

CITY OF GRANT
MINUTES

DATE : July 7, 2026
TIME STARTED : 6:30 p.m.
TIME ENDED : 8:57 p.m.
MEMBERS PRESENT : Councilmembers Cornett, Rog, Cremona,
Anderson and Mayor Giefer
MEMBERS ABSENT : None

Staff members present: City Planner Jennifer Haskamp, City Engineers Brad Reifsteck and Veronica Kubicek, and City Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer Lacey Smieja.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Giefer.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC INPUT

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

- A. June 2026 Bill List, \$786,556.45 – pg 1-4
- B. Partial Pay Application, \$190,557.31 (included in bill amount above), check #17083 -pg 5-6
- C. June 2, 2026 City Council Work Session Minutes – pg 7
- D. June 2, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes – pg 8-15
- E. Approve Resolution 2026-19 A Resolution Denying a Conditional Use Permit to Operate a Buddhist Temple at 8650 60th Street – pg 16-19
- F. Approve Resolution 2026-21 A Resolution Appointing Election Judges for the 2026 Primary and General Elections – pg 20
- G. 1 Day Temporary Liquor License – Wildlife Rehab Center – pg 21

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

REGULAR AGENDA

- A. Resolution 2026-20 A Resolution ordering a feasibility study for Indigo Trail & Dellwood Rd Ct - City Engineers Brad Reifsteck and Veronica Kubicek

1 City Engineer Veronica Kubicek presented reasons for potentially including Indigo Trail and
2 Dellwood Rd. Ct. N in the 2027 Road Improvement feasibility study in response to a previous work
3 session discussion.

4
5 A feasibility report is already being prepared for McKusick and Lofton for the 2027 Road
6 Improvements and staff recommends that Indigo Trail and Dellwood Rd Ct. N. in the 2027 project to
7 gain efficiencies in the overall road management program for Grant. Preparing the feasibility report
8 will provide more information for the Council to decide if they would like these roads included in the
9 2027 project. The anticipated cost for the feasibility study is \$15,000 in addition to the amount
10 already approved for McKusick and Lofton.

11
12 Council discussed and confirmed that the roads were not technically petitioned for. Outgoing City
13 Engineer Brad Reifsteck indicated that the residents nearby had started looking into getting a petition
14 for this but he told them to postpone the petition as the City was looking into moving projects
15 forward without a petition. The residents recently contacted him and said they should have enough
16 support (more than 50%) to get a petition, but again, he indicated that likely wasn't necessary.
17 Reifsteck indicated that recently the Council began initiating road projects without petitions, so he is
18 bringing forward the addition of Indigo Trail and Dellwood Court N. to see if the Council would like
19 to include these as well. It was confirmed that just because a feasibility report is ordered, it does not
20 mean the Council has to move forward with the road improvement at this time. The report will be
21 relevant for about 3 years and a feasibility report is necessary before any road project is initiated.
22 Putting all of the projects together is a cost savings overall.

23
24 **Motion by Council Member Anderson, seconded by Council Member Cremona to approve**
25 **Resolution 2026-20: A Resolution ordering a feasibility study for Indigo Trail & Dellwood Rd**
26 **Ct N to be included with the 2027 Street Improvement Project. Motion approved 5-0.**

27
28
29 **B. PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration of Conditional Use Permit Amendment to construct a**
30 **synthetic turf field and install new lighting for the school athletic fields located at 8000 75th St**
31 **N - City Planner Jennifer Haskamp**

32
33 Planner Jennifer Haskamp provided background on the request for an Amended Conditional Use
34 Permit to convert an existing turf field on its school campus to a synthetic turf field, install field
35 lighting, safety netting, and perimeter fencing. She explained that there is already a conditional use
36 permit for this site with several conditions that have been followed or completed and noted that all
37 other prior conditions remain valid.

38
39 Planner Haskamp provided a summary of the proposed improvements:

- 40 • The existing natural turf (grass) field will be converted to a synthetic turf surface.
- 41 • A total of four (4) 70-foot tall field lights will be installed directly east and west of the field,
42 two on each side of the field.
- 43 • Hours of operation are expected to remain consistent with existing school and community
44 usage.

