

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

DATE : July 7, 2015
TIME STARTED : 7:01 p.m.
TIME ENDED : 9:27 p.m.
MEMBERS PRESENT : Councilmember Sederstrom, Lobin, Huber,
Lanoux and Mayor Carr
MEMBERS ABSENT : None

Staff members present: City Attorney, Nick Vivian; City Engineer, Phil Olson; City Planner, Jennifer Haskamp; City Treasurer, Sharon Schwarze; and Administrator/Clerk, Kim Points

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Carr called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

PUBLIC INPUT

- (1) Jerry Helander, 6261 Jasmine – commented on the validity of Charter signatures.
- (2) Bob Tufty, 6365 Jasmine – expressed concern regarding submittal of the draft Charter and thanked City for taking care of overgrown trees.
- (3) Jean Poddratz, 8450 Jewel – commented on the Jamaca/Jeffrey Gateway Trail parking area.
- (4) Wally Anderson – 8830 80th Street – commented on School District escrow refund.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SETTING THE AGENDA

Council Member Huber moved to approve the agenda, as presented. Council Member Lobin seconded the motion.

Council Member Lanoux requested City Newspaper and Special Election be added to the regular agenda.

City Attorney Vivian advised submittal of the Charter will be on the August City Council meeting agenda.

Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux and Sederstrom voting nay.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

June 17, 2015 Special Council Meeting Minutes	Approved
Bill List, \$578,865.37	Approved
Brochman Blacktopping, Pothole Repair, \$20,011.00	Approved
Kline Bros. Excavating, Road Work, \$20,207.50	Approved
City of Mahtomedi, 2 nd Quarter Fire Contract, \$31,404.75	Approved
City of Stillwater, 1 st Half Fire Contract, \$54,266.50	Approved
Mahtomedi Public Schools, Landscape Escrow Refund, \$81,000	Approved
Revision to Landscape Plan, Manning Cell Tower	Approved

Council Member Lanoux moved to approve the consent agenda with the removal of Item 4A, June 2, 2015 City Council Meeting Minutes, 4B, June 17 Special Council Meeting Minutes and 4H, Mahtomedi Public Schools, Landscape Escrow Refund. Council Member Sederstrom seconded the motion. Motion failed with Council Member Lobin, Huber and Mayor Carr voting nay.

Council Member Huber moved to approve the consent agenda, as presented. Council Member Lobin seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux and Sederstrom voting nay.

DAN VOGT, CITY OVERVIEW

Mr. Dan Vogt, DJV Consulting, came forward and provided his background and presented the Council with basic information relating to Council/Staff relations, policy making, Council responsibilities and staff responsibilities in terms of the City process.

STAFF AGENDA ITEMS

City Engineer, Phil Olson

Discussion regarding McKusick Options – City Engineer Olson advised at the last City Council meeting, Council discussed the pavement condition on McKusick Road. Below is background

1 information about the road along with options for repairing the roadway, improving driving
2 conditions, and reducing maintenance costs.

3
4 Current Road Statistics:

- 5 • City completed seal coat in 2008
- 6 • Patching is approximately \$20,000/year
- 7 • Traffic counts
 - 8 ○ 1163 – west side
 - 9 ○ 1496 – east side

10
11 Washington County Considerations:

- 12 • Washington County turned the ownership of the road over to the City in 1988
- 13 • Washington County completed an overlay prior to the City taking ownership
- 14 • McKusick Road is not included as a detour route for the roundabout project at Hwy 96 and
15 Manning Avenue. The official detour will direct traffic to CSAH 12 and CSAH 9 however
16 some traffic may still use McKusick Road as a short cut.
- 17 • Staff contacted Washington County to discuss maintenance costs, responsibility, and having
18 the County take back ownership. Washington County is not interested as it does not provide
19 any benefit to their regional roadway network.
- 20 • A future signal is planned at the intersection of McKusick Road and Manning Avenue.
21 Roadway widening and signal sensors will be required on the Grant side of the intersection.
22

