

**North Oaks Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
City of North Oaks Community Meeting Room and Via Teleconference
December 29, 2020**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Azman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Pursuant to Minnesota Statute 13D.021, the meeting was conducted via Zoom, with Chair Azman and Administrator Kress present in the Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Mark Azman, Commissioners David Cremons, Stig Hauge, Nick Sandell, Grover Sayre III, Joyce Yoshimura-Rank.

Absent: None.

Staff Present: Administrator Kevin Kress, Septic Inspector Brian Humpal.

Others Present: Videographer Maureen Anderson

A quorum was declared present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Azman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Yoshimura-Rank, seconded by Cremons, to approve the agenda. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Chair Azman called three times for citizen comments in the chambers and via Zoom. There were no citizen comments.

BUSINESS ACTION ITEMS

a. Consider recommendation of approval/denial of septic and retaining wall setback variance for 3 Raccoon Road

Chair Azman stated there must be three separate factors shown for a variance. Reasonableness (the property owner must propose a use that is reasonable), uniqueness (the factor involves uniqueness due to the property and not due to the conduct of the owner), and the essential character is not changed by approval of the variance. Other factors that can be considered include harmony with other land use control and some economic factors however those are really a product of the three original factors. He does not believe there are any neighborhood submissions but the Planning Commission must be careful and cannot base a decision on neighborhood opposition alone. Rather, decisions must be based on the three factors identified earlier which are generally called practical difficulties.

Commissioner Hauge thinks North Oaks Home Owners' Association (NOHOA) has filed an opposition, or at least sent a letter earlier in the day at 4:10 p.m.

Chair Azman asked Staff to make a presentation and then they can enter NOHOA's statement into the record, take questions from the Commissioners, and hear from the Applicant.

Septic Inspector Humpal said the variance is for 3 Raccoon Road and the Applicant is requesting a variance for the secondary 5,000 square foot sub surface sewage treatment system which would encroach 3 feet (he noted that should be corrected to 23 feet) into the north property line setback, and 23 feet into the required 75-foot setback from Pleasant Lake. Inspector Humpal noted this is not the corrected version of the document.

- Commissioner Cremons stated the survey the Commissioners received is the one NOHOA is objecting to and is the incorrect one. The first time they have seen the corrected version is when Inspector Humpal just circulated it. He has not seen the correct setbacks to the property line.
- Commissioner Sayre agreed.
- Administrator Kress showed the correct survey onscreen dated 12/9/2020.
- Commissioner Hauge asked if NOHOA objects to the old survey drawing and not to the new one.
- Administrator Kress said that is correct.
- Commissioner Hauge wants to be sure.
- Administrator Kress noted he spoke with NOHOA's Executive Director Griffin and Engineer Elfering this morning when they noticed it was the older version.
- Commissioner Cremons noted NOHOA does not like the fact that the planned system is that close to NOHOA property as shown on the new survey.
- Administrator Kress stated that is correct. Their main concern is the distance from their trail as well as the retaining wall encroaching into the setback areas.
- Commissioner Hauge clarified there is still concern and asked if that is correct.
- Administrator Kress answered that is correct. He showed the retaining walls that extend into the road easement area on the screen and pointed them out as NOHOA's concerns. Typically, they would see a 25-foot setback and the eastern side extends about 4 feet past and the west side is approximately 55-60 feet. One question for the Applicant is if the retaining walls are necessary or if they can provide some type of alternate vegetative wall.
- Inspector Humpal explained the Staff report is mostly correct but he was a bit surprised because Pleasant Lake was not capitalized in his and he had corrected that earlier. He also added an addition under the approval motions.
- Staff clarified that the version Inspector Humpal sent later in the afternoon was emailed out to everyone and was replaced within the packet on the website.
- Commissioner Cremons asked what they are talking about in terms of retaining walls – are they five feet high concrete or something else.

