

EAST BETHEL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
February 28, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Tanner Balfany, Glenn Terry, Sharon Johnson, and Gabriel Hanschen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sherry Allenspach and Randy Plaisance

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator
Aaron Berg, Zoning Administrator/City Planner
Tim Harrington, Mayor
Kevin Lewis, City Council Liaison

1.0 Call to Order

Chair Balfany called the Planning Commission regular meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2.0 Adopt Agenda

Commissioner [redacted] moved and Commissioner [redacted] seconded to adopt the agenda as presented.

Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

3.0 Approve January 24, 2023 meeting minutes

Terry requested on Page 5, paragraph 3, third sentence, last words should be “thorough, fair.”

Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Terry seconded to approve the January 24, 2023 regular meeting minutes as corrected. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

4.0 Planning Commission Appointment of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Berg recommended the Commission appoint a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson to serve a one-year term ending January 31, 2024.

Johnson requested this be discussed at next month’s meeting when all of the Commissioners are present.

Commissioner Balfany moved and Commissioner Hanschen seconded to table to the next meeting. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

5.0 Candidate Interviews – Wanda McLaurin, Narendra Ramnarine, and Joe Reiter

Berg reviewed staff’s report stating on January 31, 2023, the term of Commissioner Karen Krepis expired. Although the Planning Commission recommended the reappointment of Commissioner Krepis to an additional term, the City Council did not approve the reappointment. This created an open position on the Planning Commission to be filled.

Berg indicated staff advertised the opening and have received three (3) resumes including Wanda McLaurin, Narendra Ramnarine, and Joe Reiter.

Berg requested the Commission interview the applicants and make a recommendation to City Council to fill the vacant seat in which the terms will expire on January 31, 2026.

Balfany requested the applicants who are not being interviewed to leave the Chamber until they are called.

Balfany asked Wanda McLaurin to approach the podium.

Balfany asked Ms. McLaurin why she wanted to be the Planning Commission for East Bethel.

Ms. McLaurin responded she originally joined the City Commissions as an EDA member and when they started working on the Comprehensive Plan she moved to the Planning Commission. She indicated she was on the Planning Commission for almost three years and chaired the Commission for two of those three years at which time she was appointed to City Council. She stated when she ran for reelection to the Council, she was not reelected and now she would like to stay involved in the City.

Ms. McLaurin believed the City was a “diamond in the rough” and there was still a lot that could be done and accomplished. She noted there are some problems and things that are not right, but she thought the Planning Commission was where everything started. She noted it starts with what they agreed to, the Ordinance changes, and the precedence that are set. She stated the Commission made decisions on things that did not fit, which set precedence and she wanted to be a part of that again.

Johnson asked Ms. McLaurin what strengths and abilities she would bring to the Planning Commission. Ms. McLaurin responded she has sat on the Commission for a number of years, chaired it for a number of years, and she had the familiarity of that. She stated she was also privileged to sit on the City Council for a year and that gave her a great deal of background knowledge of how the City runs and what happens.

Ms. McLaurin stated she came with critical thinking skills and she can think on her feet. She stated she can look at the big picture and not just a narrow scope of what they have. She indicated she also knew most of the Commissioners and she knew their strengths and weaknesses and they knew her strengths and weaknesses also. She believed this worked out to be a very good team.

Terry asked Ms. McLaurin what issues she was most interested in pursuing or promoting as a Commission member. McLaurin responded that she believed they needed to look at how they are going to keep rural rural and the Highway 65 corridor moving forward. She indicated they needed to look at how they bring new businesses into town and they have to be able to keep the taxes and levies down. She indicated residential did, but in order to take some of the pain off of the residential people, she wanted to look at the right businesses in the right places along the corridor. She stated they had a gem, but unfortunately with the City being north of Ham Lake and south of Isanti, the City was getting squeezed in where it was becoming, “let’s get proactive and let’s decide what we want instead of these people coming to us and saying I want to build on this corner and fitting all of the criteria.” She indicated at that time their hands were tied.

