

CITY OF GRANT  
MINUTES

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

**DATE** : September 1, 2020  
**TIME STARTED** : 7:01 p.m.  
**TIME ENDED** : 9:19 p.m.  
**MEMBERS PRESENT** : Councilmember Carr, Rog, Giefer,  
Schafer and Mayor Huber  
**MEMBERS ABSENT** : None

Staff members present: City Attorney, Dave Snyder; City Engineer, Brad Reifsteck; City Planner, Jennifer Swanson; City Treasurer, Sharon Schwarze; and Administrator/Clerk, Kim Points

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

No one was present for public input.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**SETTING THE AGENDA**

**Council Member Schafer moved to approve the agenda, as presented. Council Member Rog seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously with a roll call vote.**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- August 4, 2020 City Council Meeting Minutes Approved
- August 12, 2020 Special Council Meeting Minutes Approved
- August 2020 Bill List, \$83,556.41 Approved
- Kline Bros. Excavating, Road Work,  
\$32,829.50 Approved
- City of Mahtomedi, 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Fire  
Contract, \$36,407.00 Approved
- Consideration of City of Grant City Owned/  
Issued Portable Devices Policy Approved

1  
2 **Council Member Giefer moved to approve the consent agenda, as presented. Council Member**  
3 **Rog seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously with a roll call vote.**

4  
5 **STAFF AGENDA ITEMS**

6  
7 **City Engineer, Brad Reifsteck**

8  
9 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2020-37, Declaring Adequacy of Petition and Ordering**  
10 **Preparation of Report** – City Engineer Reifsteck advised a petition was received from property  
11 owners living along Knollwood Drive N requesting street improvements.

12  
13 The signed petitions account for 62% (5/8) of the property owners within the project limits. The  
14 minimum required by state law and the City assessment policy is 35% to authorize the City Engineer  
15 to prepare a Feasibility Study

16  
17 **Council Member Giefer moved to adopt Resolution No. 2020-37, as presented. Council**  
18 **Member Schafer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.**

19  
20 **Consideration of Dellwood Road Court North Subgrade Correction** – City Engineer Reifsteck  
21 stated Dellwood Road Ct roadway is experiencing unusual roadway deterioration due to frost boils  
22 and requires a subgrade correction.

23  
24 The length and width of the patch is approximately 120 x 18 feet.

25  
26 Kline Bros estimates a cost to repair the subgrade with geotextile fabric, sand, class 5 aggregate base  
27 and paving at \$13,800. The bituminous pavement will be completed by the City's roadway patching  
28 contractor.

29  
30 The total improvement is estimated at \$13,800 and its anticipated to be funded by special roadway  
31 funds.

32  
33 **Council Member Giefer moved to approve the Dellwood Road Court North Subgrade**  
34 **Correction, as presented. Council Member Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried**  
35 **unanimously by a roll call vote.**

36  
37 **Consideration of Kimbro Avenue Road Improvements** – City Engineer Reifsteck stated Kimbro  
38 Avenue is under water just north of the intersection at 75<sup>th</sup> street (CSAH 12) and is currently closed to  
39 traffic.

40  
41 Neighborhoods to the north along Kimbro Avenue currently have access from the west along 83<sup>rd</sup>  
42 Street and the north and east at 88<sup>th</sup> Street

43  
44 Washington County has already completed road improvements on CSAH 12 due to flooding.  
45

1 Minnesota Statute sections 12.29,12.37 and 375.21 provide that emergency contracts are not subject  
2 to the normal purchasing and competitive bidding requirements.

3  
4 Wetland permitting, if required, will be completed by the City Engineer.  
5

6 Kline Bros estimates a cost to install erosion control, and roadway section up to the top of the class 5  
7 aggregate base at \$42,000.  
8

9 The bituminous pavement will be completed by the City's roadway patching contractor, ARC, once  
10 flooding has resided. The paving is estimated at \$20,000.  
11

12 The total improvement is estimated at \$62,000 and its anticipated to be funded by special roadway  
13 funds.  
14

15 **Council Member Schafer moved to approve the Kimbro Avenue Road Improvements, as**  
16 **presented. Council Member Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by a roll**  
17 **call vote.**  
18

19 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2020-39, Issuance and Sale of \$735,000 General Obligation**  
20 **Improvement Bond, Pledging Special Assessments and Levying a Tax for Payment Thereof –**  
21 **City Engineer Reifsteck stated the following:**  
22