- 1 • One water service extension is proposed, and sanitary sewer connections are anticipated to
- 2 remain the same.
- 3 • Per the Applicant's initial review, no limiting soil conditions have been identified on the site.
- 4 • A new chain-link fence ranging in height from 4 to 8-feet will be installed around the perimeter
- 5 of the field. The north and south sides of the field (near the location of the goal posts) will have
- 6 a 6-foot fence with an additional 10 to 29-feet of netting. Access gates will be installed along
- 7 the east and west sides of the fence.

8
9 City Planner Jennifer Haskamp provided a detailed analysis of the request. Based on the analysis,
10 City Planner Haskamp provided options for the Council to table the decision and request more
11 information, particularly related to the proposed light fixtures, or approve the request with conditions.

12
13 **Motion by Council Member Cornett, seconded by Council Member Cremona to open the public**
14 **hearing. Motion approved 5-0.**

15
16 Mark Rutkiewicz, 8247 80th St. N, on the north side of the field. He asked how tall the lights are on
17 the varsity fields are and also wanted to know if a P.A. system was going to be installed as part of this
18 project. Will any additional stands be installed? Also wanted to know if the road was staying.

19
20 Rich Kohner, 8237 80th St., is wondering if there is any limit to the decibels for the P.A. system
21 because the one for the varsity football games is very loud and makes his house almost unlivable on
22 football nights.

23
24 **Motion by Council Member Rog, seconded by Council Member Cornett, to close the public**
25 **hearing. Motion approved 5-0.**

26
27 City Planner Haskamp indicated that the applicant would have to verify the height of the lights at the
28 varsity football field as they were not approved by the City of Grant. She indicated that there is no
29 P.A. system being proposed with this application so one would not be permitted right now but the
30 applicant could request an amendment if they wanted it in the future. She indicated that there were no
31 plans provided for additional seating; once again, if structural seating was being added, an
32 amendment to the CUP would need to be requested. And she confirmed that yes, they are looking to
33 complete the fence.

34
35 The applicant indicated that the lights at the varsity field are 65 feet tall.

36
37 Council Member Cremona asked how many lights were at the varsity field, and it was indicated by
38 the applicant that there are 4.

39
40 Mahtomedi Public Schools Superintendent Barb Duffrin responded to questions about a potential PA
41 system and said that is not part of the plan or being requested. She said it will be typically used for JV
42 and youth associations. Council Member Cremona asked about potential hours of operation and
43 Superintendent Duffrin indicated that it will be a multi-use field and they anticipate events
44 concluding by 9:00 p.m. but they had not discussed that specifically.
45

1 The applicant's architect and engineering firm indicated that the additional height of the lighting
2 fixtures was their attempt to preserve dark sky.

3
4 City Planner Haskamp indicated that there is a value judgment and discretion about what 'dark sky'
5 means and it's up to the Council if they would like the lights to be lower or not. A representation of
6 what each option would look like may help the Council with their decision.
7 The applicant's architect and engineering firm indicated that the area to be lit for the new field is less
8 than the current football stadium and therefore the lighting will be more directed and will include
9 dark sky shielding for the light fixtures.

10
11 Further discussion occurred about the potential hours of operation and Planner Haskamp said they
12 will add the clarification in the permit about what time the lights must be turned off.

13
14 **Motion by Council Member Cornett, seconded by Council Member Cremona, to table the**
15 **decision and request more information from the applicant related to different lighting options.**
16 **Motion approved 5-0.**

17
18 Mayor Jeff Giefer announced a brief recess due to heat in the building.

19
20 The meeting resumed at 7:43 p.m.

21
22
23 **C. PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration of Conditional Use Permit for a cannabis microbusiness**
24 **with retail endorsement on the property located at 11020 60th St N - City Planner Jennifer**
25 **Haskamp**

26
27 Planner Jennifer Haskamp provided background on the request for a Conditional Use Permit to
28 operate a cannabis microbusiness with a retail endorsement at the property located at 11020 60th St
29 N. She explained that per Minn. Stat. 342.13, the City must permit one (1) cannabis retail registration.
30 Further, the City adopted Ordinance #2024-82, outlines the requirement of a conditional use permit
31 for the use.