Hanschen asked Ms. McLaurin what her vision was for the Highway 65 corridor. Ms. McLaurin responded the Highway 65 corridor was a unique area. She noted they had water and sewer on the north end with Whispering Aspens. They had water and sewer on the south end. They had the stubs coming across Viking Boulevard. She indicated it would take a lot of decisions to make it the right fit. She stated the City does not need any more storage units or Dollar Generals. She noted what they put along that corridor represents the City and they don’t need the ugly car lot south of Route 65. She stated they really had to look at what is coming in and maybe search for what they want there as opposed to them coming to the City and fitting all of the criteria and the City having their hands tied.

Balfany asked Ms. McLaurin if there were any local issues that could place her in a conflict-of-interest situation (i.e. a situation where she would be financially benefiting by a Planning Commission action or on a specific topic). Ms. McLaurin responded no.

Johnson asked Ms. McLaurin if she had any questions for them or if there was anything she would like to add. Ms. McLaurin stated she had nothing to add, but she would be honored to be back on the Commission. She stated the Commission had done a lot of really good work in the years she was on it and it was extremely challenging. She indicated the years she chaired were the years of the zoom meetings and it was difficult, but they managed to do a lot of good work.

Balfany noted Narendra Ramnarine was not able to make the meeting tonight.

Balfany asked Joe Reiter to approach the podium.

Balfany asked Mr. Reiter why he wanted to be on the Planning Commission for East Bethel. Mr. Reiter responded the reason he was applying for the Commission was because he had a vision for East Bethel that combines economic growth and development with preserving the rural aspect. He did not think it was one or the other and he believed they could have a solid mix. He noted a lot of the discussion he has heard is how do they do “this” on Highway 65 and do “this” in the rural areas and he did not think that was the right way to approach it. He asked how did they make sure the businesses matched the City and how they would make sure the businesses actually served the work force that they have.

Mr. Reiter indicated right now the average commute was 40 minutes and that meant they are missing some things as far as economic development went. He asked how they would bring those businesses to the City and to make sure people didn’t have to commute that far. He asked how they could ensure the City was relevant for the workforce.

Mr. Reiter stated the reason he was there was because he felt his vision was slightly different. He did not think the vision was completely wrong but he felt his perspective was a little bit different and he could maybe be a diverse voice on the Planning Commission.

Johnson asked Mr. Reiter what strengths and abilities he would bring to the Planning Commission. Mr. Reiter responded that his strengths he knew he had was data collection and analysis. He noted in his professional career he had been an analyst working with computers and databases as well as working on a GIS (i.e. mapping software), and figuring out trends. He stated he would be a good addition for bringing in numbers and analysis for the group. He indicated he did try to find moderation in a lot of the things that he did and often he found that when there was difficulty it was usually just due to miscommunication and he was aware of that. He stated another thing was that he was very dedicated to studying the City and he spent a lot of time looking at the maps and trying to figure out ways things can be improved; interacting with the public on social media and trying to get people involved. He believed at some of the City Council meetings there have been more people showing up and he believed it was important to have civic engagement and engaging with people on a civil aspect was important.

Mr. Reiter believed it was better if he collaborated with the Planning Commission on what was going on there to make sure everyone was aware. He stated unfortunately he has been a single voice by himself. He believed if he was on the Commission there would be a lot more collaboration and moderation of viewpoints as well a solid vision and message going out to the community so people would know what to expect.

Terry asked Mr. Reiter what issues he was most interested in pursuing or promoting as a Commission member. Mr. Reiter responded that the thing that really got him involved in politics in the City was the water treatment facility on the south end of the City. He noted this was a huge infrastructure investment and he felt it was sold in and he is worried right now with the economy and interest rates that development is not going to come for a long time so he wants to see ways that they can reduce the impact of that infrastructure on the rest of the community. He stated he felt like adding high-density townhomes and apartments might not be the best approach but he knew the businesses in Soderville wanted a connection and right now the Met Council seemed to be the hold up by asking the City to change all of their rules and abide by the plan. He stated from what he knew of Ham Lake, they are not interested in that so he believes the Planning Commission should be figuring out ways those businesses can connect while reducing any impact from Ham Lake. He asked how they can get those connections in a way that was sustainable for the community but also reduce the taxes that the residents on the other side of town have to pay for. He stated his house would never connect to that and he feels it is unfair to other residents who are never going to connect to have to pay for it. He indicated he tried to start a

discussion on some of the zoning in the water district. He noted they had land investment companies come in after that development occurred and bought up large portions of land. They knew the land was undervalued at the time and his feeling is that now they have the land, they can take out loans and can basically get tax free loans without having to pay taxes. He believed adjusting the zoning to make it more appropriate for the improvement development going on there might be something that should be examined. He believed the assessor was missing opportunities. He summarized certain business properties where the tax rates did not match.

