

EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

August 12, 2024

The East Bethel City Council met on August 12, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. for the regular City Council meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kevin Lewis Brian Mundle Bob DeRoche
Tim Miller Jim Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Matt Look, City Administrator
Eric Larson, City Attorney
Aaron Berg, Community Development Director

1.0 Call to Order

The August 12, 2024, City Council meeting was called to order by Mayor Lewis at 7:00 p.m.

2.0 Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3.0 Adopt Agenda

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to adopt tonight's agenda. Miller stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

4.0 Presentations and Public Hearings

Lewis announced that they recently dedicated a new playground facility at the Coon Lake Community and Senior Center. He thanked Public Works Manager Ayshford for all the new equipment and all the effort that was put into it.

5.0 Public Forum

James Roubal II stated he appreciates the Council bringing back the Public Forum for comment. He stated that while trying to find a place to hold a family reunion, he came across some questions. He asked if the City owns the Whispering Pines Aspen, and if so why is there a business sign for a private company in the front. He is also curious how much it costs to rent the space. He stated he saw the City crew cutting grass and is concerned that a City-owned building is being used for other reasons than it was intended for, and that his tax dollars are being misused.

Look stated that he has the written contract from years ago when the building was gifted to the City, and there are some agreements the City has made in the past and he is not sure how that will play out in the future. He noted the building is still under contract at this time.

Berg stated he can meet with the resident and go through the contract and attempt to answer any questions he may have. Smith also stated he is willing to help figure things out.

6.0 Consent Agenda

~~Item A: Approve Bill List~~

~~Item B: Approve Meeting Minutes July 22, 2024 City Council Work Meeting~~

~~Item C: Approve Meeting Minutes, July 22, 2024 City Council Meeting~~

Item D: Approve the Advertisement for City Planner Position

Item E: Approve the Hire of Seasonal Ice Arena Attendants

Item F: Pay Estimate No. 1 for the 2024 Street Reconstruction Project

~~Item G: Approve ICMA conference for Administrator Look 9/21-9/26~~

Mundle requested to pull Items A, C, and G. Lewis requested to pull Item B. **Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Consent Agenda as amended. Miller stated I'll second.** Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0 A Approve Bill List

Mundle stated that the City of Blaine was defrauded \$1.2 million by a wire fund transfer and asked what practices East Bethel has in place so that the City is not defrauded in any way. He stated that it happened to a couple real estate mortgage companies a few years ago, and the proceeds were wired out to another bank and the money was lost.

Look stated the City has policies in place, and they have multiple eyes and signatures on the bills that come through and they are covered by insurance on this sort of issue.

Smith asked about what operations are being done at the arena now in the off season. Look updated that they will be creating ice soon.

Smith was curious about the high electric bill and trash removal fee. He also asked about the Metropolitan Council SAC remittance bill. Berg clarified that built into the permit fee is the SAC fee with overage, and they get billed from the Met Council and pay out from what they took in from the application.

Smith stated I'll make a motion to approve Item A of the Consent Agenda. Mundle stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0 B Approve Meeting Minutes July 22, 2024 City Council Work Meeting

Lewis requested a correction on packet page number 13, line 1, to change "it did not good" to "it was not good". He also stated that on packet page 15, line 17, to correct "lots in applied subdivision" to "lots in a platted subdivision".

Lewis stated I'll make a motion to approve Item B of the Consent Agenda as corrected. Smith stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0 C Approve Meeting Minutes July 22, 2024 City Council Meeting

Mundle stated that on page 22 of the packet, discussing the variance for 23558 Ulysses Street NE, there is some missing discussion as well as confusion about motions. Look stated that if you make a motion to get it on the table, discussion comes with it, and that is the motion that can be voted on.

Larson added that while it may look a little confusing, the Council did it right and DeRoche made the motion and Mundle seconded. Mundle stated that if Larson is comfortable with the minutes, he will go with it.

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Item C of the Consent Agenda. DeRoche stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0 G Approve ICMA Conference for Administrator Look 9/21-9/26

Mundle inquired about the \$5,000 to attend a conference in Pittsburgh. Look gave information about what the ICMA stands for and what they offer. He stated he is contemplating this because 2 administrations came up to him at a local government officials meeting and said that for the first couple of years he absolutely needs to be at the conference. He stated there will be legal, teamwork, and other presentations. He thinks it could be beneficial to potentially learn better and more efficient ways of conducting City business. He hopes that it will cost far less than the \$5,000, which is just a place setter.

Lewis stated that in his experience, the contacts made at these types of conferences were much more valuable than the content in most cases, but it is worth it to get firsthand experience being there.

