SUPERVISORS PRESENT: J Strohfus, M Ruben, J Windschitl, M Femling, D Johnson

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Troy Gilchrist (Kennedy-Graven), Kim Lindquist (WSB)

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order @ 7:04PM by Chair J Strohfus

### **AGENDA APPROVAL:**

Motion J Windschitl/2<sup>nd</sup> D Johnson to approve Amended Agenda. Voting Yes- M Ruben, J Strohfus, J Windschitl, M Femling, D Johnson. Voting No- None. Abstaining- None. Motion Carried 5-0-0.

#### **CONSENT AGENDA APPROVAL:**

Motion D Johnson/2<sup>nd</sup> M Femling to approve Consent Agenda items which include 3/04/2024 Board Minutes, 3/12/2024 Special Meeting Minutes, Claims 12428-12454, EFT payments- PERA 743605, MN Tax 1876213088, Federal Tax 35417499, payroll ending 4/01/2024, and Financial Reports. Voting Yes- M Ruben, J Strohfus, M Femling, J Windschitl, D Johnson. Voting No- None. Abstaining- None. Motion Carried 5-0-0.

### **HEARING DECISIONS/ZONING ACTIONS:**

Salas Minor Subdivision and CUP for Memorial - PID:28.027.20.44.0002 - 14766 110<sup>th</sup> St S - 6.98 acres Planner stated the request is for a minor subdivision and conditional use permit for a private cemetery which was reviewed by the planning commission. The property will be divided into two parcels with one maintaining the existing residence and outbuildings and the other created will be a .24 acre outlot which is unbuildable. Although they are separate, they will be kept together as a condition. The outlot is to permit creation of a private cemetery which by ordinance needs a conditional use permit. There are several conditions in the ordinance that relate to the use of a cemetery and the ordinance doesn't differentiate between the public cemetery or private cemetery. In discussions with the Planning Commission as well as the attorney, the conditions appear to be for a public cemetery in terms of activity and travel. The cemetery is for the grandparents with other sites available to other members of their family. There is no intention for any public access other than family and it is a recommended condition of approval. Planning Commission discussed the unusual request and the potential impact on adjoining neighborhood, particularly the location proposed. There was some discussion about moving the cemetery to the west side of the site which could be done but there are restrictions on access from the west. The applicant indicated there is vegetation in the area and a fence that provides some screening which is one of the reasons why they chose this location. The grandmother also indicated this location was where she would like to be. The Planning Commission recommends approval of the conditional use permit and the subdivision with recommendation that the board talk about alternative sites. They are recommending approval with conditions associated with the operation of the cemetery and the connection of the two parcels.

J Windschitl inquired in detail the current ordinance with the five acres and if the property or the cemetery needs to be five acres. Planner stated the cemetery needs to be five acres. J Windschitl stated in this application it is not five acres but your recommendation approval even though it isn't in our ordinance. Planner stated even though it's not technically within our ordinance, they are recommending creating an outlot that doesn't function as a buildable lot and be combined in terms of the development agreement and covenants that the two parcels function the same. In their view it toes meet the five acres because the whole thing is functioning as the 6.9 acres.

J Strohfus inquired about the creation of the outlot being procedural to create something smaller for the cemetery. Attorney stated they arrived on that path because of chapter 307 which states any private person may establish the cemetery on the person's own land in the following manner and that manner is to plat out the burial plots. He stated it seemed more orderly to have a defined area by going through the subdivision process.

Bianca Rivas stated the main reason is for their grandparents and the number of plots being reduced to 10 is up for discussion. They want to lay their grandparents to rest, and the location is the most private on their property to be respectful to the neighbors.

J Windschitl stated she visited the site and is torn because the site where they want to have the cemetery is right next to the property line and the privacy fence. She stated it is literally directly behind their home and while it sounds like we're putting it within our ordinance but in a roundabout way. Attorney stated it is a reasonable interpretation to accommodate the state statue by treating the two parcels together.

J Windschitl inquired if they considered placing it on the far north side of the property. Someone from the family stated there are not trees on the north side of the property making it more visible.

M Femling stated he visited the site as well and he likes the location, it's kind of homey.

