



MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
INDEPENDENCE PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY OCTOBER 15, 2024

1. **Call to Order**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a work session of the Independence Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Gardner at 7:30 PM.

2. **Roll Call**

**Present:** Gardner, Thompson, Tearse, Volkenant, Dumas

**Absent:** none (Tearse left early)

**Alternates:** Story, Usset

**Staff:** City Administrator Kaltsas, Simon

**Visitors:** See Sign in sheet.

3. **Approval of Minutes:**

- a. September 17, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
- b. October 1, 2024, City Council Meeting Minutes (For Information Only).

**Motion by Thompson, seconded by Dumas to approve. 5-0**

4. **PUBLIC HEARING** - Tyler and Kaitlin Johnson (Applicant/Owner) are requesting the following actions for the property located at 4610 Lake Sarah Dr. S. (PID No. 02-118-24-21-0001) in the City of Independence, MN.

- a. A variance to allow the subdivision of property in the RR-Rural Residential and S-Shoreland Overlay zoning districts that does not meet the minimum lot size.
- b. A variance from the front yard setback and OHWL to allow the subdivision of property in the RR-Rural Residential and S-Shoreland Overlay zoning districts that does not meet the minimum lot size.
- c. A minor subdivision to allow the subdivision of the subject parcel into two (2) lots.

***Property/Site Information:***

The subject property is located at 4610 Lake Sarah Drive S. The property is located along the west shoreline of Lake Sarah. There is an existing home and detached garage located on the property.

Property Information: **4610 Lake Sarah**

**Drive S** Zoning: *Rural Residential*

*(Shoreland Overlay) Comprehensive Plan:*

*Rural Residential*

Acreage (North Parcel Proposed): 0.55 acres *(24,044 square*

*feet)* Acreage (South Parcel): 1.06 acres *(46,436 square feet)*

Impervious Surface (North Parcel Proposed): 22.81%

***Discussion:***

The applicant approached the City about the possibility of subdividing their existing property into two lots and constructing a new home on the new (north parcel). The existing property has an existing home with detached garage that is accessed via Lake Sarah Drive S. The property also touches the end of the cul-de-sac on Shady Beach Circle with  $\pm$  50 LF of frontage. The city has had several different property owners of this property inquire about a similar subdivision over the past 7-10 years.

The applicant is proposing to construct a new home on the proposed north parcel and sell the south parcel. The applicant has prepared a site plan and conceptual house plans for the proposed home and associated site improvements. The proposed home would be a two-story structure at grade.

There are two different types of variances required for the proposed lot to be considered. The first variance requested relates to the minimum lot size for properties in the S-Shoreland Overlay zoning district. The second variance(s) would allow reductions from applicable building setbacks to support the proposed home on the property.

*Minimum Lot Size Variance:*

The minimum lot size in the S-Shoreland Overlay District for sewered lots is one (1) acre. The existing property is 1.62 acres. In order to subdivide the property into two conforming lots, the minimum acreage would need to be two (2) acres. The applicant is asking the city to consider a

.45-acre variance to allow the north parcel to be .55 acres in total size. Should the variance to allow a reduction in minimum lot size be considered, the city could grant the requested minor subdivision.

*Building Setback Variance(s):*

Setbacks for properties located in the shoreland ordinance are as follows:

Subd. 2. Lot standards.

	Unsewered Areas			Sewered Areas		
	NE Waters	RD Waters	Tributary Streams	NE Waters	RD Waters	Tributary Streams
Lot Area	2.5 acres	2.5 acres	2.5 acres	1.0 acre	1.0 acre	1.0 acre
Water frontage and lot width at building line	200 ft	200 ft	200 ft	125 ft	100 ft	100 ft
Structure setback from ordinary high water mark	150 ft	100 ft	100 ft	150 ft	100 ft	100 ft
Structure setback from roads and highways	85 ft from centerline or 50 ft. from right-of-way, whichever is greater					
Structure height limitation	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft
Maximum lot area covered by impervious surface	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%
Sewage system setback from ordinary high water mark	150 ft	75 ft (RR) 150 ft (AG)	75 ft (RR) 150 ft (AG)	125 ft	75 ft	75 ft

The proposed home would have following setbacks:

Required:

Lake (OHWL): 100'

Side: 30'

Street: 85' from centerline, 50' from PL\*

Proposed:

60' (40' variance)

30' (west side), 30' (south side)

85' to centerline of street/

25' to property line (25' variance)

\*whichever is greater – setback from property line would be greater

In addition to the setback requirements, properties located in the shoreland overlay district can have a maximum impervious surface coverage of 25%. The proposed house and impervious site improvements have a total impervious coverage area of 22.81% (see survey for detailed breakdown).