Mundle stated it is very surprising to see a \$5,000 expenditure for this.

DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to approve Item G of the Consent Agenda. Miller stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 New Business. Commission, Association, and Task Force Reports**7.0 A Planning Commission****7.0 A.1 20738 Tyler Street NE – Variance – Rear Yard Setback**

Berg presented the variance application the City received on June 12, 2024 from John Stewart for a variance to reduce the rear yard setback on his property from 10 feet to 5 feet, for the placement of a detached accessory building. Berg stated that Stewart's property is located in a Single Family R-1 Zoning District and in the Hidden Haven Country Club Estates Development where accessory structures are an approved accessory use in an R-1 Zoning District.

Berg explained that the property is recorded as .87 acres and would be permitted one detached accessory structure at a maximum square footage of 1,100 square feet by East Bethel Zoning Code.

Berg noted that documents on file with the City show that the well is located in the front yard and the SSTS (septic) is located in the southwest corner of the rear yard.

Berg stated that all properties in the Hidden Haven Country Club Estates have a platted drainage and utility easement on all lot lines of the perimeter of the properties. For maintenance, drainage and utility placement factors the city does not permit the placement of structures in drainage and utility easements. Stewart's property has a ten foot easement along the rear property line which overlaps and matches the ten foot rear yard setback required by Dity ordinance. In order to reduce the setback a variance would be required.

Berg explained to hear requests for variances from the literal provisions of the ordinance in instances where their strict enforcement would cause practical difficulties because of circumstances unique to the individual property under consideration, and to grant such variances only when it is demonstrated that such actions will be in keeping with the spirit and intent or the ordinance. Practical difficulties, as used in connection with the granting of a variance, means that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by an official control; the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner; and the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties. Berg explained the consideration of a variance requires a three-factor test for practical difficulties, as follows:

- 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.
In this case:
 - o *Accessory structures are an approved accessory use in an R-1 Zoning District.*
 - o *Placing the Accessory Building, as required by ordinance, would not deny the landowner reasonable use of their property.*
 - o *There is 85 feet of rear yard on this property.*
 - o *Well placement and SSTS locations do not interfere with the placement of a detached accessory structure in compliance with ordinance requirements.*
- The second factor is that the landowner's problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not caused by the landowner.
In this case:
 - o *This property is 182 feet in depth and the house was placed 48 feet from the ROW, leaving 85 feet of rear yard.*
 - o *A majority of the lots in the development are .75 to 1 Acre in size.*
 - o *There is a small grove of trees stretching across the rear property line.*
- 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.
In this case:
 - o *Every lot in the Hidden Haven Country Club Estates has a 10 foot drainage and utility easement following the perimeter of their property.*
 - o *There are other accessory buildings in rear yards throughout the development however none required a variance for placement.*
 - o *The proposed accessory building placement is to the rear of the house and in combination of the tree cover the Accessory Building would not be visible from ROW.*

Berg stated that on July 23, 2024, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing which there was no public comment. After a review of the application material and discussion the Planning Commission, by a 6-0 vote recommended denial of the variance request due to a lack of practical difficulties test being met.

Berg stated the City Council should review the request, consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation and approve or deny the variance request, to reduce the rear yard setback from 10 feet to 5 feet, for the placement of an Accessory Structure as presented in Resolution 2024-51A or 2024-51B.

DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to open up discussion of the variance application at 20738 Tyler Street NE. Lewis stated I'll second. Staff: no vote taken

DeRoche asked if the applicant was planning on taking out all the trees in the back. Berg clarified that he does not, and the application suggested that by moving it back 5 feet it would better help hide the building in the trees.

Berg presented the proposed location of the structure, straddling the 10-foot drainage and utility easement line by 5 feet.

DeRoche asked if the applicant is leaving enough space in the back to maintain the shed. Berg stated that with the 10-foot set back, he would be able to.

Berg stated that if the City needed to do drainage or utility for easement work, his shed would be in the way. DeRoche asked how to deal with it so that the applicant understands that if they need to get in to do that work it is possible. Lewis added that the City can do whatever it wants, even destroy it, and there is nothing the property owner can do about it. Look stated that the applicant would have to move it if need be.

Lewis stated if the only reason was that the ordinance said a 10-foot setback, then he would not be in favor of denying this application, but the fact that it is an easement makes him agree with the Planning Commission's recommendation to deny.

DeRoche noted that if a stipulation is added to the variance, so the applicant knows that if work has to be done, they have to be able to do it. Berg added that it would be the City's cost to move it when it needs to be moved, and the applicant's responsibility to put it back if desired.