- 23 1. The bond issuance and sale in the amount of \$735,000 was offered by Bremer Bank, National  
24 Association.
- 25 2. The interest rate is 2.00% with an issuance date of September 29, 2020 and maturity date of  
26 February 1, 2036.
- 27 3. The City Council will take action to adopt the attached approving resolutions as prepared by  
28 the City's Bond counsel.
- 29 4. The City Council will abide by the governmental bonds post issuance compliance policies and  
30 procedures adopted on June 6, 2020. This policy is simply saying that the City will comply  
31 with the IRS rules.  
32

33 **Council Member Carr moved to adopt Resolution No. 2020-39, as presented. Council Member**  
34 **Schafer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.**  
35

36 **City Planner, Jennifer Swanson**  
37

38 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2020-34, Variance from Tributary Stream Setbacks for**  
39 **Replacement Sewage System, 9440 71<sup>st</sup> Street North –** City Planner Swanson advised the  
40 Applicant Jesse Kloepfner, KSD ("Applicant") on behalf of the Owner Lawrence Tomai, has  
41 requested a variance from the tributary stream setbacks for installation of a new septic system on the  
42 property located at 9440 71<sup>st</sup> Street North. The Applicant is the designer of the new septic system for  
43 the subject property, and the owner is required to install a new compliant septic system on the subject  
44 property. The Applicant has been working with Washington County to acquire a permit for installing  
45 the new system, and they were notified by the County that the location of the replacement system is

1 within the City’s required tributary stream setbacks and thus would need to obtain a variance from the  
2 city prior to being issued a permit for installation of the new system.

3  
4 On August 12, 2020 a duly noticed public hearing was held by the Planning Commission for  
5 consideration of the subject application. One member of the public provided public testimony  
6 requesting clarification as to why the alternate location identified on the site plan was not selected  
7 since it would be located further away from the tributary stream. After public testimony, the Planning  
8 Commission discussed the request and asked staff to follow up regarding the identified location for  
9 the replacement system. Staff indicated that our understanding is that identified location is the  
10 preferred location and is most suitable from a soil and functional perspective. Additionally, the  
11 alternate location requires a second variance from the City’s front-yard setback requirements. After  
12 discussion, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the requested setback  
13 variance from the tributary stream.

14  
15 The following staff report is generally as presented at the Planning Commission meeting and  
16 summarizes the requested variance. Draft findings and conditions are found in the draft Resolution  
17 which is attached for your review and consideration.

18  
19 **Project Summary**

<p><b>Applicant:</b> Jesse Kloepfner, KSD (Septic Designer) <b>Owner:</b> Lawrence Tomai</p>	<p><b>Site Size:</b> 0.94 Acres <b>Location:</b> 9440 71<sup>st</sup> Street North <b>Existing Home:</b> Constructed in 1969 <b>Zoning &amp; Land Use:</b> R1</p>
<p>Request: Variance from tributary stream septic to install a compliant subsurface sewage treatment system on the subject property.</p>	

20  
21  
22 As referenced above, the Applicant has requested the following variance:

- 23  
24     ▪ Request for variance from required 150-foot setback from a tributary stream to site a new  
25       subsurface sewage treatment system. The subject property is a legally non-conforming lot and  
26       does not provide enough lot area to site a new system which meets all required setbacks.

27  
28 The Applicant has stated that the existing sewage treatment system serving the home is noncompliant  
29 and must be replaced prior to selling the property. According to the Applicant’s narrative, as the  
30 septic designer, the only location on site that can adequately support a replacement system is the  
31 proposed location which encroaches into the required setback from a tributary stream (both the tanks  
32 and drainfield will encroach into the required setback).

33  
34 City Planner Swansons advised City Code Sections 32-59 and 32-60 establish the criteria to review  
35 and approve variance requests. The variance application process requires the Applicant to prepare a  
36 statement of reasons why the request is made describing the hardship (or practical difficulty)  
37 describing how, “the proposed use of the property and associated structures in question cannot be  
38 established under the conditions allowed by this chapter or its amendments and no other reasonable

1 alternate use exists; however, the plight of the landowner must be due to physical conditions unique  
 2 to the land, structure or building involved and are not applicable to other lands, structures or buildings  
 3 in the same zoning district....Economic considerations alone shall not constitute a hardship.”  
 4

5 The Applicant’s statement can be found in Attachment B, which states there are no other locations on  
 6 the subject property that are available to comply with the City’s required setback. For the subject  
 7 property to be used for single-family residential purposes a sewage septic system must be located  
 8 onsite. Further analysis regarding the practical difficulties of the property are provided in the  
 9 following analysis.  
 10