- Administrator Kress stated he would like the Applicant to share as Staff discovered late the previous week that it was considered a structure and would need a variance because it extends out past the setback area.

Inspector Humpal began his presentation again. The Applicant is requesting a variance for the secondary 5,000 square foot sub surface sewage treatment (SSTS) system which would encroach 23 feet (which needs to be corrected from 3 feet) into the required 30-foot north property line setback, and 23 feet into the required 75-foot setback from Pleasant Lake. In addition, a variance is needed due to the lack of the required 12 inches of suitable soil; the change from 3 feet to 23 feet is due to the correction in the survey. The property has been previously developed the reconstruction of the house will be in the same vicinity as the existing house and will use the existing SSTS that was found compliant by others. Due to the wetlands located on the south and west sides of the property, this area appears to be the only viable location for a future SSTS. Based on these facts, it is the Staff's opinion that the Applicant has met the requirements for variances as outlined in Section 151.078 of the code. Staff is in agreement with the designer Matthew Summers that the proposed location of the 5,000 square feet appears to be the most viable location for a secondary SSTS. This would be the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulties.

- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank asked if the system that is in use right now is the original system or if it is a second system.
- Inspector Humpal noted it is a second system that he believes was installed in the 1980's,
- Commissioner Cremons thinks it said 1996 in the report. The property was developed in 1951.
- Commissioner Hauge noted this would be the third system on the property.
- Inspector Humpal explained it would be the second system, if the original was from the original construction and there was a replacement in 1996, this would be the second.
- Chair Azman said the new spot they are talking about tonight would be a potential third.
- Inspector Humpal answered that is correct.
- Chair Azman clarified that it is Inspector Humpal's opinion that there does not appear to be any other reasonable or viable option on the property to select a third site.
- Inspector Humpal said ultimately whether they redevelop this house or not, if they needed a future septic system here, this is really the only area available.
- Commissioner Hauge said the Commission has touched upon this problem before and they always say they need two septic locations. He asked what happened to the original location and can that be redeveloped or re-done to have a new, third septic system in the first location.
- Inspector Humpal said when the property was developed it was before the City had any codes pertaining to septic systems requiring a certain amount of area available for septic systems. The technology back then usually consisted of cesspools which are open bottom tanks that sit in the water table and don't provide any treatment. He noted the wonderful thing about cesspools is the footprint was very small. Codes have matured and as they have a better understanding about waste water treatment, they need more area for these things. He

does not know exactly what they had for that first system, but more than likely it was cesspools and those new tanks for the most recent system are probably located in that same vicinity right now. There is a mound system which provides the treatment of the waste water before it gets back into the groundwater. That would have been a separate area from where that original system had been located.

- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank noted on page 10 it said the future designer at the time of eventual SSTS replacement could situate the final mound in such a way as to meet the 75-foot lake setback and at least meet the State property line. She asked if that is correct.
- Inspector Humpal assumes that was based on the prior survey. More than likely, they will be able to meet the 75-foot setback to the lake with the actual system. North Oaks' code requires them to have 5,000 square feet of area and they will probably not need a total of 5,000 square feet for that future system, so they can potentially shift the actual system that will be constructed in the future further south to meet that setback.
- Commissioner Hauge said the type of septic system they are talking about here is a Type 4 or a Type 3 and asked if that is correct.
- Inspector Humpal answered in the affirmative.
- Commissioner Hauge asked if the technology that Type 4 represents requires a smaller area than Type 1.
- Inspector Humpal answered somewhat; some will depend on site conditions and soil conditions. Typically, there is some reduction in size but there are a number of other factors that play into that as well.
- Commissioner Cremons said without this variance, a new home could not be built on the site, and asked if that is correct.
- Inspector Humpal said that is correct.
- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank said the 75-foot setback is a Minnesota rule and asked if the Planning Commission has the right to give variances for that.
- Inspector Humpal believes they have reached out to the DNR and there was some other information they received on that.
- Administrator Kress stated the DNR basically said if the City was comfortable with the design, they could move forward with it. They did not object to the design; he noted he sent both of the proposals with the setbacks. They also reached out to Vadnais Lakes Area Water Management Organization (VLAWMO).
- Commissioner Cremons said they are talking about a variance to setbacks, which means the Commission is changing the City's code and asked if that is correct.
- Administrator Kress answered yes, basically they are lying outside of what is stated in the City code.
- Commissioner Cremons stated if they have the right to do that, don't they also have the right to vary the City code relative to the 5,000 square feet and do they have the option of saying "we're not terribly comfortable with building this close to the trail, and the property line either, but we will approve the variance that will allow the installation of a 3,000 foot system." When the time comes for the home owner to put in the system, they will have to