Larson added that by approving the variance, they would be increasing the City's costs as well as the difficulties of removing an accessory structure to do drainage and utility work.

DeRoche suggested writing in the variance that if the structure has to be moved for utilities, the applicant is responsible for paying for it. Looks stated that could be added as a condition. Larson added that you cannot oppose any sum upon the property owner, whether that is a reasonable amount.

DeRoche discussed adding stipulations to the variances, so they are not so black-and-white. Berg stated that the Planning Commission found no practical difficulty for the applicant.

Mundle stated that he sees this application as a want, not a need.

DeRoche brought up property on Cooper Lake and wondered why that variance was approved without a real need. Lewis added that they did not approve it as initially requested. Mundle added that the applicant worked with the City to come into compliance as much as he could.

Lewis withdrew his second of the original motion to open discussion.

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Resolution No. 2024-51: a resolution denying a variance for the reduction of the rear yard setback from 10 feet to 5 feet for the placement of an accessory structure on property located at 20738 Tyler Street NE. Smith stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 A.2 20063 University Avenue Ext. NE – Variance – Structure Placement

Berg presented the variance application the City received on June 18, 2024, from Paulo Fanucci for the placement of a detached accessory structure closer to the street than the primary structure due to wetland restrictions on his property. Fanucci's property is located in an RR Rural Residential Zoning District.

Berg referenced 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. This property is 5.37 acres, with the primary structure set back approximately 125 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 stated the applicant's property is over 5 acres in size, however, nearly two acres are wetlands/lowlands that extend from the Northeast corner of the lot diagonally to the South Property line.

Berg reviewed Sec. 66-255, which requires a Minimum Building and Septic System Setback from Delineated Wetland Edge of 25 feet. Additionally, since this variance request is for a placement in front of the primary residence according to Sec. 42-7 B (2) the Front Yard Setback distance for structural placement is 40 feet. Therefore, if a variance for this placement is approved the detached accessory structure would need to meet the 40-foot setback.

Berg explained the consideration of a variance requires a three-factor test for practical difficulties, as follows:

- 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.
In this case:
 - o Accessory Structures are a permitted accessory use in the RR Single Family Residential Zoning District.*
 - o The SSTS (Septic System) is located on the North side of the property.*
- 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.
In this case:
 - o This property is over 5 acres in size however nearly 2 acres are wetlands that extend from the Northeast corner of the lot diagonally to the South Property line.*
 - o Wetland Setbacks as defined in Artic IX, Sec. 66-255 require a 25 foot setback from the delineated Wetland Edge.*
- 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.
In this case:
 - o The accessory structure will be used for general storage, allowing for personal property to not be visible to adjoining property and the city Right of Way, as required by Sec. 24-3A.*
 - o Standing tree growth between the proposed detached accessory structure and the front property line will screen it from view from the public roadway.*

Berg stated that on July 23, 2024, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing which there was no public comment. After a review of the application material and discussion Planning Commission, by a 6-0 vote recommended approval of the variance for the placement of a detached accessory structure nearer to Front Lot Line than Primary Structure.

Berg stated the City Council should review the request, consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation and approve the variance request as presented in Resolution 2024-49.

Miller stated I'll make a motion to approve the variance application at 20063 University Avenue Ext. NE. Mundle stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion?

Berg stated that the applicant does not really have any other choice, without driving through his front yard and over his septic system, making it pretty impossible. To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 A.3 23785 Marmon Street NE – Variance – Side Yard Setback

Berg presented the variance application the City received on June 6, 2024, from Carl Mitchell to reduce the side yard setback standard from 25 feet to 10 feet on his south property line for the placement of a detached accessory structure.

Berg stated that the applicant's property is located in the Meadows of Fish Lake Subdivision and in a RR-Rural Residential zoning district where accessory structures are an approved accessory use. The property is recorded as 1.45 Acres in size and would be permitted one detached accessory structure at a maximum square footage of 1,520 square feet in size. According to Sec. 42-7 B (1) c the side yard setbacks in the RR - Rural Residential zoning districts is 25 feet.

Berg noted that this request for a reduction to the setback is due to the grade and existing elevations on the property. When the Meadows of Fish Lake Subdivision was graded by the developer in 2005 home sites were raised in order to achieve walk out basement elevations. Michell's property has an eight (8) foot elevation difference between the front of the house and the rear yard. Due to the elevation changes, a terraced boulder wall was constructed to support a driveway and parking pad which limit the buildable area available in the side yard.

