session Minutes – pg 15-16
- F. July 7, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes – pg 17-28
- G. July 10, 2026 City Council Work Session Minutes – pg 29
- H. Approve Criminal Prosecution Contract with Eckberg Lammers (2027-2031) – pg 30-33
- I. Accept 2nd Quarter 2026 Financials – pg 34-37

Council Member Cremona moved to approve the consent agenda as presented. Council Member Anderson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

A. PRESENTATION of 2025 Audited Financial Statements - *CliftonLarsonAllen*

Ezra Koetz and Chris Knopik from CliftonLarsonAllen, the City's auditing firm, were present to provide an overview of the City's financial statements from 2025. They informed the Council that the 2024 statement needed to be restated because it was discovered that there were significant delays in receiving invoices from the building inspector. They also went over a few compliance issues in 2025, most notably not receiving an investment broker certification form, not obtaining bids for contracted services exceeding \$175,000, and not obtaining an IC134 before issuing final payment. There were no disagreements or difficulties working with staff.

They also provided information comparing revenue per capita with peer governments, with Grant receiving approximately half of what peer cities are receiving in property taxes, and Grant also spending less than half of peer cities on capital outlay. The indicated there are two outstanding bonds from the 2020 street projects totaling \$895,000 as of 12/31/25 which will continue to be repaid per the bond schedules. They also indicated that there are some new standards coming out through GASB that will require more work moving forward.

B. PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration for a Variance from minimum side yard setback requirements to construct a two-story attached garage addition on the property located at 6174 Inwood Ct. N - *City Planner Haskamp*

Planner Jennifer Haskamp provided background on the request for a Variance from the side yard setback. The Applicants are proposing to construct a home addition that will provide additional living space on the main and second floor of their home and an attached two-stall garage.

The following analysis was provided in response to each Variance criterion by Planner Haskamp:

- 1) **Proposed Use of the Property cannot be established under the conditions allowed by this chapter and no other reasonable use exists.** *Based on the analysis, this criterion does not appear to be met. However, staff does believe that it is reasonable for the homeowner to want an addition that includes an attached garage and it is reasonable for the City Council to discuss whether the alternative locations are feasible and/or reasonable.*

1 **2) Plight of the Landowner must be due to unique physical conditions of the land, and**
2 **are not applicable to other lands.** *Per staff's analysis, the criterion is not met. However,*
3 *staff requests for discussion by the City Council with respect to this criterion given the*
4 *substandard lot size and recent discussions.*

5 **3) Unique conditions cannot be caused by the Owner.** *The physical constraints of the*
6 *property were not created by the Applicant and therefore staff believes that this criterion is*
7 *met.*

8 Based on all of the information and findings in the Staff report, Planner Haskamp is recommending
9 denial of the Applicant's request for a variance from minimum side yard setback standards to construct
10 a two-story addition including attached garage.

11 **Motion by Council Member Rog, seconded by Council Member Cornett to open the public**
12 **hearing. Motion approved 5-0.**

13
14 Brett Schimke, 6174 Inwood Ct. N., applicant. Read a statement explaining that they considered all
15 available options and still believe this is the most reasonable option.

16
17 Amy Hunn, 6206 Inwood Ct. N. Supports the proposal and said it will not negatively impact her
18 neighboring home.

19
20 Nancy Moses, 6129 Inwood Ct. N. Indicated she approves of the plan.

21
22 Jeff Schafer, 8688 Jamaca Ave. N. Recommends approval.

23
24 Colleen McGuire Ales, 6161 Inwood Ct. N. Recommends approval.

25
26 **Motion by Council Member Rog, seconded by Council Member Cremona, to close the public**
27 **hearing. Motion approved 5-0.**

28
29 Council Member Anderson indicated that he was in support of the request.

30 Council Member Cremona also stated that she was in favor of the plan and believes it is the most
31 reasonable location.

32 Council Member Cornett said it would be very prohibitive to make them build it somewhere else on
33 the property.

34 Council Member Rog confirmed that the garage will be 6.5' from the side yard property line.

35 Mayor Giefer said he was on the fence, but the neighborhood statements helped and he is in favor.

36
37 **Motion by Council Member Cremona, seconded by Council Member Cornett, to approve the**
38 **requested variance.**

39
40 Roll call vote:

41 Anderson: Aye

42 Cremona: Aye

43 Rog: Aye

44 Cornett: Aye

1 Giefer: Aye

2
3 **Motion approved 5-0.** Planner Haskamp indicated that the Resolution approving the Variance will
4 be on the next agenda.