figure it out or come back to the Planning Commission to expand the area. He asked if they have that flexibility.

- Administrator Kress said regarding the 5,000 square foot and the 12% FAR; they could potentially get a variance for but he cannot say he has ever seen one with the City of North Oaks.
- Commissioner Cremons said designating a smaller area would protect that boundary to the edge of the property line and the trail so the property owner would have to find a way to accommodate the septic system while not infringing so closely to the trail. If they could not do that in the future then they would have to come back and ask for a variation on it. He noted that is just a thought.
- Inspector Humpal said if the property owner requested, for example, a 3,000 square foot variance, they will still have property line setback variances.
- Chair Azman asked how close the 5,000 square feet is to the edge of the property line.
- Inspector Humpal said it is 7 feet at the closest point.
- Chair Azman clarified they are 23 feet into it and asked if that is correct.
- Inspector Humpal replied that is correct.
- Chair Azman clarified the system could be a Type 3 or 4.
- Inspector Humpal said Type 3 or 4 and he would have to work with the property owner a bit; he does not know if they drop the square footage if they would still need a variance. He'd like to think they wouldn't because if they could meet the lake setback it would be very limited on what would be available.
- Commissioner Sayre asked if they drop the square footage will they have the same quality of a system.
- Inspector Humpal noted it might force them into an area that might be less suitable within that 5,000 square feet. Typically, these systems need to be laid out properly on the contours and that is why they want 5,000 – it does not necessarily mean that they need 5,000 for the system but it gives some flexibility on how that system is placed on the area.
- Chair Azman asked about a condition that would impose a burden on the owner to move it as far north as possible, within the 5,000 square feet.
- Kathryn Alexander asked to give some information that may help the Commissioners. Back in 2014, they were granted a permit to build this house. The homeowner, for personal reasons, put it on hold. In 2019 they were told they could still do the same. At some point, North Oaks decided they need a secondary septic system and she is not sure of the timeline. She said Wenck went through the report on the main septic system to show that it is in good working order, it is very effective. If for some reason it failed, the chances of reusing that same septic site are very, very good. She said there are many other types of septic systems that North Oaks does not recognize because they want a standard system; there are some other options other than making sure a 5,000 square foot secondary system would work.
- Commissioner Hauge asked why is the City asking for another system, if the current system is in working order.
- Inspector Humpal explained North Oaks code requires them to have a future septic area, regardless of whether or not they have a working system today. He said they did receive a

compliance report indicating that the system is compliant. A compliance report is not an indication that the system will last any given amount of time, rather it is the condition of the system at that time. He noted it could fail at any point in the future, although it is unlikely that it will. Any type of system that goes in now will be a Type 3 or Type 4 system, which the City will recognize if a Type 1 or a Type 3 system cannot be installed. There is a possibility that someone could try to rebuild the area where the existing system is, however, that would still fall outside of the requirement for the 5,000 square feet. He clarified someone could put together a design rebuilding that existing area and then request a variance to not need that 5,000 square foot area.