32
33 The Proposed Use follows:

34
35 The Applicant is requesting a CUP to operate a cannabis microbusiness with a retail
36 endorsement. The proposed use is conditionally permitted in the GB district. Per Minn. Stat.
37 342.13, the City must permit one (1) cannabis retail registration, which includes any retail
38 license, microbusiness license with a retail endorsement, or mezzobusiness license with a retail
39 endorsement. There are currently no other cannabis retail operators in the City. Likewise, no
40 cannabis retail permits have been issued since the adoption of Ordinance 2024-82, which allows
41 for the sale of cannabis products from state-licensed operators in the City.

42 The Applicant proposes to operate a cannabis retail dispensary from the existing building that
43 will be built out with a public retail area and back-of-house operations including storage areas.
44 The narrative references the potential for an on-site consumption area; however, no plans were
45 submitted to address this use. As such, the permit will need to be amended if/and when plans
46 for onsite consumption area are proposed.

1 There is an existing Conditional Use Permit on the property that allows for auto sales. The
2 Applicant's submission notes that auto sales will remain in approximately 2,455 SF of the
3 building and will operate under the existing CUP.
4

5 City Planner Jennifer Haskamp provided a detailed analysis of the request. Based on the analysis,
6 City Planner Haskamp recommended approval of the request for a Conditional Use Permit to operate
7 a cannabis **microbusiness with retail endorsement on the subject property** based upon the
8 following findings of fact:
9

- 10 1. Section 32-146 Standards, subsection (a) established the criteria by which the city council may
11 grant a conditional use permit. The ordinance requires that the city council find that the
12 Applicant has proven to a reasonable degree of certainty that the following standards are met.
13 The following findings regarding each standard, as numbered within the ordinance, are
14 provided:

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

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

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

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

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

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

31 Furthermore, cannabis operators will be required to follow the regulations established
32 in Chapter 5 of the City's Code of Ordinances, which is intended to protect public
33 health, safety, and welfare in the City by implementing regulations pursuant to
34 Minnesota Statutes Chapter 342 related to cannabis and hemp businesses. The
35 proposed cannabis retail use also complies with all setback and buffer requirements
36 from schools and residential treatment facilities established in Sec. 32-355. It should
37 be noted that no onsite consumption lounge is permitted as part of this CUP since
38 plans were not submitted to demonstrate how this use would be operated onsite. As
39 such, future amendments regarding use may be required if an onsite consumption
40 lounge is proposed to ensure that such use complies with this standard. This standard
41 is met for the retail dispensary use.

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

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

6 Furthermore, the proposed cannabis retail use complies with all setback and buffer
7 requirements established in Sec. 32-355. This standard is met.

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

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

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

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

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

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

33 The Applicant included the odor mitigation and ventilation plan with the application
34 materials for the proposed cannabis retail operation. Per the submitted materials, the
35 proposed dispensary will operate entirely within enclosed indoor spaces. Cannabis
36 products will remain sealed in compliant packaging during storage and retail
37 operations. The facility will utilize commercial HVAC ventilation systems designed
38 to minimize odor migration from operational areas.

39 The Applicant will be required to maintain odor mitigation and ventilation measures
40 consistent with Minnesota Statutes Chapter 342, Office of Cannabis Management

(OCM) regulations, and applicable City of Grant ordinances. The proposed dispensary is not anticipated to generate excessive additional light, given that no changes are proposed to the outdoor lighting and the illuminated exterior signage will be required to meet the City's sign regulations. No outdoor speakers or additional noise are anticipated as part of the proposed project. The operation may generate an increase in traffic to the site; however, the Applicant will be required to demonstrate that the proposed parking area provides for adequate and safe traffic flow. This standard is met.

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

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

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

Finding: The Applicant is proposing to utilize the existing gravel parking area east of the principal structure and to install a concrete walkway; however, even with these improvements, the impervious surface coverage is anticipated to be about 40%. This standard is met.

Planner Haskamp mentioned that the largest outstanding issue she sees is the requirement of when to pave the parking lot given the highway 36 construction nearby, but that everything else seems to meet the requirements of the ordinance and appears to be consistent with state law.