There are several factors to consider relating to granting a variance. The City's ordinance has established criteria for consideration in granting a variance.

*520.21. Standards for granting variances. Subdivision 1. The City Council may grant a variance from the terms of this zoning code, including restrictions placed on nonconformities, in cases where: 1) the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this zoning code; 2) the variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and 3) the applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning code (Amended, Ord. 2011-08)*

*Subd. 2. An applicant for a variance must demonstrate that there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning code. For such purposes, "practical difficulties" means:*

*(a) The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the zoning code;*

*(b) the plight of the property owner is due to circumstances unique*

*to the property not created by the landowner;*

*(c) the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

*Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties. Practical difficulties include, but are not limited to, inadequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems. (Amended, Ord. 2011-08)*

*Subd. 3. The City Council shall not grant a variance to permit a use that is not allowed under the zoning code based on the zoning classification of the affected property. (Amended, Ord. 2011- 08)*

*520.23. Conditions and restrictions. The board of adjustments may recommend, and the City Council may impose conditions on a variance. Conditions must be directly related to and must bear a rough proportionality to the impact created by the variance. (Amended, Ord. 2011-08)*

Consideration of the criteria for granting a variance:

- a. The subject property is somewhat unique in that it has frontage on two public roads. The proposed subdivision would create a property that is similar to adjacent properties to the east. The applicant is proposing to develop a single-family home on the property and that is consistent with the Rural Residential/Shoreland Overlay zoning districts.
- b. The surrounding properties do not comply with applicable setbacks. This area of the City contains an array of properties that do not conform to applicable setbacks and are considered sub-standard lots of record.
- c. The character of the surrounding area is residential. The proposed single-family home is in keeping with the City's comprehensive plan.

The Planning Commission will need to determine if the requested variances meet the requirements for granting a variance and then if the minor subdivision meets applicable criteria. Several additional considerations that could be considered are as follows:

1. The proposed lot is similar in size and character to the lots located on Shady Beach Circle. Most of the existing lakeshore lots on Shady Beach Circle are approximately .5 acres in size.
2. The proposed property would be connected to the city's sanitary sewer system via a connection to the sewer in Shady Beach Circle.
3. Setbacks to the side yard, street and lakeshore vary considerably on the surrounding properties and within a high percentage of lakeshore properties in the city.
4. There is a wetland located on the property that has been delineated. The

applicant is seeking relief from the requisite wetland buffer (by increasing the buffer on the south side of the wetland) which will need to be further reviewed if the application is moved forward.

5. The applicant is proposing to provide a 15' lake access easement for dock use for the south parcel once subdivided. This would be a private easement but would create an additional dock and access for the non-lakeshore property. It appears that the easement would need to extend along the south boundary of the north parcel as well.
6. The south parcel would meet minimum lot size standards for S-Shoreland zoned properties. Note that the existing home on the subject property does not meet applicable building setbacks and is considered legal non-conforming.

***Neighbor Comments:***

The City has received one phone call relating to the request at the time this report was prepared.

***Recommendation:***

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission for the requested Minor Subdivision and Variances. Should the Planning Commission Recommend approval, the following findings and conditions should be considered:

1. The proposed Subdivision and Variance request meets all applicable conditions and restrictions stated in Chapter V, Section 520.19, Procedures on variances, in the City of Independence Zoning Ordinance.
2. The City finds that the criteria for granting a variance have been satisfied by the applicant. Specifically, the City finds the following:
  - a. Residential use of the property is consistent with the RR-Rural Residential District. The applicant is seeking a variance to allow a single-family home on the property.
  - b. The location of the proposed home is generally in the location of the existing home and adjacent properties.
  - c. The character of the surrounding area is residential. The proposed new home is in keeping and consistent with the surrounding uses found in this neighborhood.
3. The total impervious surface coverage for this property will not exceed 25% of the total lot area.
4. The variance will permit a 40-foot reduction to the lake setback (60' instead of 100') and a 25-foot reduction of the street setback (25' instead of 50') to allow the proposed

new home to be constructed on the property. Any modification change or alteration to the structure that does not meet applicable setbacks in the future would require additional review and approval in the form of a variance.