Hanschen asked Mr. Reiter was his vision was for the Highway 65 corridor. Mr. Reiter responded his personal vision would be to see it “skinnied up” a little bit. He noted everyone was asking for rural preservation and having a mile on each side of Highway 65 seemed a little wide to him. He wanted to focus development on the corners would be better and zoning those correctly so zoning could occur would be useful. He believed with the zoning being the same all of the way up was preventing development from happening where they needed it. He did not think this was well planned. He indicated in the past the Planning Commission had a City vision plan done but for some reason that plan was abandoned. He believed a lot of the developers wanted to do something in the City and they were being restricted due to land values being too high.

Balfany asked Mr. Reiter if there were any local issues that could place him in a conflict of interest situation (i.e. a situation where he would be financially benefiting by a Planning Commission action or specific topic). Mr. Reiter responded he did not own any property and he did not work for any businesses that would enrich him. He indicated he wanted to enrich everybody in the City and he wanted to make the properties more valuable without increasing taxes. He summarized some of the things that could be done such as ditch improvement, drainage issues corrected, and improving Coon Lake.

Johnson asked Mr. Reiter if he had any questions for them or if there was anything he would like to add. Mr. Reiter responded by addressing some of the social media and the discussion on it. He noted he has tried to start a discussion which seldom turned out to be a disagreement. He indicated it often turns out to be in-fighting. He stated he has been trying to get more residents involved in the community and make them aware of what is going on, but it always seems to evolve into interpersonal conflict. He stated he does have a love for the City and he has a lot of friends in the community. He asked how did the City preserve the things that the people value and he wanted to make sure he can work to preserve that as well as improve economic development and create jobs that are relevant, but at the same time to make sure everything is balances and that was his motivation for coming to the meeting tonight.

Terry asked if this decision should be postponed to give Mr. Ramnarine more time to show up. Berg stated when he spoke with him on the phone this morning it was left open that they would be meeting at 7 p.m. and he described a conflict with childcare and was unsure if he could make it. He indicated he had not received a definite answer from him as to attendance.

Balfany stated he was comfortable moving this to after Item 7.

6.0A Public Hearing – Interim Use Permit/Home Occupation – Innovations Plus, LLC – 23911 Johnson St NE, PUL Moon-Pruitt

(28:58.1)

Berg reviewed staff’s report stating the applicant, Paula Moon-Pruitt, is the owner of Innovations Plus, LLC. Innovations Plus, LLC is a small family owned, full-service, custom order promotional products and decorated apparel businesses. Innovations Plus, LLC specializes in advertising, promotional items, embroidery, custom T shirts and provide service to numerous customers and communities throughout the Twin Cities area.

Berg noted the business hours of operation are Monday through Friday from 9 am to 4 pm, which are within the identified hours of the City Noise Ordinance. Eighty-five percent of business is generated through online sales therefore, traffic generated is less than that of a typical retail storefront business. There is adequate off-street parking for anticipated customer traffic on the existing driveway on the property. There is no anticipated effect on groundwater, surface water, and air quality as none of the processes used by the business use water, generate wastewater for disposal or create air pollutants. Waste or refuse generated by the business is minimal as boxes received in shipment are reused for outgoing distribution of outgoing merchandise and apparel. Other refuse generated is not more than regular weekly household waste disposal volumes or bi-weekly recycling.

Berg stated the location, 23911 Johnson St NE, is a residence located in a Light Industrial Zone of the city. Light manufacturing and retail sales are identified as permitted uses in the Light Industrial Zone. This zoning designation is consistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and will not require rezoning or create a further nonconforming use.

Berg requested the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and recommend approval to the City Council for an IUP to allow the home occupation of operating an apparel and promotional items business with the conditions set forth in the resolution.