Council Member Rog asked about a potential lit sign and its location. Planner Haskamp indicated that details surrounding the sign had not been submitted, but any signs would need to be in compliance with the sign ordinance.

Council Member Anderson questioned whether putting an actual date for the paving requirement would be better than just saying 'when highway 36 is done' such as June 1, 2028, or something. Planner Haskamp indicated she reached out to Washington County for dates so she could include them but she hasn't hear back. She would like to tie the paving requirement to the date construction is finished on highway 36, giving the applicant a month or two to complete it. That could be included in the future resolution.

Motion by Council Member Rog, seconded by Council Member Cremona, to open the public hearing. Motion approved 5-0.

Randy Greenlee, 10955 62nd St. N, stated that although cannabis is legal in MN, it is still illegal federally. He doesn't believe this is a good fit for the community. What concerns him the most is the

1 clientele from outside the community that will be drawn into the community. He thinks they could
2 save a lot of time and the applicant money by just voting no; the neighborhood would appreciate that.

3
4 Jeff Warning, 10685 62nd St. N, stated that 4H, tractors and horse farms are the things you hear about
5 in Grant, and this is not that. He wanted to know what a retail endorsement is. He said there was a
6 cannabis business before and it closed. He said there are kids that ride bikes on 62nd all the time. He
7 thinks a no vote would fit right in. He said he's disappointed this can move into the neighborhood. He
8 said they need to think hard about if they want this infiltrating the City of Grant.

9
10 Jake Jones, representing Polywater, 11222 60th St. N, expressed concern about the retail cannabis
11 store being within walking distance of his business because the laws regarding testing for cannabis
12 aren't clear.

13
14 Christa Sindt, 10925 62nd St. N, said that she didn't move into Grant for that neighborhood and
15 doesn't know why Grant would need it.

16
17 Richard Lillard, the applicant, indicated his background national guard veteran and a 25 year veteran
18 of the Minneapolis Police Department. He spoke regarding his intent to operate a compliant, safe
19 cannabis dispensary and follow all state regulations. He said there is no intention to disrupt the way
20 of life and is hoping for community support. He said his main concern is for safety of surrounding
21 properties and the customers and that there are a lot of regulations from OCM regarding cameras, etc.
22 He said he will be the owner/operator and will be on-site.

23
24 Theresa Urbaniak, 11595 Grenelefe Ave. N, said that she would like them to consider that Grant
25 doesn't have a lot of retail businesses and that this is not our vision or what is in our plans. She
26 encourages them to vote no.

27
28 **Motion by Council Member Cornett, seconded by Council Member Cremona, to close the**
29 **public hearing. Motion approved 5-0.**

30
31 Planner Haskamp clarified that the state has different license types, and that a microbusiness is a type
32 of license that is allowed by the state. It allows for cultivation, manufacturing and retail options.
33 Retail is the endorsement/type of operation. It is a vertically integrated license type, which means that
34 technically, they could do all 3, but they are only seeking to operate a retail business.

35
36 She said as far as why would the City allow this, she explained that the State has said that cities may
37 not opt out so the City has to permit one license, but only one, based on population. The City is
38 legally required to have an ordinance that is consistent with the state statute, which the City does.
39 This one license would qualify, and if it is granted, there would be no other opportunities for a retail
40 endorsement in the City.

41
42 Planner Haskamp continued to say that she was with the City when they adopted the related
43 ordinance, and it was not something the Council wanted to allow, but the State required them to do so
44 and why the retail was identified in the general business district.

COUNCIL MINUTES

July 7, 2026

1 Mayor Giefer said he understands the concerns raised, but it's something people should talk to their
2 state legislators about. He said the City doesn't have a choice, they must permit one, and of all the
3 possible locations, this seems to be one of the best fits.

4
5 Administrator Smieja indicated that after a resident called to raise concerns about this, she looked
6 into it and there is a caveat that if the County has enough licenses to account for 1 per 12,500
7 residents, the City would not need to allow one. Unfortunately, that is not the case in Washington
8 County as there are not 22 already.