23 Improvement Options:

- 24 • Patching:
 - 25 ○ Currently \$20,000/year and expected to increase in the future
 - 26 ○ Does not provide long term solution to the pavement issues
- 27
- 28 • Pulverizing – Grinding the existing pavement
 - 29 ○ High traffic volumes may create increased grading or patching maintenance in some
30 areas.
 - 31 ○ Prepares road for future paving projects
 - 32 ○ Construction estimate: \$30,000
- 33
- 34 • Heavy Patching – Patching entire length of roadway with 1½ to 2 inches of pavement
 - 35 ○ Significantly reduces the amount of patching required for the next 5 to 10 years
 - 36 ○ Construction estimate: \$120,000
- 37
- 38 • Reclamation – Grinding existing pavement and paving 3½ inches of new pavement
 - 39 ○ Addresses all immediate maintenance issues and provides 20 year design life.
 - 40 ○ Construction estimate: \$300,000
 - 41 ○ Engineering, legal, administrative, and finance costs ranging from 15% to 25% are also
42 required to bid and administer the contract.
- 43

44 There are also several options for combining different types of improvements. For example,
45 pulverizing could be completed in the area between the golf course and the restaurant and heavy

1 patching could be completed at the east end near Hwy 96 and on the west end near Manning Avenue.
2 This would reduce the amount of patching required and encourage traffic to use the state and county
3 roads. He noted there is nothing to prevent the City from closing a portin of the road granted no
4 accesses are blocked.

5
6 Mayor Carr inquired about the sealcoat/patching schedule on McKusick. He also suggested the
7 business owners be contacted about potential improvements to the road and if the road can be
8 vacated.

9
10 Council Member Lanoux stated he talked to the County and they may have potential cost participation
11 opportunities regarding improvements. The funding needs to be used on high traffic roads and
12 arterials to continue getting the funds. The City does need a new road policy.

13
14 Council directed staff to obtain information regarding the sealcoat/patching schedule, discussion with
15 business owners, ramifications of vacating the road and the amount of patching dollars spent on the
16 road.

17
18 This item will be on the August City Council meeting agenda.

19
20 **Consideration of Grading System for Roads** – City Engineer Olson advised at the last City Council
21 meeting, Council directed engineering staff to provide a proposal for rating the City’s paved roads.
22 He reviewed the following proposal from WSB & Associates which includes tasks, costs, and a
23 schedule for rating the City’s paved roads.

24
25 **Cost Summary**

26 It is proposed that this project be billed hourly, with total cost estimated at **\$11,920**. If you are in
27 agreement with the terms as outlined above, please sign where indicated below and return one copy to
28 our office.

29
30 The following tasks will be completed as part of this work plan:

31
32 **1. Data Collection**

33
34 WSB staff will develop a pavement management database using Cartegraph.

35
36 As part of this process, *the City* will:

- 37
38
 - Review and provide comments on proposed street segments
 - Provide the Original Construction Dates for each segment

39
40
41 *WSB & Associates* will:

- 42
43
 - Clean and validate the data
 - Deployed data to field laptops for use in detailed field inspections
 - Create roadway segments

- Maintain data during the duration of the project

Cost: \$4,700

2. Detailed Inspection of City Pavement

WSB & Associates will complete pavement inspections in the City. The rating process consists of viewing the segment condition on the ground, recording information on the particular distresses, and inputting that data into the Cartegraph database.

- Rate approximately 30 miles of paved roads in the City of Grant.
 - View the segment condition on the ground
 - Record information on the particular distresses
 - Input that data into the Cartegraph database
 - Determine an Overall Condition Index (OCI) based on Army Corps of Engineers methodology

Cost: \$5,920

3. Meetings/Presentations/Reports

WSB & Associates will:

- Generate a report highlighting the current practices, findings from the analysis and recommendations for maintenance for the City

Cost: \$1,300

4. Deliverables

- Report and Figures showing the Overall Condition Index of all streets segments

5. Schedule

An estimated timeline for this project is as follows:

City Council authorizes Pavement Management project	July 2015
Data Collection	August 2015
Create Street Segments	August 2015
Deploy Database for Field Inspections	August 2015
Detailed Inspection of City Pavement	October 2015
Final Report	November 2015

Mayor Carr stated he thinks it may be better to put the dollars spent on this project into the roads.