5. The applicant shall submit a grading and drainage plan to the City at the time of building permit application. The grading and drainage plan will be reviewed by the City to ensure that the proposed improvements do not adversely impact any of the surrounding properties relating to grading and drainage.
6. The applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the City's review of the requested variance and minor subdivision.
7. Any future improvements made to this property will need to be in compliance with all applicable standards relating to the Rural Residential and Shoreland Overlay zoning districts.
8. The variance approval will be valid for one year from the date of City Council approval. Construction of the new home will be required to commence prior to expiration of the variance.
9. The City Council Resolution shall be recorded with the County.

Kaltsas – Variances and minor subdivision, applicants asked city to allow subdivision in RR and shoreland overlay that does not meet min lot size. Two lots. Property on west shoreline of Lake Sarah. Existing home and detached garage, zoned RR and covered under shoreland overlay, guided as RR. Property is 1.61 acres in overall size. Asking subdivision to divide a N Parcel (lakeshore) of .55 acres and south parcel of 1.06 acres with the existing home. Property is governed by RR and overlay district for shoreland. In RR/shoreland, we look at both sets of criteria and apply as needed. Accessed off of Lake Sarah Dr S. Unique that the Northern part (lakeshore side) touches ROW of Shady Beach Cir, asking city to consider the northern parcel be accessed off of the Shady Beach Cir cul-de-sac. Existing home and garage would remain on Lake Sarah Dr S. The applicant would be seeking permission to rebuild on the northern parcel and sell the existing home. Variances – min lot size & reduction in building setbacks to support new home. Min lot size variance, our min lot size is 1 acre. The existing parcel is 1.61 in overall size. They would need a min 2 acres to comply with standards. Asking for a .45 variance in acreage for North side. In order to allow this split, they would need to grant variance to min lot size. Second variance would be for the proposed building that would be built. There is applicable setbacks to shoreland overlay district and RR. Applicant prepared a survey and proposed home and as it relates to applicable setbacks. Applicant would like to set home 60ft from OHWL. It was noted that the applicable setback for lots after 1982 is 100ft from OHWL. So a 40ft variance in reduction. We have an admin for lots created prior to 1982. Lots subdivided prior to that date have a 60ft setback from OHWL and they noted that as it relates to surrounding properties. They have two side yards the way it would come off cul-de-sac. W / SW and NW sides 30 ft setbacks. Street setback – 85 ft from centerline or 50 ft from property line or whatever is greater. This would be 85 ft back from the center of the cul-de-sac. 50 ft from property line – they need a 25 ft variance for street setback. Coverage of 22.81% for impervious surface. Standards needing to be satisfied are outlined in ordinance. Property is unique – access on two public roads. Proposed subdivision would be similar to surrounding properties to E and W. To develop SFD which is consistent use. Surrounding properties do not comply with current ordinance of setbacks. Historically our ordinance is set up for 2.5 acres but there is an ordinance set up for lots created (prior to 1982?). Data points to consider

– size of lot compared to surrounding – lake shore lots are average of 0.5 acres. Property would be connected to city sanitary sewer system via Shady Beach. Setbacks to side yard street do vary considerably. We have granted variances on this stretch and other areas around the lake because there is a huge deviation in types of variances we have. There is a wetland that somewhat bisects this lot in the middle. Applicant did delineate that wetland. Physical characteristic that separates the lot. Existing home sits pretty high up on the lot compared to the lakeshore, a 30ft of fall from Lake Sarah Rd to Lake Sarah shoreline. Applicant is proposing to include a 15 ft (or 50ft -poor audio) access or dock use easement for the upper lot. The lot created would be a legal lot on the south side.

Usset – Is it 2 or 3 variances.

Kaltsas – It is 2 variances. Setback variances are looked at all together. Two side yards the way it sits. OHWL setback variance, a front yard/ street variance, and min lot size.

Dumas – there have been several different property owners that inquired about the same thing and did anyone ever take it forward?

Kaltsas – 3 different property owners approached the city to do this, previous owners of the same property. They made application but withdrew it and it never came forward. Next owner asked the same thing but did not apply. This is the first time we are actually discussing it.

Usset – Why did they withdraw?

Thompson- Regarding the private easement consideration, whose dominium is that another dock on Lake Sarah?