11 The subject property is part of the Sunnybrook Lake subdivision which was developed in the 1960’s  
 12 prior to the current minimum lot size standards. The subject property is approximately 0.96 Acres and  
 13 is considered a legally non-conforming lot. The existing home was constructed in 1969 at which time  
 14 a septic system was installed. The lot is slightly irregular in shape but is generally oriented east-west  
 15 and is approximately 215-feet wide by an average of 210-feet deep. There is a tributary stream which  
 16 connects with Sunnybrook Lake to the east, and the stream crosses the northern edge of the subject  
 17 property. Because the lot size is small, the area exclusive of the developed area, stream and setback  
 18 areas is constrained which leaves few available locations to site a new/replacement septic system.  
 19

20 The tributary stream setbacks are established in Chapter 12 of the City’s Code, section 12-260 which  
 21 identifies structural and sewer setbacks. The following description of the variance and standard is  
 22 provided (See Attachment B for site plan):  
 23

Standard	Required	Proposed	Variance	Description
Tributary Stream	150’	59’9” tanks; and 94’9” Drainfield	90.3’ for the Septic Tanks, 55.3’ for the drainfield	The proposed septic tanks will be setback behind the existing principal structure but south of stream, and the associated drainfield will be located near the southerly property line and in front of the principal structure.

24  
 25 Lot Size/Constraints

26 The Applicant’s lot was created in the 1960s when the Sunnybrook Lake subdivision was developed,  
 27 and the existing home was constructed in 1969. At the time, the plat of the Sunnybrook Lake  
 28 subdivision complied with the township and County lot development standards. Since the 1960s lot  
 29 size and area standards have changed and as a result the lot is now considered a legal non-conforming  
 30 lot with respect to size, area and dimensions. Given that the existing lot area and dimensions are  
 31 significantly smaller than those that regulate lots today, it would be nearly impossible to site a  
 32 replacement septic system on the property and meet all the current setback requirements. The lot is  
 33 naturally constrained not only by natural features on the property (stream) but also by the non-  
 34 conforming nature of the lot area and dimensions. Further, due to the location of the existing home  
 35 and the well which serves the residence the location that a septic system could be sited is further  
 36 reduced. To that end, the proposed plan requires the drainfield to be located in front of the home  
 37 (east) and for a 2” supply line extending 75-feet to be installed to the drainfield further demonstrating  
 38 the constraints associated with the lot. Staff believes the proposed location of the replacement system  
 39 is reasonable and is properly located based upon topography and other natural site limiting factors,

1 and that the variance requested has been minimized to the extent possible. It is noted that the  
2 proposed system complies with all other required setbacks including yard setbacks, right-of-way  
3 setbacks and appropriate setback from the well. Finally, the Applicant must remedy the situation to  
4 comply with the standards for septic systems as identified by Washington County to sell the property.

5  
6 The City Engineer does not have any additional comments regarding the proposed location and  
7 system.

8  
9 The site is located in the Valley Branch Watershed District (VBWD), and the Applicant has contacted  
10 the VBWD to determine whether any permits are required. Depending on the quantity of grading  
11 associated with the proposed installation a grading/erosion control permit may be required from the  
12 VBWD. As referenced previously, the Applicant must obtain a permit from the Washington County  
13 Department of Public Health and Environment prior to installation of the system, as they are the  
14 permitting authority for new and replacement septic systems in the City.

15  
16 Staff recommends approval of the requested variance with conditions as follows:

- 17  
18 1. The Applicant shall be required to obtain the proper permits from the Washington County  
19 Department of Public Health and Environment prior to installation of the replacement system.  
20 2. The replacement system must be placed outside of all stream and/or wetland areas on the site.  
21 3. The Applicant shall be required to obtain any necessary permits and/or approvals from the  
22 Valley Branch Watershed District prior to installation. A copy of any correspondence or  
23 permits shall be provided to the city prior to installation of the new system.  
24

25 **Council Member Schafer moved to adopt Resolution No. 2020-34, as presented. Council**  
26 **Member Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council Member Rog and Giefer**  
27 **voting nay by a roll call vote.**

