

EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING

May 12, 2025

The East Bethel City Council met on May 12, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. for the regular City Council Work meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ardie Anderson Suzanne Erkel Brian Mundle
 Tim Miller Jim Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Matt Look, City Administrator
 Eric Larson, City Attorney

1.0 – Gimpl IUP Discussion

Larson stated that Tammy Gimpl has 3 IUPs. Resolution No. 2019-55, which allows the applicant to have 2 horses, has 5 conditions that were discussed. Resolution No. 2021-74, which permits animal contractual services on the property, has 12 conditions that were discussed. Larson noted that these IUPS are personal and do not run with the property.

Larson stated it is common that, through annual inspections and changes over time, the IUPs are amended to reflect changes and can be initiated by the property owner or the City.

Larson stated that the trigger point for this discussion is for the Council to decide to take any kind of action regarding the IUPs and direct City staff to place it on the appropriate agenda and go through the proper notice proceedings if desired.

Larson noted that a series of events that began on January 26, 2025, the ACSO responded to a call in Linwood that has a contract with Tammy Gimpl with respect to taking and sheltering animals, such animals were brought to Ms. Gimpl, and the ACSO needed to undertake further investigation into the care and condition of those animals, and they were denied entry.

Larson stated that with respect to Ms. Gimpl refusing entry onto the property, refusing to provide information upon request in a timely manner, and refusing to provide all the information upon request, the Anoka County Sheriff's Department referred it for criminal prosecution which resulted in a summons and complaint that was issued on March 12, 2025.

Larson stated that the summons and complaint contain two counts, Count one, theft take use movable property without consent in violation of Minnesota Statutes Section 609.52.2 subdivision 1A on January 29-February 10, 2025. Count two, obstruction legal process, lawful execution legal process in violation of Minnesota Statute section 609.50 subdivision 11 on January 29-February 10, 2025.

Larson noted that the charges are just allegations at the moment. Larson stated that under the IUP with the City, an inspection of her premises to ensure compliance with the IUP is one of the conditions.

Anderson asked if Look had had any further information on violations.

Look stated that he does not want to confuse this conversation with code enforcement, notification of code enforcement, or the process taken by the City to enforce code enforcement violations. Look stated that these IUPs are a contract where the City approved an IUP conditioned on whatever is written.

Look outlined the two IUPs noted by Larson. Look noted that in regard to Resolution No. 2019-55, he drove by the property and noted 8 horses that he could see in comparison to the two horses allowed

by the Resolution. Look discussed multiple conditions of the IUP Resolution No. 2021-74, specifically condition number 9, all dogs must be confined to the premises to ensure all animals are properly cared for.

Smith asked if Look had pictures of the horses discussed. Look stated he could present the pictures at a public hearing if desired.

Mundle asked if any letters for notice of violations on this property had been sent out. Look stated that it is not required as a condition that letters be sent out for violations, and it is incumbent upon the applicant at that time that the conditions are followed, but an email was sent to notify the owner of the IUP discussion occurring.

Erkel asked what the next step is. Look stated that if there is a consensus of the Council to bring it to a future City Council meeting on May 28, 2025, staff can prepare a case, and there can be a public hearing.

Erkel stated that she thinks they should have a public hearing so they can hear the whole story and see pictures.

Miller asked if they could get copies of the IUP. Look stated they can send those out.

Anderson stated that they would like to see this as a public hearing at the next City Council meeting, and all other Councilmembers nodded in agreement.

Larson stated they will assemble a packet of information and the documentation for the basis of the action and provide it to the holder of the IUP so they can be aware of the evidence for the City to take action.

2.0 – Fee Schedule Review

Look stated that they are in the process of establishing the budget parameters and want the Council's feedback on some of the current fees, particularly the planning and zoning fees, variance, and code enforcement fees.

Look noted that for planning and zoning fees, they charge an escrow of \$300. Look discussed the costs associated with different instances and requests that are made in regard to planning and zoning.

Miller stated that it comes down to a lack of communication process, not informing an applicant that the extra work takes time and resources from the City.

Look noted that the extra cost can be there on top of the escrow fee is due to the amount of work that is required of staff, advertising is required, among various other expenses.

Erkel asked if the fees could be itemized, so that the Council could decide on what happens with the fees based on whether it is a bigger development/rezoning vs something on private property. Look stated that it is itemized, and everything is broken out in terms of what category it is going to be billed as.

Smith stated that for personal property, they shouldn't raise prices on the residents, but it is a different story when it is businesses or developers. Smith stated that the residents should know exactly what they are paying for.

Look noted that there are two different developers, professional developers who are aware of all the costs associated, and then there is the private developer who does not know the additional work required, and the City then does the work.

Look stated that it is a serious liability to the City to continue doing things the way they have always done it, or they can revisit it and see what is more equitable for the residents.

Mundle asked if, before they contracted with Landform, they had the costs that the last five or six people had complained about. Look stated that before contracting with Landform, they billed out contractual services, and if it exceeded the escrow, the City ate the cost.

Mundle stated that the residents should not have to pay extra for something that happened internally at City Hall when they lost their director to the Planning Department.

Look stated that they have a unique situation where they have hired a City Planner and still have to pay contractual costs. Mundle stated it should not be the applicant's responsibility to pay those contractual costs.

Anderson stated that they need to be upfront with the fee schedule right away, so residents know what they are getting into. Mundle stated that he thinks they should go back to how they did things before they contracted with Landform.

Erkel stated that any developer can pay extra costs associated, but the residents should only be responsible for the \$300 fee since they already pay property taxes.

Look stated that the application fee covers the planner review and inspection, but the escrow is an amount that is paid and gets reimbursed if not used.

Look stated that staff can draft something up based on the conversation from tonight and bring back to the Council.

3.0 – Business Advisory Council

This item was not discussed.

4.0 – Adjourn

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

Work Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Submitted by:

Lilian Rokosz

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.