Council Member Lanoux stated the benefit of this system is to determine the value of the roads and what is necessary to repair them. An inventory of the roads is needed as well as the set up of a three year repair program.

1 Council Member Huber stated the City does need to start working on this and he is willing to discuss
2 it further during the budget work session.

3
4 **Council Member Lanoux moved to accept the WSB proposal to rate the roads, as presented.**
5 **Council Member Sederstrom seconded the motion. Motion failed with Council Member Lobin,**
6 **Huber and Mayor Carr voting nay.**

7
8 This item will be on the August City Council meeting agenda.

9
10 **City Planner, Jennifer Haskamp**

11
12 **Discussion of Land Use Definitions** – City Planner Haskamp advised at the regular City Council
13 meeting in June staff requested authorization to begin the process of drafting land use definitions for
14 the second group of land uses included within the Moratorium. As background to the overall
15 moratorium process, staff initially identified 22 land uses without/or with limited definitions that were
16 most critical to review because they either 1) were uses that have been discussed/addressed by
17 applicants over the past year; or 2) were permitted with a conditional use permit in at least one zoning
18 district; or 3) have caused confusion by residents and/or staff over the past several years due to
19 lacking information. These land uses, per the direction of the Council, became the subject of the
20 Moratorium. The first group of 5 land use definitions has been drafted and considered at a public
21 hearing, and will be processed for final vote once the second group of definitions has undergone the
22 same process.

23
24 At the regular June City Council meeting staff proposed the second group of land use definitions
25 identified below:

- 26
27 ▪ Business Seasonal
28 ▪ Café and Restaurant
29 ▪ Clubs or Lodges
30 ▪ Greenhouses (commercial production only)

31 The following background information related to these uses is provided for your review and
32 consideration:

33 **Business – Seasonal**

34 The City's ordinances currently do not provide a definition for Seasonal Businesses; however, there
35 have been several inquiries from residents and landowners with respect to the seasonal operation of
36 businesses. There are several businesses in the city that are seasonally operated that were either
37 processed under the guise of a home occupation or under Ordinance 50 when Seasonal Businesses
38 were a permitted conditional use in most zoning districts (See table below depicting current Table of
39 Uses related to Seasonal Business). The City's previous Ordinance 50 which was replaced when the
40 ordinances were codified, permitted Seasonal Businesses with a Conditional Use Permit in every
41 zoning district except the Conservancy district where they were not permitted. Various council
42 people and other members of the public have brought up to Staff that perhaps the codified version is

1 an error that should be corrected to reflect Ordinance 50. As a starting point, the City Council should
 2 discuss whether Seasonal Businesses should be permitted, and if so should they be permitted with a
 3 Conditional Use Permit in the same zoning districts as previously permitted in Ordinance 50?

4 *Table 32-245:*

USE	ZONING DISTRICT				
	Conservancy	Agricultural A1	Agricultural A2	Residential R1	General Business (GB)
Business - Seasonal	N	N	N	N	N
<i>ORDINANCE 50</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>C</i>

5
 6 Secondly, the City’s ordinance includes a general definition for **Business**, which is provided for your
 7 reference:

8 **Business** means any occupation, employment or enterprise wherein merchandise is exhibited
 9 or sold, or where services are offered for compensation.