5
6 **C. Continued: Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit Amendment to construct a synthetic**
7 **turf field and install new lighting for the school athletic fields located at 8000 75th St N -**
8 **City Planner Haskamp**

9
10 Planner Haskamp reviewed the additional materials provided by the applicant in response to the
11 Council's concerns related to light fixture height, as well as light fixture specification and hours of
12 operation. She also indicated that the public hearing was opened and closed at the July Council
13 meeting.

14
15 Planner Haskamp recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit based on the following
16 information provided in the staff report:

- 17 1) *The proposed use is designated in section 32-245 as a conditional use for the appropriate*
18 *zoning district.*

19 **Finding:** The subject property is zoned A-1. Public Schools and their accessory uses are
20 conditionally permitted within the A-1 zoning district. This standard is met.

- 21 2) *The proposed use conforms to the city's comprehensive plan.*

22 **Finding:** The Subject Property is guided Rural Residential/Agriculture (RR/AG) and is
23 currently used for the Mahtomedi School Campus. It was determined that the use is consistent
24 with the City's regulations during the 2006 CUP process for the Athletic Fields. This standard
25 is met.

- 26 3) *The proposed use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general*
27 *welfare of the city, its residents, or the existing neighborhood.*

28 **Finding:** The project site is currently used for athletic fields and recreational purposes. Per the
29 Applicant's narrative, the proposed synthetic turf will be permeable, and will not generate
30 additional and unreasonable stormwater run-off which will be verified through the RCWD
31 permitting process. The proposed fencing will be located and designed similarly to what
32 currently exists on the site; however, the addition of netting will prevent athletic equipment
33 from leaving the field and impeding vehicular and pedestrian traffic off the site.

34 Per the submitted footcandle analysis, light produced by the proposed field lights will not extend
35 beyond the property boundary. However, ambient lighting from the field lighting may still be
36 visible from surrounding properties and rights-of-way. This will be minimized to the maximum
37 extent possible by using dark sky fixtures as shown in the applicant's supplemental submission
38 package. The vegetated areas between the property and the residential uses to the north and
39 south, will help to mitigate potential impact and must be maintained. The proposed fixture
40 design is required to demonstrate dark sky compliance which includes, at a minimum, fixtures
41 that are down-cast with short cutoffs extending beyond the field.

1 The proposed use is similar to what currently exists on the site and is not anticipated to be
2 detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare of the city, its residents,
3 or the existing neighborhood. Provided the conditions are followed, this standard is met.

- 4 4) *The proposed use is compatible with the existing neighborhood.*

5 **Finding:** The Subject Property and project site are currently used for athletic purposes that
6 support the Mahtomedi School Campus and greater community. The proposed use of the project
7 site and surrounding athletic fields is anticipated to remain the same. The 2006 CUP confirmed
8 that the use of the property for athletic purposes is consistent with the City's regulations and
9 the existing neighborhood. As previously noted, additional conditions within the amended CUP
10 address hours of operation for the field lighting, and that fixture specifications demonstrate that
11 they are dark sky compliant and downcast with short cutoff distances at the field perimeter.
12 Provided that these conditions are met, the conversion of the athletic field and proposed lighting
13 is compatible with the surrounding area.

- 14 5) *The proposed use meets conditions or standards adopted by the city through resolutions or*
15 *other ordinances.*

16 **Finding:** The Subject Property is zoned A-1. The City of Grant zoning ordinance conditionally
17 permits Public Schools and their accessory uses within the A1 and A2 zoning districts. It was
18 determined that the athletic field use is consistent with the City's regulations during the 2006
19 CUP process. The existing CUP for the Athletic Fields requires an amendment if additional site
20 improvements or changes are proposed. The Applicant's submission for an amendment is
21 consistent with the intent of the permit and therefore this condition is met.

- 22 6) *The proposed use will not create additional requirements for facilities and services at public*
23 *costs beyond the city's normal low-density residential and agricultural uses.*

24 **Finding:** Per the Applicant's narrative, one water service extension is proposed, and sanitary
25 sewer connections are expected to remain the same. The proposed use will remain consistent
26 with current usage of the site. The proposed project and use will not create a substantial
27 additional burden on City facilities or costs. This standard is met.