9
10 Mayor Giefer said this is a situation where they need to abide by state statute.

11
12 Council Member Anderson reiterated that the City has been put in a corner by the State. He then
13 asked if there are any restrictions on hours.

14
15 Council Member Cremona said they can put reasonable restrictions on time, place and manner. She
16 asked about illuminated signs and if it would be permitted.

17
18 Council Member Rog indicated that he believes it must be diffused, meet certain size requirements,
19 and cannot be blinking.

20
21 City Planner Haskamp reiterated that they did not submit a detailed sign plan, but it would be
22 required to comply with the sign ordinance. She said that the ordinance does include hours of
23 operation for this type of business and it is from 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. daily, and the business is
24 proposing shorter hours than in the ordinance.

25
26 Planner Haskamp has indicated that there are ongoing updates to the State Statute regarding hours of
27 operations and many other facets of the law, and she indicated that the ordinance likely does need to
28 be updated in the future to reflect some of the changes. But that does not impact the current
29 application. She said that whether the hours of operation can be more restrictive than state law has not
30 been litigated that she knows of. The allowed hours in the current ordinance were approved by the
31 City Attorney at the time.

32
33 Mayor Giefer asked if any cities have violated the statute to require cannabis.

34
35 Planner Haskamp said not that she is aware of but she is not an attorney and doesn't work in every
36 city.

37
38 Council Member Cornett asked if it has ever happened before that the state mandates the acceptance
39 of something.

40
41 Planner Haskamp said that there are certain parts of laws that you cannot opt out of, like MPCA noise
42 rules, but this is unusual.

43
44 Council Member Anderson asked if they were under a deadline and Planner Haskamp indicated that it
45 is subject to the 60 day rule under Minn. Stat. 15.99, but it could be tabled, with reasoning, and
46 potentially file an extension to 120 days.

1
2 Council Member Cremona said they need more info on the signage. Council Member Anderson
3 indicated he would like more info about the County's schedule so they can confirm the parking
4 improvements.

5
6 Planner Haskamp clarified that the Council would like the County's schedule for highway 36 so that
7 a reasonable condition for paving the parking lot can be placed on the permit and the sign detail and
8 specifications to confirm that it complies with the code.

9
10 **Motion by Council Member Anderson, seconded by Council Member Cremona, to table the**
11 **decision and request more information from the applicant related to the paving schedule and**
12 **sign details as outlined by Planner Haskamp. Motion approved 5-0.**

13
14
15 **D. PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration of an Application to Combine and Rearrange the Lot**
16 **Lines for the properties located at 11425 Grenelefe Ave N, 11335 Grenelefe Ave N, and 6636**
17 **Indian Wells Trail lot split - City Planner Jennifer Haskamp**

18
19 Planner Jennifer Haskamp provided a detailed analysis of the request to combine three properties into
20 two buildable lots comprising of approximately 25.4-acres and 48.5-acres each.

21
22 A summary of the request follows:

23
24 The subject properties are guided Rural Residential/Agriculture (RR/AG) in the City's adopted
25 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed Minor Subdivision will not change the use of the site, nor will it
26 expand the amount of land in the City designated for rural residential/agricultural uses. Lots guided
27 RR/AG are required to develop at no more than 4 dwelling units per 40 acres. No development is
28 proposed at this time or as part of this land use application, so the proposed lot combination will not
29 impact the overall density of the area.

30
31 Based on the analysis, City Planner Haskamp recommended approval of the request and
32 recommended that the Council approve Resolution 2026-22: A Resolution approving the request for
33 lot combination and lot line adjustment for the properties located at 11425 Grenelefe Ave N, 11335
34 Grenelefe Ae N, and 6636 Indian Wells Trail based upon the following findings:

- 35
36 - A minor subdivision may be approved by registered land survey when the division does
37 not create more than two lots, and all resulting lots comply with the Comprehensive Plan
38 and the Zoning ordinance.
- 39 - The subject parcels are guided Rural Residential/Agricultural (RR/AG) in the adopted
40 2040 Comprehensive Plan which permits a maximum density of four dwelling units per 40
41 acres (4DU/40 AC).
- 42 - The proposed Minor Subdivision combines three lots into two buildable lots comprising
43 25.4-acres and 48.5-acres each, which conforms to the RR/AG density.