10 It would be reasonable to use this as the starting point for a definition related to seasonal business and
 11 to simply address the ‘seasonal’ nature of a use. Some general definitions of “Seasonal Business” are
 12 provided for your reference (dictionary.com, webster, etc.):

13 **Seasonal business** is a term that refers to the fluctuations in business that correspond to
 14 changes in season

15 **Seasonal** – pertaining to, dependent on, or accompanying the seasons of the year or some
 16 particular season; periodical

17 **Seasonal** - relating to, occurring in, or varying with a particular season

18
 19 However, staff would request Council to consider what types of seasonal uses and businesses would
 20 fit the character of the community. Through researching various codes, most communities address
 21 seasonal businesses that are primarily agricultural types of product/merchandise. For example, even
 22 the City of Bloomington addresses ‘seasonal’ in this context. A couple definitions related to seasonal
 23 sales are provided for your reference:

24 **Seasonal sales, outdoor** – Outdoor seasonal retail sales, where permitted, including but not
 25 limited to the seasonal sale of Christmas trees, plants, flowers, vegetables and related products
 26 available on a seasonal basis. (Bloomington)

27 **Agricultural-Business, Seasonal** - A seasonal business not exceeding six (6) months in any
 28 calendar year operated on a rural farm as defined offering for sale to the general public,
 29 produce or any derivative thereof, grown or raised on the property. (Scandia)

30 Staff would request the Council discuss what, if any, types of seasonal operations should be permitted
 31 and then staff can draft the appropriate language based upon that direction.

32
 33 **Café and Restaurant**

1 Section 32-1 Definitions, does not include a definition for Cafés and Restaurants. While it is
 2 somewhat intuitive what these uses are, it is also a bit confusing because the City’s code does include
 3 a definition for Supper Clubs which is similar to what someone might expect as a definition for a
 4 Restaurant. It is not entirely clear what the distinction between a Supper Club and a Restaurant would
 5 be, and given how the code addresses these uses within the Table of Uses, a definition that clearly
 6 distinguishes between the two uses is necessary. The following excerpt from the table is provided for
 7 reference:

USE	ZONING DISTRICT				
	Conservancy	Agricultural A1	Agricultural A2	Residential R1	General Business (GB)
Café and Restaurant	N	N	N	N	C
Supper Clubs	N	C	C	N	C

8
 9 For background the City’s Code defines a Supper Club as the following:

10 **Supper Club** means a building with facilities for the preparation and serving of meals and
 11 where meals are regularly served at tables to the general public. The building must be of
 12 sufficient size and design to permit the serving of meals to not less than 50 guests at one time.
 13 Intoxicating liquors may be sold on-sale and live entertainment and/or dancing shall be
 14 permitted. (Grant, definition)

15 Some sample definitions of various restaurants, cafes, clubs are provided below for your reference:

16 Restaurant and Club – an establishment engaged in the preparation and on site retail sale of
 17 readily consumable food and beverages, and characterized by sit down table, counter or drive-
 18 through service to customers. Establishments may include but are not limited to a coffee
 19 shop, cafeteria, fine dining, bar, fast food, take out, drive-in or sandwich stand serving food,
 20 licensed brewpub, and all other eating or drinking establishments. (Bloomington)

21 Coffee House: A shop where ready to serve food, such as cooked meats, salads, sandwiches,
 22 etc. which are prepared in advance, and coffee, tea or other non-alcoholic beverages are sold.
 23 (Scandia)

24 Restaurant: A business establishment whose principal business is the preparing and selling of
 25 unpackaged to the customer in a ready-to-consume state. (Scandia)

26 Restaurants (class I) means a restaurant in which food is served to the customer and consumed
 27 by him while seated at a counter or table, and the restaurant does not serve intoxicating liquor
 28 or provide live entertainment. Food is selected by a customer while going through a serving
 29 line and taken to a table for consumption. (Orono)

30 Restaurants (class II) means fast food convenience, drive-in and liquor service restaurants; a
 31 restaurant where a majority of customers order and are served their food at a counter in
 32 packages prepared to leave the premises, or to be taken to a table, counter, automobile or off-
 33 premises to be consumed; or a drive-in where most customers consume their food in an
 34 automobile regardless of how it is served; or restaurants which serve intoxicating liquor or
 35 have live entertainment. (Orono)

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

Staff would request the Council consider the following questions and provide a little feedback to assist with drafting a definition for Restaurants and Cafes:

- In the opinion of the Council, is a café similar to a coffeehouse? Is food prepared on site? Is alcohol permitted?
- Is a restaurant different than a café? Substantially different? Should they be different uses on the Table of Uses?
- Would a restaurant or café be required to have seating for patrons? What about a drive through? Should they be allowed?
- Should there be a minimum number of seats for dine-in?