- 28 7) *The proposed use will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment or conditions*
29 *of operation that will be detrimental to people, property, or the general welfare because of*
30 *production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors or any other nuisance.*

31 **Finding:** The Subject Property and project site are currently used for athletic purposes that
32 support the Mahtomedi School Campus and greater community. The proposed use of the project
33 site and surrounding athletic fields is anticipated to remain the same. The 2006 CUP confirmed
34 that the use of the property for athletic purposes is consistent with the City's regulations and
35 the existing neighborhood.

36 The field is currently active, and the purpose of the project is to extend the number of months
37 and hours in which it can be used, not to increase the intensity of use. Existing parking and site
38 circulation will be adequate to serve the site. As previously noted, conditions related to the field
39 lighting are included within the draft amended permit to mitigate for potential adverse impacts
40 to surrounding areas. Provided that the conditions are followed, this condition is met.

1 8) *The proposed use will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic*
2 *features of importance.*

3 **Finding:** The Subject Property and project site are currently used for athletic purposes that
4 support the Mahtomedi School Campus and greater community. The proposed use of the project
5 site and surrounding athletic fields is anticipated to remain the same. Destruction, loss, or
6 damage of natural or historic features on the site is not anticipated. This standard is met.

7 9) *The proposed use will not increase flood potential or create additional water runoff onto*
8 *surrounding properties.*

9 **Finding:** The proposed synthetic turf grass will be installed on 8” of porous aggregate with flat
10 drain tiles. The Applicant must obtain all proper permits from the RCWD, and the City Engineer
11 must review the permits for compliance with the City standard. Provided this condition is
12 followed, this standard is met.

13 **Motion by Council Member Cornett, seconded by Council Member Cremona, to approve the**
14 **Conditional Use Permit Amendment and related resolution 2026-23. Motion approved 5-0.**
15

16 **D. Continued: Consideration of Conditional Use Permit for a cannabis microbusiness with**
17 **retail endorsement on the property located at 11020 60th St N - City Planner Haskamp**
18

19 Planner Haskamp reviewed the additional materials provided by the applicant in response to the
20 Council’s concerns related to parking surface and site access as well as the sign plan. She again
21 indicated that the public hearing was opened and closed at the July Council meeting.
22

23 Planner Haskamp recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit based on the following
24 information provided in the staff report:

25 1) *The proposed use is designated in section 32-245 as a conditional use for the appropriate*
26 *zoning district.*

27 **Finding:** Cannabis Dispensary (Retail) is a conditionally permitted use within the General
28 Business (GB) district. This standard is met.

29 2) *The proposed use conforms to the city’s comprehensive plan.*

30 **Finding:** The site is guided GB – General Business in the City’s adopted Comprehensive Plan.
31 The proposed cannabis microbusiness retail operation is consistent with the City’s goal to
32 maintain commercial development along the Highway 36/60th Street North corridor. This
33 standard is met.

34 3) *The proposed use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general*
35 *welfare of the city, its residents, or the existing neighborhood.*

36 **Finding:** Per Minn. Stat. 342.13, the City must permit one (1) cannabis retail registration, which
37 includes any retail license, microbusiness license with a retail endorsement, or mezzobusiness
38 license with a retail endorsement. License-holders will be required to follow all state regulations
39 regarding the sale and distribution of legal cannabis products.

Furthermore, cannabis operators will be required to follow the regulations established in Chapter 5 of the City's Code of Ordinances, which is intended to protect public health, safety, and welfare in the City by implementing regulations pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 342 related to cannabis and hemp businesses. The proposed cannabis retail use complies with all setback and buffer requirements from schools and residential treatment facilities established in Sec. 32-355. It should be noted that no onsite consumption lounge is permitted as part of this CUP. As such, future amendments regarding use may be required if an onsite consumption lounge is proposed to ensure that such use complies with this standard. This standard is met for the retail dispensary use.

4) *The proposed use is compatible with the existing neighborhood.*

Finding: The proposed cannabis microbusiness retail operation is consistent with the City's goals of orderly commercial development along the Highway 36/60th Street North corridor. There are several business operations in the surrounding area, so the proposed use is compatible with the existing land use pattern.

The proposed cannabis retail use complies with all setback and buffer requirements established in Sec. 32-355. This standard is met.