28  
29 **Consideration of Application for a Conditional Use Permit for Two Silo Farmhouse Resort,**  
30 **7040 117<sup>th</sup> Street North** – City Planner Swanson advised on August 4, 2020 the subject application  
31 was considered at the regular City Council meeting. City staff provided a presentation and summary  
32 of the application materials submitted by the Applicant, and summarized the analysis completed in  
33 the staff report dated July 27, 2020. After presentation and discussion, the City Council provided  
34 direction to staff to prepare a Resolution of approval for the subject Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”),  
35 and directed staff to prepare a draft CUP for consideration at the regular September 1, 2020 City  
36 Council meeting. The following staff memo summarizes information submitted by the Applicant  
37 since the August meeting, provides a staff response (if needed), and provides draft findings as  
38 presented within the attached resolution. Since most of the information remains the same as  
39 presented at the August meeting, staff requests that you reference the staff report dated July 27, 2020  
40 for details regarding the proposed operation.

41  
42 Supplemental Information  
43

1 City staff communicated with the Applicant to obtain supplemental information that would be helpful  
2 to the City Council to complete its review on September 1, 2020. The following summary of the  
3 supplemental information, including staff's response, is provided for your review and consideration.  
4

- 5 • **Narrative Addendum #2:** The Applicant submitted a narrative addressing the city staff's  
6 requested additional information. As noted in the Addendum staff requested: 1) updated site  
7 plan to identify bathroom locations, overflow parking, ADA parking stalls, expanded  
8 driveway and future septic and holding tank areas; 2) Driveway Expansion; 3) Overflow  
9 Parking; 4) Landscape buffer for the parking area(s) and any improvements; and 5) Public  
10 Restrooms location, septic drainfield and holding tanks. The following summary and staff  
11 response of each items is provided.

- 12 ○ **Updated Site Plan:** Site Plan has been updated to identify location of bathrooms,  
13 overflow parking, ADA parking stalls and future drainfield locations.

- 14 ■ **Staff Response:** The Site Plan now includes the identified elements but does  
15 not include the expanded driveway as requested by the city engineer. Staff  
16 continues to include a condition within the attached draft CUP that requires an  
17 updated Site Plan to reflect the conditions of the City Engineer.

- 18 ○ **Driveway Expansion:** The Applicant restates their desire to maintain the driveway  
19 plan as presented on the Site Plan submitted in the August 4, 2020 City Council  
20 materials.

- 21 ■ **Staff Response:** The City Engineer has reviewed the site plan and has indicated  
22 that the driveway should be 22-feet of traveled surface, and that the expanded  
23 driveway should be extended from the public road right-of-way (117<sup>th</sup>) to the  
24 turnaround near the proposed operations. While city staff understands the  
25 desire to maintain as many trees on site as possible, staff believes that the  
26 driveway should be expanded to ensure safe ingress and egress on the site.  
27 Staff requests discussion by the City Council regarding this item. A condition  
28 has been included in the permit that all requirements of the City Engineer must  
29 be completed which includes the requested driveway expansion.

- 30 ○ **Overflow Parking:** The Applicant has identified an area onsite for overflow parking  
31 to the east of the proposed parking lot. The area designated will remain a grassy area  
32 and will have adequate area for approximately 21 additional cars on site.

- 33 ■ **Staff Response:** The area identified onsite for overflow parking is adequate.  
34 Staff recommends including a condition in the Permit that the overflow parking  
35 area shall be used on a limited basis only to prevent parking or back-ups on  
36 117<sup>th</sup> Street N., and that the overflow parking is not a means to permit higher  
37 occupancy levels onsite.

- 38 ○ **Landscape Buffer for the parking area:** The Applicant indicates that the existing  
39 trees on the property line and at the road right-of-way are adequate and no further  
40 buffering is needed.

- 1                   ▪ **Staff Response:** Staff would suggest that proof of the existing vegetation and  
2 screening be provided, and that existing vegetation be included on an updated  
3 landscape plan. If it is deemed adequate, Staff recommends including a  
4 condition in the CUP that the landscape buffering shall be maintained and  
5 replaced (if necessary) provided the operations of the CUP are active.
- 6                   ○ **Public Restrooms & Septic Drainfield:** The Applicant has identified the location of  
7 the proposed restrooms and has indicated that natural screening exists in this area. The  
8 Applicant is proposing to use an, “upscale portable bathroom trailer with a self-  
9 contained holding tank, running water, ADA accessible and electricity will be utilized”  
10 from 2022 through 2025 (see attachment A for facility type). Future septic drainfield  
11 location is identified and is proposed to be installed in Spring of 2026.
- 12                   ▪ **Staff Response:** The proposed location of the permanent bathroom facilities  
13 meets all setback requirements, but details including size of the facility was not  
14 provided. Consistent with staff’s recommendation regarding the landscape plan  
15 on the easterly property line, staff recommends that an updated landscape plan  
16 be provided to demonstrate adequate screening of the permanent restrooms.  
17 Additionally, staff recommends including a condition that the bathroom  
18 facilities shall be designed to be architecturally compatible with the existing  
19 structures on site and that such design shall be reviewed and approved by the  
20 city staff.