Clubs or Lodges

During various applications over the past year, the Council has discussed what constitutes a Club or a Lodge, and how are such uses different than a country club, supper club etc. Section 32-1 of the City Code does include a definition for a Club or Lodge, and the applicable excerpt from table 32-245 is provided:

Club or Lodge means a nonprofit association of persons who are bona fide members paying annual dues, use of premises being restricted to members and their guests. (Grant, current definition)

USE	ZONING DISTRICT				
	Conservancy	Agricultural A1	Agricultural A2	Residential R1	General Business (GB)
Club or Lodge.	N	C	C	C	C

In the first group of the land use definitions the term Country Club was removed from the table of uses and definitions, and will now be addressed under Golf Courses. With the removal of the term Country Club, staff believes that the current definition for Club or Lodge is likely adequate and does not need to be modified. However, if the Council is interested in further clarifying the term, staff would suggest discussion related to the following questions:

- Should a club or lodge be required to be private? Or is public acceptable?
- Is regular assembly required? Is a specific stated social purpose, or similar, required to qualify as a club or lodge?
- Is food service permitted? Alcohol?

Depending on the Council discussion, staff could address some of these questions and revise the definition for your consideration, or the definition can remain unchanged per your direction.

Greenhouses (commercial production only)

Section 32-1 of the City Code does not include a definition for Greenhouses, commercial production only, and there are no other sections of the code that provide a definition. The following excerpt from Table 32-245 Table of Uses is provided related to this, and similar uses:

USE	ZONING DISTRICT				
	Conservancy	Agricultural A1	Agricultural A2	Residential R1	General Business (GB)
Greenhouses (commercial production only)	N	C	C	C	C
Nursery – Commercial (production of trees and shrubs)	CC	P	C	C	N
Nursery and garden supplies (exterior or enclosed sales)	N	N	N	N	C

Staff researched other city codes from communities of similar size and character and found that the majority of codes do not call out Greenhouses as a separate use. Instead, they address Greenhouses as a permitted structure/use in coordination with Nursery uses. Grant’s code does address Nursery uses as identified in the above table, which are further defined in Section 32-1 Definitions of the code as the following:

Nursery, landscape means a business growing and selling trees, flowering and decorative plants, and shrubs which may be conducted within a building or without. (Grant)

As noted in our definition, a building would be permitted associated with a Landscape Nursery, and a greenhouse could theoretically be the building. Some general definitions of Greenhouses are provided below:

Greenhouse: a building or complex in which plants are grown. A greenhouse is a structural building with different types of covering materials, such as a glass or plastic roof and frequently glass or plastic walls; it heats up because incoming visible sunshine is absorbed inside the structure. Air warmed by the heat from wared interior surfaces is retained in the building by the roof and walls; the air that is warmed near the ground is prevented from rising indefinitely and flowing away. (Wikipedia)

Greenhouse: A structure, primarily of glass or sheets of clear plastic, in which temperature and humidity can be controlled for the cultivation or protection of plants.

Staff would ask Council to discuss and consider the following questions to provide direction to staff when preparing a draft definition for this use:

- What is the intended use associated with the greenhouse? Is it to permit retail sales from the greenhouse?

- 1 ▪ Should there be a size limit on the greenhouses? Additional setbacks? Or are they simply
2 compatible with rural character?
- 3 ▪ Is the intent to permit greenhouses only for distribution of what's grown in the greenhouses?
4 No retail sales? (Essentially, just a distributor)
- 5 ▪ Is there a reason why commercial production of trees and shrubs is acceptable in most
6 districts, but other plant types would not be acceptable? What about flower cultivation in
7 greenhouses?
- 8 ▪ Should Greenhouses just be covered under the Nursery use?