J Strohfus inquired about the total footprint is .24 acre for the cemetery. Attorney stated that is correct and it is encompassed by the rest of the property which can only be used for residential purposes. There are many limits and conditions with the conditional use permit such as only family members, not open to the public, the two parcels need to remain together under the same ownership, etc.

M Femling inquired if they are vaults and if they can be relocated in the future.

M Ruben inquired about the setback in the ordinance regarding cemeteries. Attorney stated the setback is 20 feet.

### **Public Comment:**

Bob Barr, 14820 110th ST S, stated he is the neighbor and offered his sympathy. He has lived in the town for 31 years and has served on the Planning Commission and as chair for most of it. He stated it has taken him a long time to understand the development code which is the ordinances for the township. B Barr stated he appreciates what they are doing for their parents, grandparents. He consulted with an appraiser and was told it would limit possible buyers for his house and the state statue states it can be acquired with potential to grow. He stated if allowed, he asks that it be relocated away from his property line. B Barr inquired if the board had their development code in front of them and stated that the board and planning commission is obligated to enforce the development codes which are the ordinances. The town's ordinance does not differentiate between public and private cemeteries, but they are separate in the state statues. The development code states the minimum standard for a cemetery is 5 acres. He believes a development agreement is more specific to densities and it is trickery to create an outlot of .24 acres for a cemetery when the development code says minimum of five acres unless associated with a house of worship. A residence is not a house of worship. B Barr stated he is filing an administrative appeal because he doesn't think the facts are correct and was misrepresented to the Planning Commission. He stated he would like the opportunity to review it with the board. He handed out his appeal. J Strohfus inquired B Barr's point if the board can approve or deny the planning commissions recommendation. B Barr inquired if J Strohfus knows how an appeal works. J Strohfus stated he does. Attorney stated before it gets misstated, an appeal is not appropriate. An appeal is only administrative actions, and you can't appeal a report, it has to be a decision. Once a decision is made you can file a judicial appeal. B Barr stated the judicial appeal recommends if you are going to appeal you try working with the local body of government. Attorney stated you are to exhaust local remedies, but this is not a local remedy. B Barr stated he provided parts of the development code and highlighted areas that pertain to the request. He stated what he is appealing was the information that was provided to the planning commission. He stated it didn't feel accurate and doesn't believe it is. B Barr stated the development code doesn't have room for them to put their own agenda or write their own opinions in and should be used as their guideline since it is what was adopted. He stated he highlighted for the board to discuss the minimal standards and it doesn't meet the minimal standards.

J Strohfus stated that B Barr has been on the planning commission and a part of the town and understands how things work. He stated B Barr stated his concern at the planning commission but didn't give anyone on the board a courtesy of his strong objections or something like this to be presented tonight is really unfortunate. B Barr stated the Planning Commission gets the information right before the meeting and they spend their weekend working on it.

Steve Radke, 7642 Neal Ave S, stated about three weeks ago at the town planning meeting, he was touched with the love of a family. However, after reviewing the township ordinances, he feels he made a mistake with the subdivision and CUP request by voting in favor of the subdivision and Cup without considering the acreage requirements and looking at lighting and screening and access prerequisites.

Jason Rudd, EG Rudd and Sons in Lino Lakes, stated cemetery platting is rarely done and he discussed the request with another local surveyor. He stated the statue lacks detail and states the land shall be surveyed and a plat thereof made, a stone or other monuments shall be established to mark one corner of such cemetery and its location shall be designated on the plat. He also stated the rationale for including an outlot was so that it could be defined and clear on the record of plat. The statute doesn't say that it needs to be a separate lot for the cemetery and the fact that there seems to be confusion on the five acres, he apologized. J Windschitl stated the confusion isn't from surveyor but on how it was presented. J Rudd stated the trickery to him was that Chairman B Barr didn't divulge he was the neighbor at the planning commission meeting, and he should have abstained from the vote. He stated in the future, when B Barr has a conflict of interest, he should make it known. He also stated cemetery plating is unique and has only done a handful over the past 40 years.