Kaltsas – Good question. Recent discussions on lakes. DNR regulates docks. City has the ability to take on some regulation, Lake association, too. Currently no regulation on number of docks, but through the subdivision process the city can regulate it. Not private use though. You have the ability to say we do or don't want more docks, etc. but they could still privately do something.

Story – In their letter they mention in 2022 4944 they did a deck or something that was a setback, not a subdivision, was it?

Kaltsas – It was not a subdivision. We haven't granted many. We have granted variances from subdivision standards. If a lot is bisected by a road we have granted.

## PUBLIC HEARING OPENED (24:00)

Kathleen Nelson (lives next to applicants) - Just to answer a couple questions that happened up here. Mike and Pam Peterson did apply and talked to us. We were both in opposition, so they withdrew application. Owners after them who'd applied, we didn't know them. The realtor did state in the listing that possible subdivisions. I got a copy of the letter and plans and in talking to Linda Johnson she said there would be a couple things needing to be present for consideration – undo hardship and following up with the state of MN – reasonableness, uniqueness, and essential character. The ones that the applicants mentioned in their letter, you clarified that the property butts up against Shady Beach Cir. There is a 20ft strip of land and has been maintained by Jorgensons. Living closer to the lakefront is the ultimate goal. Multiple properties offer a closer lakefront that have been listed and sold that would have been a good option for them. That doesn't affect anyone. Safety challenges described for the family getting from household to lakefront. This is a first world problem. The geography of property hasn't changed. There was a large pond on the property. If we talk about safety and young family, being closer to lake would create worse challengers. Regarding proposed setbacks, there is a few reasons I am assuming we put setbacks in place, obviously high-water levels, health of the lake – Lake Sarah is a currently impaired body of water, I didn't know there would be an additional easement with the sale of property next to me creating an additional lake property being created. Setbacks have been allowed in the past but I'm most afraid of precedent this sets. There is an acre minimum, and we are trying to protect that. Anyone with over 1.5 acre could potentially ask for a subdivision and could claim discrimination if they don't get it. I spoke with applicants a few

times about this. Abundance of wetlands, The property that sits on the lake, in 26 years has always been low and wet. So to put a house on that property, it would take a lot to bring in to make it solid enough. What kind of drainage issues would that create for the next-door property?

Joe Slavic (Shady Beach Circle, 20-yr resident, active on LSIA)– Thanks for what you do giving up time to serve. This has been an impaired lake. We have fought many battles trying to reduce phosphorus. Booklet directed to homeowners and councilmembers had been brought to council many years ago re: managing shoreline. Shoreland management act regulates within 1000 ft of shoreline. The City has bad rep of not following these rules. My goal is to improve lake and go in the right direction. Not following DNR rules and regulations breaks precedence. House that went in –had approved for raingarden put in, but it is now off the side of house, no gutter, runs off into the lake. This property is so low and a rain garden wouldn't do any good. Accelerated heat going into the lake from the rain on the grass escalates the eco system devastation. 60ft is way too short, almost half.

Mary Jorgenson (property runs along Tylers') - If you put this property through, how are you going to get to it? My property goes with Tyler. It's not a through street. It's never been a through street. (Gardner stated the possible driveway comes off Shady Beach Circle.) I'm on both sides of Shady Beach Circle.

Daryl Jorgenson (Mary's son, Otsego) - I've observed a lot of this and done a lot of developing myself. This is setting a far precedent of shrinking lot size and setbacks way out of whack. The property if you look at the elevations, the water is at 79/80. The corner of the house is at 82. How much fill will you have to bring in so the house doesn't flood every spring. I believe there is a max amount of fill you can bring in on these properties. Those are other laws and precedence you will be breaking if you allow this to go forward. I vote no and I hope you consider this. Mary has maintained it, but it can't be more than 5 ft. now adding another home with another dock. The people that live on top, how do they get their jet ski down there? They will come through the cul-de-sac and use the easement. Who is going to regulate that?

Tyler & Katie Johnson (applicants)– We thank you neighbors for voicing your concerns. We take them seriously. A couple points we would like to point out and open to discussion, easement on that side. I agree with those concerns. We would be willing to remove that. As a member of the LSIA, I am all for the lake improvement. My family has been here for 5 years on this property. We really enjoy everyone in the community. We are not trying to set a precedence. No other property would be able to do this, ours is unique. Most lots are 1/3 – 1/2 of an acre. Water setback from the lake, we would love to be further back, but we are limited with the wetlands on the property. We tried to delineate it back as much as we can. There are 60ft setbacks on all the other neighbor lots including Mary's and Slavics. We would be open to take thoughts into consideration.