9 Mayor Carr asked if this item could be tabled to a future meeting.

10 Council Member Huber proposed the land use definitions be broken down into smaller pieces.

11 City Planner Haskamp stated the definitions could be discussed at the next meeting and broken down
12 into business seasonal/green houses and then café/lodges/clubs.

13 Land Use Definitions for Business Seasona/Green Houses will be on the August City Council
14 meeting agenda.

15 **City Attorney, Nick Vivian**

16 **2015 CUP Review** – City Attorney Vivian advised as contemplated by Section 32-156 of the Grant
17 City Code, City Staff has reviewed twenty-two conditional use permits (CUPs) and Jack Kramer has
18 conducted five site inspections in connection with such review. The CUP's that were included in the
19 regular 2015 review were found to be in compliance.

20 Mr. Kramer has recommended that the CUPs for 11591 McKusick Road and 6450 117th Street be
21 vacated. Accordingly, he recommend the Council conduct a formal review of each of the two CUPs
22 recommended for vacation. Prior to such formal review, the City Clerk / Administrator must
23 schedule a public hearing and notify the owner of the hearing, which notice must also be published in
24 the official newspaper at least ten days prior to the hearing.

25 **Mayor Carr moved to schedule the public hearings to vacate two CUP's, as presented. Council
26 Member Lobin seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux and
27 Sederstrom voting nay.**

28 **Review of Council Member Censure** – City Attorney Vivian advised on February 3, 2015, the City
29 Council voted to approve Resolution 2015-07 (“Resolution”) censuring Councilmember Larry
30 Lanoux. The Resolution directed the City Council to review compliance with the Resolution after
31 sixty days.

32 On April 7, 2015, the City Council voted by motion to extend Resolution 2015-07 by an additional 90
33 days. The extension of the Resolution expired on July 6, 2015.

34
35
36
37
38

1 The status of the Resolution is again before the Council for review and consideration. The Council
2 should determine whether the sanctions contained within the Resolution have sufficiently deterred
3 Mr. Lanoux's conduct or whether the Resolution should be extended for an additional period of time.
4 The Resolution principally concerns Mr. Lanoux's conduct with staff arising from the unauthorized
5 removal of governmental property from the City's office, outbursts of anger privately and in public
6 toward City staff and members of the City Council, the creation of an unsafe, unfriendly, unsecure
7 and intolerable environment in the City's workplace and a disregard for City procedures and protocol.
8 A copy of Resolution No. 2015-07 was distributed for review. The conduct was also the subject of a
9 complaint filed by the Administrator / Clerk which was filed on February 3, 2015 which was also
10 distributed attached for review.

11
12 The Council may take the following actions:

- 13
- 14 1. Consider the Censure of Councilmember Lanoux to be complete.
- 15 2. Approve an extension of the Resolution for engaging in conduct which creates a difficult,
16 unsafe, unfriendly, unsecure and intolerable work environment for staff.
- 17 3. Approve a new Censure Resolution with updated remedial measures aimed at maintaining a
18 safe work environment for staff.

19
20 **Council Member Huber moved to extend the censure 60 days and include the authority of legal**
21 **staff to fine an injunction to enforce the censure if any violations occur. Council Member**
22 **Lobin seconded the motion.**

23
24 Council Member Sederstrom stated this is a witch hunt and the City should not spend any more
25 money on this.

26
27 **Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux and Sederstrom voting nay.**

28
29 **Zoning Enforcement, 9711 Keswick** – City Attorney Vivian advised on June 16, 2015, in
30 accordance with the City of Grant Complaint Policy, a Notice of Zoning Violation was forwarded to
31 Lawrence and Maureen Lanoux, owners of the property located at 9711 Keswick Avenue. Maureen
32 Lanoux signed for the certified letter on June 19, 2015.