B Barr stated he didn't divulge he was the neighbor and he stayed objective. He stated the Planning Commission didn't know he was the neighbor next door, and he did that intentionally because he didn't want to influence the Planning Commission members' decisions. He stated he took previous advice he was given by the attorney on a different matter, and he wasn't trying to steer the Planning Commission and believes he did nothing wrong.

Hasan Sahouani, 12250 120<sup>th</sup> St S, stated it is a very emotional issue and difficult for everybody but believes we should be able to arrive at some compromise. He stated when dealing with interpreting our ordinance, what does it say, does it apply, and we could be opening the door, and we need to be careful.

Attorney stated to the surveyors point, the ordinance doesn't spell out that it has to be subdivided and the statute says that the burial plots need to be platted. He stated identifying the boundaries of the specific area made sense. He stated the concern about it expanding can't happened under the way it is written and is limited to the number of plots. Attorney stated the can be no expansion of it unless they come back through the process again.

J Strohfus stated it gives him comfort that it would not be the alternative of a 7 acre cemetery. Attorney stated creating the outlot and defining that as a limited space on the property was more orderly and wasn't an attempt to get around the ordinance but a way of interpreting the ordinance that is consistent with the statute and practical sense.

J Windschitl inquired what the family plans for above ground structures. B Rivas stated headstones and possibly a garden, which is what they liked to do and why they want it close to the house. J Windschitl stated the decision is difficult for all of them because they have to think about the legal perspective and community perspective. There are so many variables to consider.

Juan Salas stated if the neighbor ever wants to sell, they will buy his property from him.

D Johnson inquired the attorney about the different points B Barr brought up. Attorney stated the cemetery is not expandable without going through the whole process again. He addressed the outlot of .24 acres not being 5 acres but believes the conditions that are in place in the proposed resolution forever tying those parcels together essentially accomplishes the purpose of the ordinance. He stated he believes they are accomplishing the purpose of the statute and recognizing that it is not a public cemetery. If the board were to approve it, he is not concerned from a legal perspective. He recommended the order of acting to be subdivision first and then the CUP.

J Strohfus stated the size of the outlot is the conflict however the applicant wasn't required to do an outlot which is an improvement. He stated he takes staff recommendations as well as commentary from residents and the planning commission into consideration when making decisions on sensitive matters. He also stated his main concern is potential lawsuits if not allowed. Attorney stated either decision could result in legal issues. He stated

if the board denies the application, they need to make a motion to direct the attorney to come up with a resolution denying it. Attorney stated he could add a condition to the CUP that the property could not be further subdivided.

J Windschitl inquired if it was approved if they would be willing to work with the neighbor, B Barr, on the placement of the burial site. B Rivas started 22 feet away from the property line. B Barr stated if it was allowed, he would like them to relocate the cemetery but honestly, he is uncomfortable because it violates the development code so he would need to think about it.

J Windschitl stated she doesn't feel she is in a position to decide today. J Strohfus stated that is their role, and if she has more questions, she should ask them questions.

M Femling inquired about escrow money if things need to be located if they decided to sell the property. Attorney stated an escrow wouldn't be effective in that regard and if they were to sell the realtor would need to disclose the cemetery and would be the seller's responsibility to bear the cost of relocating if needed. The town would not have any oversight.

Motion J Strohfus/2<sup>nd</sup> J Windschitl to approve Resolution 2024-02 Granting Preliminary and Final Approval for a Minor Subdivision of Property Located at 14930 70<sup>th</sup> Street South. Voting Yes, J Strohfus, M Ruben, M Femling, D Johnson. Voting No-None. Abstaining- J Windschitl. Motion Carried 4-0-1.

M Ruben inquired about the number of plots. Attorney stated 10 plots per discussion and reflected in the draft resolution.

Motion D Johnson/2<sup>nd</sup> M Femling to approve Resolution 2024-03 Approving a Conditional Use Permit for the Property Located at 14930 70<sup>th</sup> Street South with additional conditions captured by Attorney.

J Strohfus stated this was a delicate situation and if it's within the development code then he supports property owner's rights.

Voting Yes, J Strohfus, M Ruben, M Femling, D Johnson. Voting No-None. Abstaining- J Windschitl. Motion Carried 4-0-1.