- Commissioner Sandell noted the City is not asking for a replacement system nor is there a plan for a replacement system right now. This is simply the secondary contingent site that would receive the variance.
- Inspector Humpal said that is correct.
- Commissioner Sandell said it is good for everyone to know that there is not a new system going in right now, it is just the secondary contingent system.
- Inspector Humpal clarified it may never go in.
- Commissioner Cremons asked if at some point the septic system has to be replaced, what is the process for City input, review, and approval of the new system when that time comes, going into the 5,000 square foot area.
- Inspector Humpal said when an applicant comes in for a system, Staff reviews the design and engineering to make sure it meets codes, they visit the site to make sure it makes setbacks, and they verify that the soil conditions are suitable for the type of system proposed, and that they agree where limiting conditions on the soil are identified.
- Chair Azman said right now the situation is if the property owner wants to build here, code requires a second location. The Applicant has submitted a plan from a very good engineering firm that identifies the second location; it is a little close to property lines and ordinary high water mark line which is why they need a variance. The only complaint received was from NOHOA who had concerns about the proximity – while he respects NOHOA's position highly, he does not find that to be a significant enough of a neighborhood opposition to justify denial of the variance based on what the Commission is hearing from Inspector Humpal. However, NOHOA also said their concern also includes a lack of suitable soil on this location. As he reads the Wenck report and listens to Inspector Humpal, it appears there is suitable soil if they use a Type 3 or 4. He noted the concern by NOHOA seems to be ameliorated by that issue; a Type 3 or 4 can be managed with that approach.
- Inspector Humpal said yes that would be correct. He added that even if nothing had ever changed with this house and they needed a new system, the City would be looking at essentially the same options that they are today.
- Chair Azman said Ms. Alexander had indicated that it may be possible to fit a new system on the old system site with some sophisticated engineering; however, they still need that 5,000 square foot area. With a type 2 or 3, he understands it can be moved north so it can be placed further away from the borders. Chair Azman does not hear an objection to a condition that at least requires consideration by the property owner of a future site to put it as far away from the south border as possible. This seems to him to be a wishy-washy condition but at least

keeping it in mind in the future may exist. The property owner seems to have satisfied the three conditions for practical difficulties in this scenario.

- Commissioner Sandell said if the house or proposed house was not there and they moved the septic south a bit, is the land suitable at that location. He asked if part of the reason it is being pushed north because of the size and location of the proposed building.
- Inspector Humpal does not believe the placement of the house encroaches any more than the previous house did into that septic area.
- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank asked if the Commission gives the approval for this second system plan, if and when it happens that the owner needs this second system, does it come back to the Planning Commission again.
- Chair Azman replied and said no, they have the variance and the owner would have to come back to the City and Inspector Humpal or his successor would get involved with review of the septic design before it can be installed. He clarified once the variance is there it follows the land and not the owner; if someone else purchased the property down the line, that variance would still be in place.
- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank asked if it is limited to what the Commission approves, the 23 feet.
- Chair Azman said that is correct.
- Inspector Humpal said if the Commission put a condition in that they position the future septic system as far south as possible, that would give the City more ability to review it at the time that a replacement system is needed. It would also give Inspector Humpal or his successor ability to ask the designer or engineer to prove that they have positioned it as far south as possible.
- Commissioner Sayre noted Chair Azman has been saying “north” but he thinks the Chair has been meaning to say “south.”
- Chair Azman said that is correct and he was making sure they were all listening.
- Commissioner Sayre is for that as long as the quality of what they put in stays the same. He would not want the quality of the system to be less because they must move it into a less desirable location within this 5,000 square foot space. At the end of the day that is what matters; if it is a little closer to the lake that is not good, but if it is buttoned up tight and is state-of-the-art that is what matters in his mind.
- Commissioner Cremons asked Administrator Kress if they have a final survey for the record that shows the actual setbacks from the property lines and where the proposed drain field would be with dimensions.
- Ms. Alexander clarified it was sent to the City on December 9, 2020.
- Administrator Kress noted that is the one he has been showing this evening. He pulled it up on screen so everyone could see the secondary site, the existing site, and the 30-foot setback.
- Chair Azman believes the packet discusses the retaining wall but the proposed variance document does not.
- Administrator Kress would like to have a discussion with the Applicant regarding the retaining wall, as it looks like it goes beyond the 30-foot mark. He brought up the survey on screen and pointed out the 30-foot mark (red line) and noted two sections of the retaining