Berg also noted that, additionally, the SSTS (septic) is located in the Southeast corner of the rear yard limiting the depth of the lot area available for detached accessory structure placement. In order to meet the required SSTS setbacks of 10 feet as well as the zoning requirements of Section 14-2. F which states, No accessory building or detached private garage shall be located nearer the front lot line than the principal building, a side yard setback reduction would be necessary.

Berg stated the Meadows of Fish Lake Subdivision has a platted 10-foot draining and utility easement (D&U) on the side yard property lines of all lots. For maintenance, drainage and utility placement factors the city does not permit the placement of structures in drainage and utility easements.

Berg explained the consideration of a variance requires the Planning Commission consider a three-factor test for practical difficulties, as follows:

- 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.
In this case:
 - o *Detached accessory structures are an approved accessory use in the RR - Rural Residential zoning district per the City Ordinance.*
- The second factor is that the landowner's problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not caused by the landowner.
In this case:
 - o *Elevations of the property limit area for the construction of an accessory structure.*
 - o *There are zoning regulations restricting placement of accessory structures in the front yard.*
 - o *The rear yard location of SSTS limits the depth of the lots available buildable area.*
- The third factor is that a variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.
In this case:
 - o *There are multiple detached accessory structures throughout the Meadows of Fish Lake Development.*
 - o *The accessory structure will be used for general storage, allowing for personal property to not be visible to adjoining property and the city Right of Way, as required by Sec. 24-3A.*
 - o *By maintaining the 10 foot Draining and Utility Easement distance throughout the development, the proposed structure would not alter the character of the neighborhood.*

Berg stated that on July 23, 2024, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing which there was no public comment. After a review of the application material, a discussion and hearing from the applicant the Planning Commission, by a 5-1 vote, recommended approval of the variance request to reduce the side yard setback standard from 25 feet to 10 feet on the South property line at 23785 Marmon St NE for the placement of a detached accessory structure.

Berg stated the City Council should review the request, consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation and approve the variance request to reduce the side yard setback standard from 25 feet to 10 feet on the South property line at 23785 Marmon Street NE for the placement of a detached accessory structure as presented in Resolution 2024-50.

Smith stated I'll make a motion to approve the variance for 23785 Marmon Street NE, Resolution 2024-50. Miller stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion?

Smith stated he was out at the property today and the applicant has no room because of the boulder wall. Berg clarified that the applicant has proposed a 1,200 square foot detached accessory building and showed the Council where the applicant is proposing to put the accessory building.

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

7.0 B Economic Development Authority

None.

7.0 C Park Commission

None.

8.0 Department Reports

8.0 A Community Development

8.0. A.1 Rezoning – R-2 to B-2 West Highway 65 – Klondike Drive to 207th Avenue NE

Berg noted that this item was discussed at the March 11, 2024 Council Work Meeting with staff direction to explore the requirements to initiate rezoning to include MET Council requirements, public hearings and possible Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Berg stated that City staff have received requests from the owner of 20454 Highway 65 NE (Hunter's Inn) for a rezoning of the property in order to facilitate the sale of the property. This property, although once an active commercial use in a residential zone, has been discontinued for more than 365 days. As a non-conformity it loses its ability to be used as a non-conformity after 1 year of discontinued use. This provision is contained in East Bethel Ordinance and State Statute.

Berg added that, City staff have responded to zoning information requests for the property at 1351 Klondike Dr. NE, which is also currently on the market for sale. As a corner lot it may have more value as a commercial parcel than a residential parcel due to its proximity to Highway 65.

Berg stated these two properties are located in a larger area, approximately 120 acres, zoned Single Family and Townhome Residential (R-2) which stretches from Klondike Drive NE north to the area of 207th Ave NE. Although there are two single family residential parcels directly on Hwy 65 in this R-2 Zone, it also contains the over 35 acre U-Pull R-Parts Salvage Yard parcel which was approved by a Conditional Use Permit on July 17, 1996, when this area was a B-2 Zone.

Berg noted that according to Anoka County Tax Assessor Alex Guggenberger, as long as the existing use of a property remains the same use, the tax classification would remain the same. Tax classification is how a property is assessed, not the underlying zoning designation. The properties

zoning designation might change but that would not change the actual use or tax classification. The underlining zoning classification helps determine the Highest and Best Use of a property from a valuation perspective. If a rezoning were to be approved, the two residences located in the area would be allowed to remain as residential uses, located in a Commercial Zone and taxed as a residential use.

Berg stated that this rezoning would also create a continuous Commercial Zone on the west side of Highway 65 from Sims Road NE south to 197th Avenue NE.