MN Coaches Variance and Amended Conditional Use Permit – PID:31.027.20.33.0009 - 12044 120th St S Planner stated the request is to amend the 2017 CUP for the construction of two approximately 5,000 square foot garage buildings and a variance for 2,800 square foot canopy over fuel island and a variance for the fuel island canopy setback of zero from eastern property line. The property is already developed with the bus garage and its activities the primary use. There are several buildings currently on the site. The applicant stated they may shift the southern proposed garage north to provide better visibility to the adjoining daycare. She stated the shift may prompt additional fire safety issues which would be addressed by the building inspector. The garages will be primarily used for storage and the overhead doors are sized appropriately for bus storage. The fuel canopy would need a variance because of the setback being zero when a 20 foot minimum setback is required. There are numerous conditions, the request meets the criteria, and the variance is a reasonable option. The adjoining residential property has brought up concerns with the double row of trees screening and lighting. This application gives the town the opportunity to address the concerns of the screening and lighting which the building inspector has been sent out to evaluate and the results are not in yet. Staff and Planning Commission recommend approval with conditions for CUP of 2 garages and fuel canopy as well as the variance for fuel canopy setback.

Pat Regan, Minnesota Coaches, stated when he purchased the property, he worked with Jen Gelhar, owner of Little Beginnings Daycare, to develop the property together. They sold her 2.5 acres for the daycare and worked on the landscape plan together. Where the fueling station hits the edge of the daycare's property is next to the shared storm drainage pond and they have talked with J Gelhar, and she is supportive of the location. The fueling canopy is important for safety reasons to protect the drivers from the elements and a very significant work comp safety issue. Water drainage from the canopy will flow right into the storm drainage pond. He addresses the comments from the planning commission minutes regarding the color of the canopy and lighting which would

make the canopy over the fueling stations safer as well especially in the wintertime. They can screen the lighting to the neighbors and the color of the canopy will match the rest of the buildings as well as with the new buildings. The new buildings will improve the appearance of the whole property by reducing the number of yellow school buses exposed. They put up a hoop building with the 2021 amendment primarily to screen the lot from the neighbors to the east from the lights and noise. They have not put lights up on the east side of the building, but they did put some lights on the concrete wall that they built. He stated that if they are a disruption to the neighbors, they will put some kind of screen or shade over them. The lights are motion detected solar lights making them the least disruptive parking lot lights he has. He addressed the issue about the double row of trees from 2021 stating that it was misrepresented, and he was asked to plant 15 trees, but he bought 30 trees. When he walked the property with the neighbors, the northeast corner has no trees and there was a 50 to 100 foot area on his property that is full of trees. He said he could put a double row of trees where there were not trees, single row where there were thick trees, and now it is a problem. He stated there are 4 dead trees that he will replace. P Regan stated the town's attorney had a good suggestion by trying to delineate how many vehicles and what types in the CUP. He stated they have continued to grow and completely use the site themselves as a bus terminal. He explained the different types of buses and vehicles they have on the premises. There is an issue with a power pole that they are trying to work out and the daycare has inquired them to shift the building to the north, so they don't block her front entry. He stated if moving the buildings closer together would require them to upgrade the fire suppression they would do that. They are unable to install sprinklers due to having well water not city water and that is why the buildings are around 5,000 square feet. He stated his engineer is working on delineation of vehicles on lot today which can very over time due to contract needs. There are driver and bus aide vehicles for the special needs buses resulting in more employee vehicles. P Regan stated they would be willing to install another fence between the hoop building and the fuel island on the east side of the parking lot but would need to be mindful of the septic sites.

M Ruben inquired if the canopy is temporary or permanent. P Regan stated permanent and will be the same shape as the hoop building.

M Femling inquired about the garage door locations on the new buildings. P Regan stated they would be on the west side with possible service doors on the north and south sides per code. The roof line would slope back towards the daycare.