wall go well beyond the 30-foot setback of the front yard. The main concerns from NOHOA were the setbacks that go into the road easement area. Some questions are: is it possible to put in some sort of natural barrier rather than the retaining wall.

- Ms. Alexander stated there are 30 feet from the road, and then another 30 feet and asked which Administrator Kress is referring to.
- Administrator Kress said it looks like it goes beyond in both scenarios, 30 feet from the structure and 30 feet from the road.
- Ms. Alexander asked which one are they referring to that it cannot go beyond.
- Administrator Kress said either one.
- Ms. Alexander asked if it cannot go 60 feet from the road.
- Administrator Kress said 60 feet looks like it would be appropriate and would be very close to the garage in that case.
- Commissioner Cremons asked if Administrator Kress can take his cursor and point to the edge of the road easement as that may be the appropriate spot to measure the 30 feet.
- Ms. Alexander noted there are two 30-foot easements marked and Administrator Kress is pointing to 60 feet from the road. She clarified the red line is 60 feet.
- Chair Azman asked regarding the red line – it is 30 feet from what.
- Administrator Kress said the lot line.
- Ms. Alexander said the edge of the road is over near the “A” on screen in the word “ROAD.” There is a 30-foot dimension to a grey line.
- Inspector Humpal said the City’s setbacks are typically 60 feet on the road.
- Ms. Alexander said there is a 30-foot dimension to a grey line.
- Administrator Kress noted on screen he is talking about two little “chunks.”
- Ms. Alexander replied the little chunk can be adjusted; it is really minor.
- Administrator Kress asked about NOHOA’s stance on the retaining walls in general.
- Ms. Alexander asked if the retaining walls have anything to do with this variance for the septic system.
- Administrator Kress answered no; however, the Applicant would need a variance if it goes beyond the 30 feet like the two sections noted on screen.
- Ms. Alexander asked what if she presents an updated survey that adjusts that little bit.
- Administrator Kress said then she would not need it.
- Ms. Alexander said that is correct, they would not need it.
- Administrator Kress asked if that means Ms. Alexander is not requesting a variance for that tonight.
- Ms. Alexander said for that [retaining wall], no; this is the first she has heard of it and they are talking about a few feet.
- Administrator Kress said they will take that off the table if Chair Azman is willing to adjust the distance.
- Ms. Alexander said that was not part of their submission.
- Administrator Kress said they were just trying to get it done if they needed it as part of a variance; they would do it tonight rather than having the Applicant come back.
- Ms. Alexander asked if it is correct that it is just that little piece.