Balfany opened the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

There were no comments made.

Balfany closed the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

Berg stated he had received one phone call from a neighbor who was in support of this.

Johnson asked why was an IUP required if it was in the light industrial district. Berg responded this was designated as a residence and not a light industrial use so it has to be declared as one or the other and it cannot be both in the zoning district. He indicated they needed permission to allow for one or other in this zone.

Commissioner Terry moved and Commissioner Hanschen seconded to recommend to the City Council approval of Resolution No. 2023-13, A Resolution Granting an Interim Use Permit for a Home Occupation, located at 23911 Johnson St NE, PIN: 29-34-23-31-10009, Legally Described as Lot 6, Block 2, Wargo Pond, Anoka County, Minnesota. Balfany asked any discussion?

Hanschen asked if once this gets approved would this change how they are taxed. Berg responded he understood that they would be taxed based on the zone currently assigned to their zone.

To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

This item goes before City Council on March 13, 2023.

6.0 B Public Hearing – Variance – Detached Accessory Structure Placement – 23911 Johnson St NE – Paula Moon-Pruitt

Berg reviewed staff's report stating this property is located in the (I) Light Industrial Zoning District and is located within the Wargo Pond Subdivision. The property owner is requesting a variance to keep a detached accessory structure closer to the street than the primary structure.

Berg indicated zoning Appendix A. General Regulations – Section 14-2.F states “No accessory building or detached private garage shall be located nearer the front lot line than the principal building except when the lot is three acres or greater and the existing principal building is located a minimum of 200 feet from the lot line. Then the accessory building or detached private garage may be located closer to the

front lot line than the principal dwelling, but not closer than 50 percent of the principal dwelling's setback. This property is 3.93 acres, with the primary structure set back approximately 149.39 feet from the front lot line. This request does not meet the criteria set forth to allow the structure to be placed closer to the road, so a variance would be required for the placement of a detached accessory structure.

Berg indicated consideration of a variance requires the Planning Commission to consider a three-factor test for practical difficulties:

- The first factor, a test of reasonableness, means that the landowner would like to use the property in a practical way but cannot do so under the rules of the ordinance. It does not mean that the land cannot be put to any reasonable use whatsoever without the variance. For example, if the variance application is for a building too close to a lot line or does not meet the required setback, the focus of the first factor is whether the request to place a building there is reasonable. In this case:
 - ***The property owner is requesting a variance to keep a detached accessory structure in which she can continue operating a home occupation - light manufacturing and retail business. This use is listed as a permitted use in the (I) Light Industrial Zoning District.***
- The second factor is that the landowner's problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not caused by the landowner. The uniqueness generally relates to the physical characteristics of the particular piece of property, that is, to the land and not personal characteristics or preferences of the landowner. When considering the variance for a building to encroach or intrude into a setback, the focus of this factor is whether there is anything physically unique about the particular piece of property, such as sloping topography or other natural features like wetlands or trees. In this case:
 - ***This property is partially located in the Minard Lake - Shoreland Overlay with specific setback requirements.***
 - ***This property is an irregular shape with approximately three fourths of which are Wargo Pond or a designated Drainage and Utility Easement. These features limit the buildable area available in the rear or side yard for new construction.***
 - ***The Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) and Well are located in the side yard, opposite of Wargo Pond and the Drainage and Utility Easement, preventing access to the rear yard for accessory building placement and use.***
- The third factor is that a variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. This factor is used to consider whether the resulting structure will be out of scale, out of place, or otherwise inconsistent with the surrounding area. For example, when thinking about the variance for an encroachment into a setback, the focus is how the particular building will look closer to a lot line and if that fits in with the character of the area. In this case:
 - ***Standing tree growth between the primary residence and the front property line will screen it from view from the public roadway therefore not altering the characteristics of this neighborhood.***
 - ***Accessory uses permitted in the (I) Light Industrial Zone include other uses customarily associated with a permitted use as determined by the planning commission and approved by the city council.***

Berg requested the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council for a variance for the placement of a detached accessory structure nearer to the front lot line than the primary structure with conditions as written in Resolution 2023-14.