J Windschitl inquired if it will create any issues with driveway to Little Beginnings. P Regan stated it would not create any issues because the daycare is higher than the driveway and there are trees separating it. J Windschitl stated there is a significant number of buses on the property and inquired if they will all fit. P Regan stated they will fit and if the CUP is approved with the numbers that they have he suggests they will be maxed out on the number of buses that will fit on the property. He explained how many different types of buses can fit in a 40 foot stall and how employee vehicles are parked away from the operating vehicles for safety reasons. He explained how the traffic pattern on the property is counterclockwise whether entering or exiting the property. M Femling inquired for clarification if all the buses will be in a building. P Regan stated he misunderstood the question, no they will not all be inside a building. The two proposed buildings will hold 28 smaller buses and stated they had been approved and had a building permit for another 5,000 square foot building on the north side of the shop building which they intend to build also. This building would fit the larger buses and have a drive through capability.

M Femling inquired if it's only school buses or will they have any coach buses. P Regan stated only school buses, the coach buses need wash facilities as well as a dump station and this location is not conducive without city water and sewer.

M Femling inquired if he could speak about the issues of exiting and entering Hwy 61. P Regan stated he is less concerned about it, and they train their drivers to use Margo Ave, not 120<sup>th</sup> St. They would be willing to work on getting access out onto Hwy 95. J Strohfus stated there is a proposed MNDOT project with turnback lanes which will limit the speed of traffic which is proposed for 2026 implementation.

J Strohfus inquired about the lighting plan with downcast etc. P Regan stated they are happy to have Mr Stensland out and to comply with what needs to be done whether it is to dim, shade or whatever. J Strohfus stated that he believes Mr Stensland has scheduled a visit at night and the town has not received the report yet.

P Regan inquired about speaking to the number of vehicles. Attorney stated he was unsure of how many buses would be parked in the new buildings and how it would impact the parking in the parking lot. P Regan stated that the number of vehicles is as follows: 134 car stalls, 62-40 foot bus stalls, and 66- 11x27 foot bus stalls for the minibuses. He stated that is what fits on the lot today. J Windschitl inquired if that is what fits but not necessarily what is on the lot today. P Regan stated that how many buses and what type depends on the contracts they obtain each year and expressed the need to be flexible. They wouldn't be able to get any more than that on the lot.

P Regan stated that he needs to maintain the property to keep it safe and there is a need to keep gravel or recycled asphalt on site to fill in potholes and such with a skid steer as needed. They like the recycled asphalt because it's less dusty for the neighbors and keeps the inside of the buses clean as well.

### **Public Comment:**

Hassan Sahouani, 12250 120<sup>th</sup> St S, stated he request P Regan not to plant ash trees and noticed the bus drivers try to beat residents to stop sign and control lights.

Joe Engler, 12184 120<sup>th</sup> St S, stated he has been run off the road by a bus and worked through it with P Regan. His concern from the very beginning is the driveway being too close to the intersection causing the buses to be broad side making the intersection unsafe. The buses do not have the right of way and should not have an intersection that close to the highway. He suggested they change the direction that they enter and exit the parking lot closer to Little Beginnings.

J Strohfus stated the traffic flow was discussed with regard to the daycare parents and bus traffic and appreciates the comment. J Engler stated the safety at this intersection is already a safety concern and when you add the buses into the mix it makes it worse. He stated they are great neighbors other than that and inquired about the height of the buildings.

Tyler Cysiewski, 12521 Norell Rd S, stated he drives that way quite a bit and has learned the busy times are which you can choose an alternate route or defensive driving skills.

J Strohfus inquired about traffic counts in the current draft. Attorney stated the numbers that they just provided max out the space available compared to the 2017 numbers and he will add it to the document. P Regan inquired if the 30 spaces for Universal services were among the numbers in 2017. Attorney stated the language seems to encompass those spaces. He inquired about the previous building comment because the way the draft is written, it only allows the existing buildings and the two proposed additional buildings. P Regan stated that it is their intention to put that third building up at the same time. Attorney stated he would need to add that into the narrative and inquired about the size of the building. P Regan stated 50 feet x 100 feet. Attorney stated he would clarify under the additional building a subpart with language regarding previous approved 50x100 building.

J Windschitl inquired about the size of the lot and lot coverage. Discussion on impervious surfaces and it was noted that the town engineer doesn't have any concerns with stormwater as long as it on impervious surface.

P Regan stated he would talk to the terminal about changing the route for the long/full buses to use the main driveway. Discussion on lighting and screening with P Regan willing to meet the code on lighting being downcast and will add 10 arborvitaes at Building Inspectors recommendation.