33
34 As stated in the Notice of Zoning Violation, Mr. and Mrs. Lanoux are required to apply for a
35 Conditional Use Permit for the keeping of more than ten horses on their property. To date, the City
36 has not received the required application. Accordingly, this matter is before the City Council for
37 enforcement consideration.

38
39 The Council may take the following actions:

- 40
- 41 1. Direct Staff to initiate legal action against Lawrence and Maureen Lanoux for failure to obtain
42 a Conditional Use Permit.
- 43 2. Direct law enforcement to issue a citation for violation of the City's Code of Ordinances.

1 Council Member Huber stated Council Member Lanoux stated himself that he would like a jury trial
2 relating to this issue. He stated he would support a CUP and asked him to uphold his oath, City
3 ordinances and apply for a CUP.

4
5 Council Member Lanoux advised this will be a long drawn out battle that will cost the City a lot of
6 money. He has provided information to the City Attorney as to why he does not need a CUP. He
7 noted a CUP was not on the agenda and the supporting documents related to that were not received.

8
9 City Attorney Vivian stated a revised agenda was prepared. All Council Members had the requested
10 compliance letter except for Council Member Lanoux, due to a conflict. Everyone received the
11 information three weeks ago. The question on the table is how the Council wants to move forward
12 with the main goal being compliance. He noted he has not received any factual response from
13 Council Member Lanoux and this is not a grandfathered use.

14
15 **Council Member Huber moved to direct staff to initiate legal action for zoning enforcement at**
16 **9711 Keswick, as presented. Mayor Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council**
17 **Member Lanoux and Sederstrom voting nay.**

18 19 NEW BUSINESS

20
21 **Consideration of Policies and Procedures for Implementing a Franchising Process,**
22 **Ramsey/Washington County Cable Commission, Jeff Huber** – Council Member Huber advised
23 the cable commission is requesting approval of the policies and procedure for implementing a
24 franchise process.

25
26 **Council Member Huber moved to approve the Policies and Procedures for Implementing a**
27 **Franchise Process, as presented. Mayor Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried**
28 **unanimously.**

29
30 **Consideration of Process for Establishing Quiet Zone, Administrator/Clerk** – Mayor Carr stated
31 he has been receiving calls from residents about the train noise problem.

32
33 Information relating to the process to establish a quiet zone was included in the packets. Many
34 complaints have been received by the City regarding trains blowing their horns in the Ironwood/Irish
35 Avenue area. Staff wanted the Council to be aware of the complaints as well as the process involved
36 with establishing a quiet zone.

37
38 City Engineer Olson briefly explained the quiet zone process noting it is a very long drawn out
39 process, many years and the cost is in the \$100,000's of thousands of dollars.

40 41 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

42
43 **Discussion of Draft City of Grant Planning Commission Manual** – Council Member Sederstrom
44 **moved to table this item to the August City Council meeting. Council Member Huber seconded**
45 **the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

City Council Reports:

Mayor Carr stated there are new laws going into effect relating to water issues, buffer zones, etc. The City needs to be aware of the changes.

Staff Updates:

State Liquor Law Change –

COMMUNITY CALENDAR JULY 8 THROUGH JULY 31, 2015:

Mahtomedi Public Schools Board Meeting, Thursday, July 9th and 30th, 2015, Mahtomedi District Education Center, 7:00 p.m.

Stillwater Public Schools Board Meeting, Thursday, July 9, 2015, Stillwater City Hall, 7:00 p.m.

2016 Budget Work Session, Monday, July 13, 2015, Town Hall, 6:00 p.m.

Charter Commission Meeting, Thursday, July 16th, 2015, Mahtomedi City Hall, 7:00 p.m.

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

ADJOURN

Council Member Lobin moved to adjourn at 9:27 p.m. Council Member Huber seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

These minutes were considered and approved at the regular Council Meeting August 4, 2015.

Kim Points, Administrator/Clerk

Tom Carr, Mayor