- Administrator Kress said correct, it is just the two small sections that go beyond the 30 foot.
- Commissioner Cremons noted there is the little piece and then there is that longer extended wall further west. Basically, Ms. Alexander would have to present plans that did not show either of those walls going within the 30-foot setback. If that is the case, there will not be an issue, but if either of those walls is still there it will be a problem.
- Chair Azman asked if Ms. Alexander does not want the Commissioners to deal with the retaining wall issue this evening.
- Ms. Alexander asked to pull up the survey and said no, they should be fine.
- Administrator Kress asked if Ms. Alexander could get him an updated set in the next week or two.
- Ms. Alexander replied yes, that is not a problem.
- Administrator Kress said if the retaining walls will be adjusted it does not look like they would require a variance.
- Chair Azman noted they only have the septic to deal with tonight.
- Inspector Humpal asked if there is a motion to approve, he would like the Commissioners to add that the area should be fenced off prior to construction to prevent accidents from construction equipment that would potentially negatively impact that soil.
- Administrator Kress asked if Inspector Humpal can add that to his variance documents.
- Inspector Humpal replied yes, he had added it, but it is not on the documents the Commission has tonight.
- Commissioner Cremons asked what they will do about Inspector Humpal's suggestion concerning the location of the system within the 5,000 foot area and that it be located as far south as is feasible. He would like that language put in the variance if possible.
- Administrator Kress will speak with Attorney Nason about it, as it sounds reasonable but he wants to be sure it is legal from her end.
- John Kraemer, architect, mentioned that they have already put the fence around the septic site proactively.
- Chair Azman said if the Applicant does not object, can they put that restriction in.
- Administrator Kress does not see why not.
- Chair Azman noted Commissioner Cremons and Inspector Humpal mentioned the restriction on locating as far south as possible within the 5,000 foot area subject to appropriate improvement planning for a system as Commissioner Sayre had mentioned.
- Inspector Humpal said normally they would have a deadline but in this particular case the Applicant is not putting the system in so it is not needed.
- Chair Azman asked if Inspector Humpal has any other concerns or needs for further restrictions.
- Inspector Humpal does not believe so.
- Administrator Kress asked if there are any other questions from the Commission to the architect on the project, or comments from Matt Summers from Wenck.
- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank asked if there is a way to ask that the engineer putting in the system revisit the possibility of putting a system in where the existing system is now.

- Chair Azman does not see why they cannot put a recommendation in to observe and confer with engineers.
- Commissioner Cremons asked in the variance if the reference to the December 6, 2020 design is still correct.
- Inspector Humpal said it would still be correct, he has not seen any revisions in the design. The only revisions received are in the survey.
- Matt Summers had a comment on the potential condition suggesting looking at reusing the existing site. He said five to ten years from now, reusing the existing site is always a consideration for any designer, he does not think they need to state it as that would be a standard protocol. If he went out to design a new system, he would meet Inspector Humpal out there to discuss the best option.
- Chair Azman asked if Inspector Humpal concurs that would be a standard practice.
- Inspector Humpal replied depending on the designer, yes, but most good designers will have that consideration. Perhaps it might be easier that as a condition of this, they would have to meet on site and work on an approved location with himself or his successor in placement of the system.
- Chair Azman thinks with their particular community and the proximity of Pleasant Lake, as well as the lake being part of the St. Paul Water Department, he wonders if there can be a condition that reminds the parties to consider the existing site as a preferred alternative to the site that required a variance.
- Inspector Humpal thinks it may be easier to just spell out that they have at least explored those options in a future design before even using this other 5,000 square foot area. He suggested asking them to consider the option of rebuilding the existing area and after that positioning the system as far south as possible and utilizing whatever technologies may be available in decreasing the footprint of the system.
- Commissioner Sandell is not a lawyer but it is the old handy commercially reasonable efforts to use the old system or the southern most of the new proposed site.
- Inspector Humpal thinks that would be appropriate in addition to noting they need to fence off the area, which they have already done.
- Administrator Kress asked Commissioner Sandell to repeat what he said.
- Commissioner Sandell said the lawyers on the call may be able to help but he suggested commercially reasonable efforts to utilize the existing site or if unavailable, utilize the southern-most area of the new secondary site.
- Chair Azman said instead of commercially reasonable they use “good engineering standard and practice.”
- Commissioner Sayre agreed and said the term commercially reasonable is a defined term under the uniform commercial code and has to do with business transactions, while this is an engineering thing, so he likes the reference to engineering practices.
- Chair Azman does not want to go overboard here for the Applicant either and he understands the engineer’s comments, but he noted they do have a community in North Oaks that is very sensitive to the environment, particularly with Pleasant Lake being an integral part of the

water system. He thinks people will feel more comfortable and it sounds like they will do that anyway; he thinks writing it down as a reminder is not a bad practice either.