Motion J Strohfus/2<sup>nd</sup> J Windschitl to approve Resolution 2024-04 Approving a Conditional Use Permit and Variance to Operate Certain Uses on the Property Located at 12044 120<sup>th</sup> Street South with the following changes captured by attorney: Applicant shall provide review of traffic flow and report back

with in 12 months, 10 arborvitaes and downcast lighting. Voting Yes- J Strohfus, J Windschitl, D Johnson, M Femling, M Ruben. Voting No- None. Abstaining-None. Motion Carried 5-0-0.

#### **Public Comment:**

Hassan Sahouani, 12250 120<sup>th</sup> St S, stated in December he provided a letter to the board regarding the old Cordes property and in February the board reported the inspector visited the site which they are waiting for some improvements. He provided the board with pictures of the property of what it looks like today which is basically the same. He inquired the town board to inform the new owner to get rid of the dumpsters or put them inside the buildings because he is in violation with the ordinance.

Jordan McCullum, 11373 Neal Ave S, stated she has approached the board and the Washington County Sheriff's multiple times about the dog issued at 11401 Neal Ave S. She provided the board with a letter with all the neighbors' signatures asking the board to do something about enforcing the dog at large ordinance. Their dog has been attacked as well as one of the neighbors in 2022.

John Hanson, 11789 Mendel Ave S, inquired about the Class B Home Occupation definition and gave a scenario of a home construction business that would use tandem trucks and/or semis on 120<sup>th</sup> street and uses equipment to load and unload that may have beepers etc. He inquired if this type of business would qualify as a Class B. J Strohfus stated J Hanson could submit the scenario to the board to work through and he would personally respond back to him. J Hanson inquired about the intention of large vehicles. D Johnson stated if were talking hypotheticals there more factors that would need to be added in order to examine the scenario and the town typically only deals with actual applications. Attorney inquired if the applicant in the scenario lives on the property full time because it is home occupation. He said it has to be a home first and foremost and explained how the process of an application and the conditions would be worked through. He also stated there is a risk that it may be too restrictive with the criteria to avoid bad things from happening. J Strohfus stated the town is still working through the process with no public hearing planned and the town is trying to be transparent.

H Sahouani inquired if it could be something put to election. J Strohfus stated no.

Joe Engler, 12184 120<sup>th</sup> St S, inquired about the Cordes property because they are moving stuff in and out. He stated he reached out to the clerk and was informed that they were using it as a staging area for cleanup. They are bringing in material and equipment, dumpsters are being rotated through. Discussion on the activities they are witnessing. J Strohfus stated code enforcement has been involved and he will update them with the new information. Attorney stated the town anticipates an application. J Engler inquired about consequences for operating without a CUP and code enforcement. J Strohfus stated it is a complicated question but there is a process for code enforcement and explained the complaint process. J Windschitl inquired if the company currently operates in the township elsewhere. Attorney stated they do not have a permit.

J McCullum inquired about the process regarding the dog issue. J Strohfus stated the town takes these matters seriously. Attorney stated it is prohibitive to have dogs running at large unless they are caught in the act. J McCullum stated she has sent in lots of videos to the township and the sheriff's office and feels she is getting the run around on who is responsible. Attorney stated there are two options the sheriff's office and animal control. J McCullum stated animal control wouldn't do anything unless they captured the dogs. Attorney stated he hasn't talked to animal control. Someone in the audience stated they ultimately are looking for a way to keep their pets in their yard and they have 7-9 dogs. J McCullum stated they are breeding, they can't keep them on the property, they are attacking humans, dogs and killing chickens. J Strohfus stated there are a few incidents regarding dogs that the town is working through. Attorney stated there has been communication with the owners but there is only so much the town can do. J McCullum inquired who enforces Washington County Ordinances regarding potentially dangerous dogs needing physical enclosures. Attorney stated county enforces county ordinances. J Strohfus stated the town has deemed the dogs potentially dangerous, but we do not have a fencing requirement in our ordinance. He stated the other matter is civil.

Laura Pope, 8858 Pleasant Ave S, stated there is a lack of feedback loop and the complaint process. J Strohfus inquired if the complaint process is on the website. Clerk stated it is on the website under policy and procedures.