Balfany opened the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

There were no comments made.

Balfany closed the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Hanschen asked if this was to keep the existing structure or were they adding to the structure. Berg responded there request is to keep the existing accessory structure in its location in front of the residence.

Balfany asked how long this structure has been in place. Berg responded he was not sure but it was prior to 2021.

Terry stated he did not remember a variance coming before the Planning Commission previously on this property.

Balfany asked how long the current property owner has lived there. Berg responded he did not know but he could find that out that information.

Terry stated part of the issue was if the Commission allowed this, and the building remained where it is, this is not something he would think of as setting a precedence as it has so many unique factors to it. He indicated he would not want to use that as a reason to deny (the fear of setting a precedence). He indicated he wanted to evaluate each item on its own merits and not be locked into decision making because of things that are not relevant to things that are specific to this. Berg indicated there were zoning regulations regarding wetland setbacks. He stated he was not confident that matched the 25-foot setback for wetland. He stated there are zoning regulations that also need to be applied for wetland.

Balfany stated this was an extremely unique property and a complex situation. He asked if this would have been someone to come before the Commission previously, would they have allowed it at that time.

Terry stated if this was before them previously, he would have recommended it be rotated 90 degrees and the driveway rotated 90 degrees, which would not involve cutting down trees to make it fit. Berg noted there were a number of options that could potentially work.

Hanschen stated he understood this is not something the Commission needs to be concerned about. Berg stated they needed to be concerned about whether it was in front of the primary residence or not and not the existing location, although the applicant had applied for that. He stated this department was willing to work with the applicant to get this to comply with the Zoning Code.

Terry asked if their intention would be to move the existing building rather than rebuild something in a different location. Berg responded the applicant had indicated she was not interested in moving the building, but rather wanted a variance.

Terry stated if there was nothing special about the dimensions of the building, it would be easier to have it sized differently so it fit better. Berg responded he did not want to speak for the applicant but this was the building she purchased. He noted the building was not on a permanent foundation and could be moved.

Johnson stated she had no issues with it being in front of the home.

Hanschen stated if the Commission said no, there was no other place for the building to go.

Balfany noted the Commission had just recently had another front yard accessory structure request based on a similar unique property so if they were talking along those lines, he could agree they had approved similar unique situations. Berg stated the applicant was notified of the violation and in terms of rectifying the situation she has made the application to make things right.

Commissioner Terry moved and Commissioner Johnson seconded to recommend to the City Council approval of Resolution No. 2023-14 with conditions, a Resolution Granting a Variance for the Placement of a Structure Nearer to the Front Property Line than the Principal Structure on Property Located at 23911 Johnson St NE, PIN 29-34-23-31-0009, legally described as: Lot 6, Block 2 Wargo Pond, Anoka County, Minnesota. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

This item goes before City Council on March 13, 2023.

7.0A Conditional Use Permit Amendment – Site Expansion: Wasche Commercial Finished – 2133 Aberdeen St NE – Matt Wasche

Berg reviewed staff's report stating Mr. Wasche is requesting an amendment to the CUP to expand the business known as Wasche Commercial Finishes, Inc. The business has been in operation since 1986 and has been operating out of the current East Bethel location since 2004. In 2004, the existing zoning in the Neighborhood Center allowed Construction, Trade and Service Businesses with Limited Outdoor Storage as a CUP; therefore a CUP was approved to allow for the business to operate from its current location. For your review, Attachment 4 is the original CUP and meeting minutes.

Berg stated the business has outgrown the indoor and outdoor space and would like to remain in the City East Bethel. The owner purchased the 1.03 acre parcel to the east of the site and was approved on September 12th, 2022 under resolution 2022-50 to build a 7,200 square foot building and a fenced storage area. The storage area will be used for the parking of work vehicles, including trailers. All products will be stored within the building.

Berg indicated Mr. Wasche has applied to amend the CUP further to construct a 1400 square foot unconditioned addition, for storage, to his existing building.

Berg noted an amendment to the original CUP is required for the following reasons:

1. The business is a legal nonconforming use. This means the business is legal because a CUP was previously approved, however, current city code does not allow for this type of business in the B2 – Central Business district; therefore it is nonconforming. City Council has the authority to determine if a legal nonconforming use can be expanded.
2. When a conditional use expands its footprint, an amendment to the original CUP is required.