Katie Johnson– Re: the 2022 Variance, from our understanding that was 2 minor lots that became 1 lot to get a minimum lot size. We want to live here, and we appreciate your concerns too.

Daryl Jorgenson – I have to correct Tyler for talking about Mom's property. She has to tie her property with the other side of cul-de-sac. Her property had to have a second property there.

Kaltsas – He is referencing to when he split the two parcels off (Shady Beach Circle) and created two new parcels in the shoreland district. Mary's property has an existing detached shed, so it had to be combined to the house. If that shed came down, splitting it could be considered. They are not contiguous. We are not crossing a property line; it is the ROW. The strip is maintained by the homeowner.

Joe Slavic – Two things: I remember when Mike Peterson (original owner) was really considering, he knew there were 3 variances, so he didn't propose it. Breaking rules. More importantly, I live a few houses down where the lift station is. That thing has been filled to the brim. Before decision is made, you need to



Speak to the Public Works guys that maintain it. The water was overflowing. The guys said they can't keep up with it and there are so many places on it. Guys said it was the lower point in the city to push waste up hill. If it backs up, it will be a huge issue for all.

Lyndy Nelson/Klaers (resident since 1978) - I just met the people that are trying to do this. I don't think this is right. I think they are so nice, but I agree with everything everyone said. I've been here since I was 13. It'll be a different area for animals, grandkids.

Tyler Johnson – We spoke to other neighbors that are in support of this, Brent and Sara (to West) Lowe that are not here tonight, Lewises, and Johnsons. Outside of the rejections here, there are some that approve.

Daryl Jorgenson – Isn't the connection the city ROW?

Kaltsas – It's a ROW for Shady Beach Cir (not asphalt) does touch the property.

Thompson – Aerial view shows the car is completely parked on the public land in the street. To show you the City's ROW might not be as clear when one's driving on the road.

Gardner – size of cul-de-sac?

Kaltsas – Asphalt probably lesser than our standard, likely 80.

## PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Thompson – There is 50ft of abutment between this property and Shady Beach Cir. Is there a frontage standard?

Kaltsas – 50ft

Volkenant – Does the cul-de-sac meet full requirement?

Kaltsas – With the ball that is there, it could be made full standard. It looks like the pavement is a little shy, but area is there.

Thompson – What is our strategy for upgrading cul-de-sac?

Kaltsas – City's unofficial policy – if road were built new or fully reconstruction. We try to maintain the roads in their current condition. It is either known or done at the time of redoing.

Thompson – You mentioned Bridgevine shared dock and putting restraints on it. What was the vehicle on that? Can we do the same with a motion?

Kaltsas – I would have to talk to Legal and what we would require. One variance you can add conditions to and subdivision with conditions. You could do subject to on approvals.

Gardner – If we considered moving the lot line further south, it would make setback back.

Kaltsas – Not exactly. The problem is the wetland. Wetland buffer, average buffer, reduce it on the north side of property. No where to go with that setback. You can't get less with the buffer.

Gardner – Which is worse? OHWL setback or wetland setback?

Dumas – You look at this aerial and everyone on the circle is 60ft setbacks. What was the reason and when did the city go to 100? I assume it is predated.

Kaltsas – We have provisions relating to. On the west side there is no house there. This is a unique lot. Its not inconsistent with what is there. The 60-100ft is DNR. City had to adopt the shoreland restrictions. Ordinances built in prior to a date. There are physical limitations on some lots where we have allowed homeowners to do this. I don't know any new lots where the 60ft has been applied.

Thompson – the variance comes from the hardship comes from wetland, unique access to frontage to another road, personally after Mark clarified, we put in language of no private easement. There are unique characteristics here that drove a lot of this area here.

Usset – I don't know if that pertains since they bought this the same way. I don't see the hardship. I can see why they want to do this, but I don't see hardship. I'm not voting though.

Dumas – We're creating new lot and then allowing a variance.

Gardner – But its consistent with surrounding lots.

Thompson – With wetland on the property, if they were to tear down the house in the back half and build a new one in the front, the setback would be 60ft. Is this a reasonable variance?

Usset – new lot conforming and left over lot nonconforming?

Thompson – it doesn't fix our setbacks. We are just flipping a coin on which one is less than an acre.