- 1 - No changes in use are currently contemplated for either lot and they will remain consistent
- 2 with the City's adopted vision for land guided RR/AG and the Agricultural Large Scale
- 3 (A1) and Agricultural Small Scale (A2) zoning districts.
- 4 - The lots created by the proposed Minor Subdivision (Lot Split) meet or exceed the City's
- 5 established A1 and A2 zoning and dimensional standards.
- 6 - Each lot will be required to comply with the A1 and A2 zoning district standards at the
- 7 time of development.

8 And that the following conditions of approval of the Minor Subdivision (Lot Split) shall be
9 met:

- 10 - The Applicant must file the new deeds for the lot/parcel combination at the Washington
- 11 County Recorder consistent with the lot configuration shown in the Exhibit dated May 28,
- 12 2026.
- 13 - Any future improvements will require the Applicant to obtain septic permits from
- 14 Washington County prior to the issuance of a building permit. The septic systems for each
- 15 lot must be fully contained on the lot they are intended to serve.
- 16 - The Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any other applicable permits from any
- 17 other agency having jurisdiction over the subdivision or future improvements, including
- 18 the Rice Creek Watershed District, MDH, and Washington County.
- 19 - Any future development or redevelopment of Lot 1 or Lot 2 shall be subject to the rules
- 20 and regulations related to the applicable zoning and subdivision ordinances in effect at
- 21 time of application.

22 **Motion by Council Member Cremona, seconded by Council Member Cornett, to open the**
23 **public hearing. Motion approved 5-0.**

24
25 Paul Rogosheske, 11365 Grenelefe Ave. N, spoke as the President of Northridge Acres Homeowners
26 Association. He said that the covenants of the HOA run with the land. He recommends the Council
27 approve this request. He requested that the City consider the HOA's covenants and keep the HOA
28 apprised of land use issues within the HOA.

29
30 **Motion by Council Member Cremona, seconded by Council Member Rog, to close the public**
31 **hearing. Motion approved 5-0.**

32
33 Mayor Giefer asked Planner Haskamp how the covenants interact with the City policies, such as the
34 assertion Mr. Rogosheske made that the HOA has a 10 acre minimum but the City has a 5 acre
35 minimum. Planner Haskamp indicated that unless the City is a party to the agreement, it is a private
36 matter amongst the HOA. The City cannot enforce the private HOA covenants.

37
38 **Motion by Council Member Cornett, seconded by Council Member Cremona to approve the**
39 **request and approve Resolution 2026-22: A Resolution approving the request for lot**

1 combination and lot line adjustment for the properties located at 11425 Grenelefe Ave N, 11335
2 Grenelefe Ae N, and 6636 Indian Wells Trail. Motion approved 5-0.

3
4 **E. Staff Report: Reschedule November City Council meeting – City Administrator Smieja**
5 City Administrator Smieja indicated the regularly scheduled November Council meeting falls on
6 election day so it must be rescheduled as no city elections are allowed to occur. Recommendations
7 were provided for alternate dates and the Council gave direction to reschedule the meeting to the
8 following Tuesday at the same time. **Regular November Council meeting rescheduled to Tuesday,**
9 **November 10 at 6:30 p.m.**

10
11
12 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

13 Mayor Giefer indicated that there should be PEG funding coming in from the Cable Commission
14 which can only be spent on A/V equipment. He recommended that the money be used to purchase
15 speakers to amplify sound in the meeting room as well as larger TV/computer screens so the public
16 can see the presentations during meetings better. The rest of the Council concurred and staff will
17 begin looking into it.

18
19
20 **ADJOURNMENT**

21 **Motion by Council Member Rog, seconded by Council Member Cornett to adjourn at 8:57 p.m.**
22 **Motion carried 5-0.**

23
24
25
26 These minutes were considered and approved at the regular Council Meeting on August 4, 2026.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33 
34 Lacey L. Smieja
35 Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer
36

37
38
39
40
41
42
43 
44 Jeff Giefer
45 Mayor