5) *The proposed use meets conditions or standards adopted by the city through resolutions or other ordinances.*

Finding: Cannabis Dispensary (Retail) is a conditionally permitted use within the General Business (GB) district. The proposed cannabis operation will be located in an existing commercial building in an established commercial district. The submitted plans comply with the conditions and standards adopted by the City. The Applicant is required to demonstrate compliance with the Code as a condition of approval. This standard is met.

6) *The proposed use will not create additional requirements for facilities and services at public costs beyond the city's normal low-density residential and agricultural uses.*

Finding: Per the Applicant's narrative, the proposed dispensary will utilize the property's existing well and septic systems, which have supported the existing commercial use. The proposed operation is expected to generate relatively low water usage. No significant increase in wastewater flow is anticipated. The Owner is responsible for verifying the capacity of septic system to support the proposed dispensary operations.

7) *The proposed use will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to people, property, or the general welfare because of production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors or any other nuisance.*

Finding: As part of the state licensing process, cannabis operators are required to submit odor mitigation and ventilation plans to the Office of Cannabis Management (OCM). The plans must demonstrate that the proposed dispensary will operate in a manner that minimizes cannabis-related odors and maintains compliance with Minnesota cannabis regulations and applicable City ordinances.

The Applicant included the odor mitigation and ventilation plan with the application materials for the proposed cannabis retail operation. Per the submitted materials, the proposed dispensary

1 will operate entirely within enclosed indoor spaces. Cannabis products will remain sealed in
2 compliant packaging during storage and retail operations. The facility will utilize commercial
3 HVAC ventilation systems designed to minimize odor migration from operational areas.

4 The Applicant will be required to maintain odor mitigation and ventilation measures consistent
5 with Minnesota Statutes Chapter 342, Office of Cannabis Management (OCM) regulations, and
6 applicable City of Grant ordinances. The proposed dispensary is not anticipated to generate
7 excessive additional light, given that no changes are proposed to the outdoor lighting and the
8 illuminated exterior signage will be required to meet the City's sign regulations. Exterior
9 lighting that is a requirement of the OCM permitting standards must be designed to comply
10 with the City's ordinances and must downcast and hooded. The illuminated sign on the east
11 elevation must be turned off during non-business hours. No outdoor speakers or additional noise
12 are anticipated as part of the proposed project. This standard is met.

- 13 8) *The proposed use will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic*
14 *features of importance.*

15 **Finding:** The proposed retail operation will be located in an existing commercial structure and
16 none of the building modifications are expected to impact existing natural, scenic, or historic
17 features. Best management practices will be implemented as required by applicable local,
18 watershed district, and state regulations. This standard is met.

- 19 9) *The proposed use will not increase flood potential or create additional water runoff onto*
20 *surrounding properties.*

21 **Finding:** The Applicant is proposing to utilize the existing gravel parking area east of the
22 principal structure and to install a concrete walkway; however, even with these improvements,
23 the impervious surface coverage is anticipated to be about 40%. Any expansion of impervious
24 surface area and/or when the parking lot is planned for upgrades must comply with all
25 stormwater rules and regulations. All permits must be obtained and must be reviewed and
26 approved by the City Engineer. This is included within the conditions of the permit. With the
27 conditions as noted within the permit, this standard is met.

28
29 Council Member Cornett confirmed that the illuminated sign will be turned off during non-operating
30 hours. He also stated that this one is odd because the state is mandating the allowance of this. He said
31 you have to work for the residents and although this isn't ideal, he thinks with the proposed operator
32 and it seems to be the best case scenario.

33 Council Member Rog stated that the State of Minnesota has said you have to allow one per 12,500
34 residents, and even though Grant only has 4,000, the state doesn't allow rounding down to zero. If a
35 City has 500 people, they still have to allow one cannabis retail. He does not agree with what the State
36 is doing he doesn't agree with the rounding. But, he said they do not have a choice.

37 Council Member Anderson brought up the fact that if it's approved as is, he thinks there are
38 pedestrian safety issues by having the customers for this business drive directly in front of the car
39 sales building. He said the gravel parking lot is partially grass, so he said a friendly amendment to
40 this request is that he thinks the parking lot should be paved and striped now, not after the highway
41 36 project is completed. He struggles with the fact they're being forced to do this, there is another

1 location about 3 miles away so not having it wouldn't prohibit people from getting it, and that it's
2 creating a traffic issue in front of an existing business.