Story – if we put the restriction, why do we have the 1 acre?

Kaltsas – there is a history to it. Shoreland ordinance. DNR standard. City historically had a different take on shoreland ordinance. It was changed by a couple council actions in late 90's and early 2000's. There was an interpretation that you had to have 7.6 acres to subdivide any lot in the City. It got changed to if you have a sewer lot, you can go down to 1-acre septic standard. Non-sewered 2.5 a buildable upland. The 1 acre is the shoreland district.

Dumas – We are breaking a lot of rules here.

Gardner – PC makes a recommendation; city council makes the final decision.

Thompson- The sewer piece that was brought up, we rely on MetCouncil?

Kaltsas – No we rely on us to decide if we have capacity. We investigate this fully within the city. We have 2 vacant lots that haven't been built on yet, so we will investigate it.

Gardner – It fits the neighborhood like a glove.

Thompson – The issue of fill was brought up. Grading and drainage plan was in the notes.

Kaltsas –With building permits, we require a grading plan and fill plan. Whether you can build on a lot, Planning doesn't look at that. Is it in a flood plain? There isn't one. Then look at wetland for elevation and lakeshore for elevation. There are standards that would have to follow. Quite a few homes here are built on helical with no basements due to soil conditions. We are not guaranteeing that you can build a home on this. It is in the building permit.

Thompson – The City Council will ultimately decide. I would offer a motion to approve this with the additional requirements for no private easement or no additional dock or dock access being granted to Lake Sarah.

Dumas – I would suggest that the setbacks and lot and lake setback don't meet the standards. I would be inclined to say no.

Volkenant – Too many adjustments, changing drainage, it shouldn't be in existence. Building house on fill with that close to the lake is a concern.

Thompson – We are saying you can't build a house that looks like all your neighbors.

Dumas – We are creating a lot though. This isn't an existing lot that someone wants to build on.

Thompson – If we are going to tear down a house on Lake Sarah, you would still be here with a reduced setback.

Dumas – I don't know if we would approve it then either.

**Motion by Story to not recommend the approval bases for quantity of variances and lack of hardship, second by Dumas. Ayes: Dumas, Story, and Volkenant. Alternate Story. Nays: Thompson. Absent: Tearse. Abstain: Gardner. Motion Denied.**

Kaltsas – PC recommended to deny the requested variances and the Council will officially decide.

November 19<sup>th</sup> will be the next PC Meeting. MetCouncil Draft 2050 Plan letter. I encourage you to read the Draft Plan. The land use planning act created met council. Covers 7 County Metro. Every 10 years MetCouncil must issue their own regional plan. Cities then need to put it into their plans. I feel like the reach of the MetCouncil just keeps expanding broadly. It really impacts our residents and land use in our

city. MetCouncil uses density as a planning mechanism and a one size fits all. Their vision – every development should be a mixed-use higher density development, looking like an attached house next to apartment building, etc. If we plat 10 lots or 400 lots, they don't look at City build out. How do you provide transportation, school districts, sewer systems, parks, etc. when it's all density driven? It doesn't take into consideration what cities want to be.

Usset – Is it appropriate to throw it on the agenda?

Kaltsas – We provided common letter and I sat at these meetings.

Usset – Are there formal ways to bring others into the conversation like water, etc.?

Kaltsas – They are taking away our population growth that we'd planned on. We have landowners that want to develop. When they are not boots on the ground in Cities, they don't understand what they're pushing. Read the Wastewater section of the Plan when you're not sleeping.

## 5. Open/Misc.

Gardner – property on Klinkner's?

Kaltsas – I have heard about it, but nothing came back. We have pressure from airport property subdivide. National developers. We talked sewer and water, talked to MetCouncil, they are committed to providing sewer to the site. But water has always been talked about connecting to Maple Plain and we reached out to Maple Plain and talked to our shared engineering. They ran water usage, and they don't have the extra water to provide. They don't have firm capacity, may need another water tower. We are stepping back and trying to see how to serve that property. I think developer will pay for the study needed to understand water.

Gardner – Could they do wells?

Kaltsas – No. 270 units. Maple Plain has full treatment center. On the hottest summer day when everyone is using water, they do not have the pressure to fight a fire. Less there than they thought.

## 6. Meeting adjourned.

**Motion by Story to adjourn at 9:02 p.m.**

**Approved 5-0.**

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Linda Johnson / Recording Secretary