21  
22                   Based on the discussion by the City Council on August 4, 2020, staff does not  
23 believe that the “upscale portable bathroom trailer” meets the Council’s request  
24 for bathroom facilities to support the operations through 2025. City Staff  
25 understands the applicant’s desire to delay the investment in the bathroom  
26 facilities until the site is fully operational, but the portable bathroom facilities  
27 were not acceptable based on the Council’s discussion. Consistent with the  
28 City Council’s discussion on August 4<sup>th</sup>, staff has included draft conditions  
29 within the CUP that require the installation of permanent restrooms onsite. To  
30 address the timing issue, staff provides an option that permanent bathrooms  
31 must be installed when the tasting room is opened to the general public (i.e.  
32 Guests of the farmhouse, or small activities scheduled in the farmhouse would  
33 not trigger the construction of the public restrooms. However, any public  
34 visiting the site for the winery only – no staying or participation in the  
35 farmhouse – would require the installation of the permanent restroom  
36 facilities). Lastly, soil borings were not submitted to demonstrate that the  
37 drainfield area is adequate to support a septic system. Staff has included a  
38 condition within the CUP to require soil borings be submitted prior to  
39 commencement of operations.  
40



1 City Planner Swanson stated as required in Section 32-146 Standards for issuing a Conditional Use  
2 Permit (“Permit”), “...the city council may grant a conditional use permit in any zoning district if the  
3 applicant has proven to a reasonable degree of certainty that:”  
4

- 5 • The proposed use is designated in section 32-245 as a conditional use for the appropriate  
6 zoning district.
  - 7 ○ Finding: The proposed Two Silo Farmhouse Resort is a combination of uses which  
8 include agricultural, small-scale rural event facility, resort, and seasonal business. All  
9 uses contemplated and proposed as part of the operation are permitted or permitted  
10 with a conditional use permit in the A-1 zoning district.
- 11 • The proposed use conforms to the city’s comprehensive plan.
  - 12 ○ Finding: The subject property is guided A-1 and the City’s comprehensive plan  
13 identifies Goal #3 regarding land use, “Preserve and protect agricultural land and  
14 facilities, agricultural lifestyles, and encourage hobby farms and commercial  
15 agricultural uses within the City.” Per Minnesota State Statute, as well as the City’s  
16 land use designations a Farm Winery must be located on agricultural property and is a  
17 considered an agricultural and/or agritourism business. The proposed use is consistent  
18 with the City’s adopted Comprehensive Plan.
- 19 • The proposed use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general  
20 welfare of the city, its residents, or the existing neighborhood.
  - 21 ○ Finding: The proposed use will not be detrimental or endanger the public health, safety  
22 or general welfare of the residents or existing neighborhood provided the conditions of  
23 the Permit are met. Conditions contained in the Permit include mitigation for adequate  
24 ingress/egress, hours of operation, maximum occupancy levels and provisions to  
25 ensure that adequate utilities (sanitary) are on-site.
- 26 • The proposed use is compatible with the existing neighborhood.
  - 27 ○ Finding: The proposed use is compatible with the existing neighborhood provided the  
28 conditions of the Permit are met. The site is greater than 20-acres, allows adequate area  
29 for buffering, and limited structural improvements are proposed. The neighborhood is  
30 comprised of large-acreage parcels with a mix of agricultural, agritourism, and rural  
31 residential use. The proposed use will maintain and preserve the existing farmhouse  
32 that has been restored and the existing accessory buildings as part of the operations.  
33 The vines (vineyard) is an agricultural use which is consistent with surrounding small  
34 hobby farms and agricultural activities. Site improvements such as parking areas must  
35 be properly buffered from adjacent neighbors and public right-of-way so that the  
36 property remains visually consistent with surrounding properties.
- 37 • The proposed use meets conditions or standards adopted by the city through resolutions or  
38 other ordinances.
  - 39 ○ Finding: The proposed use is consistent with conditions and standards adopted by the  
40 city through its zoning ordinance, and other ordinances. Rural Event Facilities were

1 added to the City's table of uses in 2014 to support agritourism types of uses, and the  
2 Farm Winery and its operations is consistent with the performance standards identified  
3 by the City.