- Administrator Kress asked when the Applicant anticipates going before the Architectural Supervisory Committee (ASC) again.
- Mr. Kraemer thinks it was two Mondays ago and they gave their conditional blessing before this meeting. He has not spoken about going before the ASC again but that is a good question and they should get that on the calendar before the City Council meeting.
- Administrator Kress noted City Council meets on January 14, 2021 and if possible, it would be nice to have ASC commentary if available.
- Chair Azman said they have their conditions and he does not hear any further comment. He asked for a motion regarding the application.

MOTION by Sayre, seconded by Cremons, to recommend approval of variance 20-14 to the City Council.

- Administrator Kress noted he has conditions listed as fence off the area for construction, move as far south as feasible, and good engineering standard practices to reasonably apply effort to use the existing site.
- Commissioner Sayre agreed and as clarification that is what he moves for approval. Commissioner Cremons seconded again.
- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank asked the orders of the conditions.
- Administrator Kress noted Inspector Humpal has his listed on variance 20-14 and Administrator Kress added several additional; fence off the area prior to construction, move as far south as feasible, and good engineering standard practices to reasonably apply effort to use the existing site.
- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank asked if they could put the last one second and move the “further south” third.
- Administrator Kress said he could but they would have to comply with all of them. He said he does not have an issue with flipping them.
- Commissioner Sayre does not have any problem with reordering as the conditions are all there.
- Administrator Kress noted this is only for the septic variance and is not anything to do with the retaining wall as that has been taken off the table.

Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

Chair Azman noted the variance has been recommended for approval. He reminded the Applicant that the Planning Commission is an advisory body and the Applicant will have to seek final approval with the City Council at the January 14, 2021 meeting.

Mr. Kraemer thanked the Planning Commission for their time and for considering the application.

Chair Azman said it seems like a great project and a redevelopment site and the Planning Commission is happy to see a wonderful new development out in the community.

Councilmember Kingston asked to say a word just before adjournment; he noted this is the last meeting he will be attending as a City Council liaison to the Planning Commission and apparently the last meeting he will be attending as part of the North Oaks City Council before the new Council is sworn in. He understands that Mayor-elect Kara Ries and Councilmember Jim Hara decided they want to pre-empt the swearing in of the new Council that typically takes place at the first Council meeting in January. He just learned this afternoon that Mayor-elect Ries is calling for a special meeting next Monday which will deprive the outgoing Councilmembers the opportunity to say good-bye and thanks to the residents and others than have worked so hard for the City during their tenure. Normally, Councilmember Kingston would have thanked and recognized all the Planning Commissioners then, but instead he will do so now. He would simply like to say that all of the Commissioners have acted honestly, with honesty, integrity, and transparency and it has been an absolute privilege to work with each of them. He has faith in their ability to continue serving the community and “doing great things for all of us.” He thanked them, said goodbye, and wished them the best of luck in 2021.

Chair Azman thanked Councilmember Kingston, and said he appreciates all the nice comments and working with him as well over the last few years.

Each of the Councilmembers thanked Councilmember Kingston for his service.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Azman noted it is also the Planning Commission’s last meeting of 2020 and his term has expired, although he has reapplied to serve on the Commission; he hopes he will be reappointed but if not, it has certainly been a privilege and an honor to work with everyone.

Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank stated her term is also up and she will also reapply; she said if they do not see her, she will miss them and it has been a very busy year and she thinks the Planning Commission did really, really well. She wished everyone a Happy New Year.

Commissioner Sayre noted he would be rooting for both of them.

MOTION by Yoshimura-Rank, seconded by Hauge, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 7:15 p.m. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

Kevin Kress

Kevin Administrator Kress, City Administrator

Mark Azman

Mark Chair Azman,
Chair

Date approved 2-25-2021