J Strohfus stated the town takes complaints and code enforcement seriously and he has been very strict about pushing them into a process and deploying code enforcement to look and finding matters of fact so that it takes a lot of the ambiguity out. He stated there are some limitations on what is directly fed back to the person who complained as part of our process.

9:24PM Public Comment Closed.

### **BUSINESS ITEMS:**

### **Sigler Lot Line Adjustment:**

Attorney stated the applicant is seeking a lot line adjustment to take 0.63 acres out of Outlot A and move the property line to expand plot one block one within the plat. He stated he didn't find any issues with adjusting the lot line because it doesn't change density units on either parcel. He also stated there is a condition that requires the recording of the combination of the transfer parcel with the Sigler property.

Motion M Femling/2<sup>nd</sup> D Johnson to approve Resolution 2024-05 Approving a Lot Line Adjustment for the properties located at 12740 Mary Avenue South and Outlot A in the Plat of Kummer's Cliff. Voting Yes- M Femling, D Johnson, J Windschitl, J Strohfus, M Ruben. Voting No- None. Abstaining-None. Motion Carried 5-0-0.

### 87th Street Road Update:

M Femling stated the town is still working out a few issues with the project. Discussion on different design options, Martin Marietta's budget and the specification in the IUP. Consensus to set up a workshop date to work through the logistics and get everyone on the same page.

### 2024 Amendments to the Development Code:

Consensus to table until next meeting.

### **Town Hall & O'Connor Park Mowing:**

J Strohfus stated he is abstaining.

J Windschitl stated the contract for mowing at the town hall and O'Connor park is up. She received two quotes for services from Tri-County Services Inc. and Ecosnow Services LLC. Tri-County Services quote was \$10 more than Ecosnow per time. Discussion on how many times the town hall is mowed, insurance and bonded. J Windschitl stated the town is happy with the services provided by Tri-County and believes we should stay with them.

Motion J Windschitl/2<sup>nd</sup> D Johnson to award the contract to Tri-County. Voting Yes- J Windschitl, D Johnson, M Femling, M Ruben. Voting No- None. Abstaining- J Strohfus. Motion Carried 4-0-1.

#### **Board Room AV Quote:**

J Strohfus explained the AV design and quote from BestBuy and the need to have an electrician do some work to bring electricity to the equipment. Discussion on remoting into meetings.

Motion J Windschitl/2<sup>nd</sup> D Johnson to approve quote for BestBuy in the amount of \$26,000 from ARPA funds. Voting Yes- J Windschitl, D Johnson, M Femling, M Ruben, J Strohfus. Voting No- None. Abstaining- None. Motion Carried 5-0-0.

### 2023 Financial Audit-Oberloh & Oberloh:

D Johnson stated she went over the audit report and everything looks as it should.

Motion D Johnson/2<sup>nd</sup> M Femling to accept 2023 Financial Audit performed by Oberloh & Oberloh. Voting Yes- D Johnson, M Femling, M Ruben, J Strohfus, J Windschitl. Voting No- None. Abstaining-None. Motion Carried 5-0-0.

### Letter of Resignation:

J Windschitl announced her resignation and wants her seat to be on the ballot for election. Discussion on terms and how to proceed. Attorney advised to table, and he will have a resolution ready for the May meeting. Consensus to table.

### **Historical Society:**

J Strohfus inquired if anyone is interested in being the liaison to the Historical Society.

Motion J Strohfus/2<sup>nd</sup> J Windschitl to appoint Matt Ruben as Liaison to Denmark Historical Society.

Voting Yes- J Strohfus, J Windschitl, D Johnson, M Femling, M Ruben. Voting No- None. Abstaining-None. Motion Carried 5-0-0. Legal Updates: None. 10:33PM Motion D Johnson/2<sup>nd</sup> J Windschitl to adjourn April 2024 Board Meeting. Voting Yes- M Ruben, J Strohfus, J Windschitl, M Femling, D Johnson. Voting No- None. Abstaining- None. Motion Carried 5-0-0. Jessica Maurer Denmark Township Clerk/Treasurer Denmark Township Chair