Berg stated if the CUPA is approved, a site plan review is not required prior to issuance of a building permit for new construction or additions to commercial buildings greater than 25 percent of the existing building footprint (Appendix A, Sec. 04, 12. – Site Plan Approval). The existing building footprint is 6800 square feet and the proposed addition of 1400 square feet will not exceed 25 percent. A formal building application will be submitted for review and approval by the Community Development Department Staff.

Berg requested the Commission review the CUPA request and make a recommendation to City Council, with the conditions set forth in attached Resolution 2023-16.

Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Balfany seconded to open discussion on the CUP request. To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Hanschen noted this had come before the Commission last fall and at that time the plan was to turn it into additional parking. Balfany believed it was for parking and to expand the building.

Terry stated he did not have any issues with this. Johnson agreed.

Balfany believed the neighbor also did not have any issues with this proposal.

Commission Johnson moved and Commissioner Balfany seconded to recommend to the City Council approval of Resolution 2023-16 with conditions, a Resolution Approving a Conditional Use Amendment to Allow the Expansion of a Legal Non-Conforming Use at 21335 Aberdeen St NE, East Bethel, PIN 08-33-23-43-0015, Legally Described as Lot 4, Block 1, Linges East Bethel Center. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

This item goes before City Council on March 13, 2023.

7.0B Site Plan Review – Wasche Commercial Finishes – 2133 Aberdeen St NE – Matt Wasche

Berg reviewed staff's report stating on September 12th, 2022, under Resolution 2022-50, an expansion of an existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP) was amended and approved with the following three conditions:

1. Prior to construction of the new facility, a site plan review must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and City Council.
2. Exterior storage is limited to commercial vehicles and trailers associated with the principal use of the business.
3. Ingress/egress from the site shall be from Davenport St NE.

Berg indicated although Mr. Wasche is not ready to begin the construction of the previously approved expansion, he is applying for a smaller addition to the existing building for storage. Additionally, he is requesting to begin the site preparations, to include clearing and leveling of the lot, fencing, ponding, in addition to constructing the driveway entrance from Davenport St NE for the previously approved expansion.

Berg stated staff has reviewed the site plan and support the configuration of the site. All City Engineer comments will need satisfactorily addressed prior to the issuance of any building permits.

Berg noted the City Engineer comments regarding grading and drainage will need satisfactorily addressed prior to the issuance of building permits.

Berg stated an easement for grading City Owned Lot 1, Block 1, East Bethel Commercial Center will be required.

Berg indicated the landscaping plan will be required at time of application for a building permit of the new facility and need to meet the requirements of city code. Requirements for plantings are based on the square footage of the building.

Berg stated the future building shall meet established building design and architectural standards.

Berg noted a lighting plan will be required at time of application for a building permit of the new building and need to meet the requirements of city code.

Berg recommended the Commission review the site plan and makes a recommendation of approval to City Council, with the conditions set forth in the Resolution.

Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Hanschen seconded to recommend to the City Council approval of Resolution No. 2023-17, A Resolution Approving the Site Plan Review for the Expansion of a Legal Non-Conforming Use at 21335 Aberdeen St NE, East Bethel, PIN 08-33-23-43-0015, Legally Described as Lot 4, Block 1, Linges East Bethel. Balfany asked any discussion? To

the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

This item goes before City Council on March 13, 2023.

5.0 Continuation of Candidate Interviews – Wanda McLaurin, Narendra Ramnarine, and Joe Reiter

Balfany requested each Commissioner place their vote for an additional Planning Commission member.

Berg tallied the votes and indicated Wanda McLaurin was recommended by a vote of 4-0 to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Balfany moved and Commissioner Johnson seconded to recommend to the City Council appointment of Wanda McLaurin to the Planning Commission. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

8.0 Updates

There were no Council liaison updates. Terry noted that at the conclusion of the commissioner voting results the council liaison walked out of the meeting.

9.0 Adjournment

Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Hanschen seconded to adjourn at 8:18 pm. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Submitted by:

Kathy Altman

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.