3
4 Council Member Cremona is equally concerned about traffic flow and safety in the short term. She
5 concurs that she feels the state is taking a bit of unconstitutional reach by treating cannabis differently
6 than it treats other types business and it's unclear why. She remarked that you can have a 'dry' city
7 when it comes to alcohol, but you cannot have a 'dry' city when it comes to cannabis and that it is
8 unique. She said they're trying to listen to the residents but they don't really have a choice. She does
9 have concerns about the safety and the fact that this is a business within a business and they might
10 have people going through from one business to the next.

11
12 Mayor Giefer said he completely understands the concerns raised by the residents, but as has been
13 pointed out, the State of Minnesota has superseded local authority and is requiring this. And Staff has
14 tried very hard but cannot find a defensible position to deny the variance. He asked about the health
15 and safety issues raised by Councilmembers Anderson and Cremona, and if looking at it closer would
16 change anything. City Attorney Johnson stated that no, there is no evidence to support that there is a
17 legitimate traffic problem. Planner Haskamp also clarified that there is no door between the two
18 businesses and there is no access from Cartiva to the other business. There is one entrance and IDs
19 have to be checked, and they must comply with all of the OCM security standards.

20
21 Council Member asked if they had to allow illuminated signs. Planner Haskamp confirmed that the
22 sign ordinance does allow illuminated signs, and reviewed some of the sign criteria.

23
24 **Motion to Approve the Conditional Use Permit from for a cannabis microbusiness with retail**
25 **endorsement by Council Member Cornett, seconded by Mayor Giefer. Council Member**
26 **Anderson asked for a friendly amendment to require the lot be paved and striped now. Cornett**
27 **and Giefer agreed to the amendment of paving the lot now.**

28
29 Roll call vote:

30 Cornett: Aye

31 Rog: Aye

32 Cremona: Naye

33 Anderson: Naye

34 Giefer: Aye

35
36 **Motion approved 3-2.** Planner Haskamp indicated that the Resolution approving the CUP as
37 amended will be on the consent agenda at the next meeting.

38
39 **E. Dust Control - City Administrator Lacey Smieja**

40 Administrator Smieja indicated that she met with Ken Johnson and Brian Kline, and that roughly
41 \$40,000 is required to complete the third application of dust control and only \$32,000 remains in the
42 budget. Smieja indicated that during their discussion Johnson and Kline indicate that there was excess
43 money in the road shouldering and heavy brushing budgets. So, if the Council is okay with moving
44 the money from one line item to another, the money has been 'found' to complete the third
45 application of dust control. Council all agreed that the third application of calcium chloride should be
46 done.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Administrator Smieja stated that building inspector/code enforcement report was in the packet and she could answer questions. Council Member Anderson asked if more follow-up would be done with the SiteOne complaint. Smieja indicated that Jack Kramer would confirm that the material is moved.

Administrator Smieja said that the Street Improvement neighborhood meetings should be happening on September 9th and 10th in the evening and that she would share the invites as soon as she receives them. Additionally, she requested they keep in mind that a special meeting may need to be scheduled in September to approve the preliminary budget and levy before the September 30th deadline.

Mayor Giefer indicated that he has been attending the MN Mayors Association and regional council of Mayors meetings, as well as LMC policy committee meetings (improving local economies and improving service delivery). They allow local officials to provide input about what policy positions LMC advocates for at the state legislature. The top priorities he shared with them were the opposition to the MN starter home act which pre-empts local zoning control and requires areas of higher density housing. The next priority was opposition to the state imposed cannabis mandate. The other two topics were related to broadband franchising and concerns about data centers.

Council Member Cremona stated she was happy residents came forward about revitalizing the Planning Commission and she is hoping they can talk about it during a future meeting, maybe the next special workshop could have this on the agenda.

CLOSED SESSION

Motion to enter into Closed Session by Mayor Giefer, seconded by Council Member Cremona, pursuant to Minn. Stat. Sec. 13D.05, subd. 3(b) for the purposes of attorney-client privileged communications to discuss possible litigation related to *Hillukka v. Grant*, Court File No. 82-CV-25-3834. Motion carried 5-0.

Motion by Mayor Giefer, seconded by Council Member Cremona, to end the closed session and return to the open session for the purpose of adjournment. Motion carried 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Council Member Cornett, seconded by Council Member Rog to adjourn at 8:40 p.m. Motion carried 5-0.

These minutes were considered and approved at the regular Council Meeting on September 1, 2026.



Lacey L. Smieja
Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer



Jeff Giefer
Mayor