- 4 • The proposed use will not create additional requirements for facilities and services at public  
5 cost beyond the city's normal low-density residential and agricultural uses.
  - 6 ○ Finding: The proposed use will not create additional requirements for facilities or  
7 services. The proposed operations shall be required to make all improvements on site  
8 to adequately serve the proposed use. Any required improvements to the County  
9 roadway shall be completed by the Applicant and at their cost to ensure adequate  
10 ingress/egress to the operations and to obtain an access permit from Washington  
11 County.
- 12 • The proposed use will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment or  
13 conditions of operations that will be detrimental to people, property, or the general welfare  
14 because of production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors, or any other nuisances.
  - 15 ○ Finding: The proposed use is a permitted and conditionally permitted use per the  
16 City's table of uses. Proper conditions detailing mitigation of potential nuisances are  
17 provided for and addressed within the Permit conditions which address parking, noise,  
18 glare (lighting) and other operational considerations.
- 19 • The proposed use will not result in the destruction, loss of damage of natural, scenic or  
20 historic features of importance.
  - 21 ○ Finding: There are no natural, scenic or historic features of importance on site that are  
22 proposed for removal, modification or disturbance.
- 23 • The proposed use will not increase flood potential or create additional water runoff onto  
24 surrounding properties.
  - 25 ○ Finding: The proposed operations will not increase flood potential or create additional  
26 water runoff onto surrounding properties. The Applicant shall be required to manage  
27 stormwater onsite consistent with the City and Rice Creek Watershed District rules  
28 and regulations.
- 29 • These standards apply in addition to specific conditions as may be specified through the city's  
30 ordinances.
  - 31 ○ Finding: Specific ordinances and performance standards were applied and evaluated  
32 regarding the proposed operations. Details regarding the analysis are documented  
33 within the agenda packet materials.

34  
35 Mr. Keith Dehnert, Applicant, stated all parking on site does make sense and he is open to widen the  
36 driveway and will accept putting full bathrooms – well and septic in as there is plenty of area to do  
37 that. He noted he has full intent to work with staff on a landscape and buffering plan for the site.  
38

1 After much discussion, the City Council determined a 22 foot driveway would be required, a  
2 landscaping plan is required and full well and septic will be installed.

3  
4 **Council Member Schafer moved to table Consideration of Application for a Conditional Use**  
5 **Permit, Two Silo Farm Resort to the October 2020 City Council meeting. Council Member**  
6 **Giefer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.**

7  
8 **City Attorney, Dave Snyder (no action items)**

9  
10 **NEW BUSINESS**

11  
12 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2020-35, Preliminary City Budget for 2021** – City Treasurer  
13 Schwarze reviewed the changes to the 2021 budget per the budget work session and advised the  
14 preliminary budget is set at \$1,634,413.

15  
16 **Council Member Rog moved to adopt Resolution No. 2020-35, as presented. Council Member**  
17 **Schafer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.**

18  
19 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2020-36, Preliminary Levy Certification for 2021** – City  
20 Treasurer Schwarze advised the a 3% levy increase was considered resulting in the average market  
21 value home an increase of \$11.00 of City portion tax.

22  
23 **Council Member Schafer moved to adopt Resolution No. 2020-36, as presented. Council**  
24 **Member Rog seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.**

25  
26 **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

27  
28 There was no unfinished business.

29  
30 **DISCUSSION ITEMS (no action taken)**

31  
32 **Staff Updates (updates from Staff, no action taken)**

33  
34 **City Council Reports/Future Agenda Items**

35  
36 No items were placed on a future agenda.

37  
38 **COMMUNITY CALENDAR SEPTMBER 2THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2020:**

39  
40 **Mahtomedi Public Schools Board Meeting, Thursday, September 10<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, Mahtomedi**  
41 **District Education Center, 7:00 p.m.**

42  
43 **Stillwater Public Schools Board Meeting, Thursday, September 10th, Stillwater City Hall, 7:00**  
44 **p.m.**

1 **Washington County Commissioners Meeting, Tuesdays, Government Center, 9:00 a.m.**  
2

3 **ADJOURNMENT**  
4

5 **Council Member Giefer moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 p.m. Council Member Rog**  
6 **seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**  
7

8 These minutes were considered and approved at the regular Council Meeting October 6, 2020.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kim Points, Administrator/Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeff Huber, Mayor