Berg stated that Eric Wojchik, the City's Met Council Sector Representative, has been consulted and does not believe they would be opposed to a rezoning of this area as it is currently outside of the MUSA area. In the City's 2040 Plan, commercial and industrial development is allowed with the Future Growth Area, provided each site can be supported by a viable septic system. Staff are waiting on a more definitive answer to determine if this change will require an Administrative Comp Plan Amendment now or if this can be updated during the next required update since the change is outside the MUSA boundaries.

Berg referenced Section 04 -11. B1 - Zoning Ordinance text and map amendments. An amendment to the text of this chapter or a change in the boundaries or designations in the official zoning map may be initiated by a simple majority of the City Council.

Berg stated that the City staff are requesting the City Council, as required by city ordinance, provide formal direction to staff to take the steps necessary to rezone this area from Single Family and Townhome Residential (R-2) to Central Business (B-2) District, in order to better align the use in this area with the City's overall goals. In addition to the rezoning, staff are seeking formal direction, if necessary, to complete the accompanying Comprehensive Plan Amendment steps.

DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to approve staff to engage in the necessary steps and processes to rezone the area from R-2 to B-2. Miller stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion?

DeRoche stated he would like to see the specs of the pipes because they were told in the past that the sewer water and the pipe put in there was not big enough to handle that much. Look updated that the Engineer Jochum is confident in the capacity of that sewer line to feed this area.

DeRoche stated that Johnson Road is considered "the road going nowhere" because of the dead ends on both sides. Berg stated that according to the Met Council making a transition to business or industry in the future use area, they would not get in the way of the City doing that.

DeRoche stated he has been looking at this stuff since 2011 and the reasoning behind doing what they did. He noted high-density housing would bring more than housing as far as connections. Berg stated he was not sure if anyone would want to rent near a salvage yard. He stated he has a problem with somebody coming in and requesting to rezone so they can sell it.

Berg stated that they looked at rezoning Hunter's Inn in isolation as a business and ran that by the City Attorney, but thought spot zoning could be applied to that area. He stated he guarantees that they will hear from both of the occupied residents at the public hearing, worried about their taxes and how they will be assessed.

Lewis is surprised that discussion on the east side of Highway 65 has not come up. Berg clarified that it is already zoned B-2. Lewis stated it has an odd zoning to it.

DeRoche stated that originally when the sewer and water came in, the estimates were 19,000 connections between the south end of the sewer water district and 241st Avenue. He added that if

they keep rezoning, they are cutting back on residential, density that was originally planned to take up sewer water connections.

Look stated that he thinks it is important to have a healthy balance between commercial/industrial and residential and this a down stroke in the commercial/industrial part after two rather large housing projects have been approved. He also stated that having housing adjacent to Highway 65 could spawn a sound wall, which is very expensive.

Miller inquired if doing this rezoning they will be in a stronger position when lobbying for the \$12 million for the water tower and school system. Look clarified that after discussion with Met Council, they need more flow to make their plant operate more efficiently, and they believe that a commercial/industrial part would create that additional flow and the Met Council would be willing to help lobby for the water components that are needed provided the sewer has the capacity.

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

8.0 B Engineer Report

None.

8.0 C City Attorney

None.

8.0 D Finance

None.

8.0 E Public Works

None.

8.0 F Fire Department

None.

8.0 G City Administrator Report

8.0 G.1 Set Fall Town Hall Meeting Date

Look stated that the Fall Town Hall meeting is held in November and is proposed for a date after the General Election that doesn't conflict with any other municipal or School District meetings. Staff has reviewed and found there to be no conflicts with the evening meeting schedules for ISD #15, ISD #831, or any East Bethel Commissions or Committees in November 2024 for the dates listed below.

- Thursday, November 14th
- Wednesday, November 20th
- Wednesday, November 27th
- Tuesday, November 19th
- Thursday, November 21st

Lewis stated his first choice is Wednesday, November 20th. All other Councilmembers agreed.

9.0 – Other Items

9.0 A Staff Report

Look updated that the Coon Lake Beach Park dedication was well-attended. He also updated that they are working on a Capstone Development Agreement which will identify what the City will require the developer to do. He stated two Staff members were present for the absentee voting which took place last Saturday, and 1 person came in to vote. He reminded everyone to vote in the primary tomorrow.

9.0 B Council Reports

DeRoche stated that someone left a set of keys by the boat landing on the County Park side. The lanyard was wrapped on the post, if anyone is missing their keys.

Miller pointed out that the Coon Lake Beach project was heavily influenced by East Bethel residents, and it is a testament to what can be done when there is teamwork.

10.0 Adjourn

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to adjourn. DeRoche stated I'll second. To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

Submitted by:

Lilian Rokosz

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.