



Approved: June 22, 2020

---

---

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA  
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MAY 26, 2020  
7:00 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

---

---

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Mayor David Grant called to order the regular City Council meeting at 7:00 p.m.

*Note: On March 20<sup>th</sup>, the Mayor signed a determination allowing Councilmembers to participate in City Council meetings via telephone pursuant to State Statute 13D.021*

**Present via Telephone:** Mayor David Grant, Councilmembers Brenda Holden, Fran Holmes, Dave McClung and Steve Scott

**Absent:** None

**Also present:** City Administrator Dave Perrault; Finance Director Gayle Bauman; Public Works Director/City Engineer Todd Blomstrom; Community Development Director/City Planner Mike Mroska; Associate Planner Joe Hartmann; City Attorney Joel Jannik (via telephone); and City Clerk Julie Hanson

**1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve the meeting agenda as presented. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

**2. PUBLIC INQUIRIES/INFORMATIONAL**

**Brenda Goldman**, 1146 Walden Place, stated she was the proud mother of four children and has lived in Arden Hills since 1993. She commented on the Council's last worksession meeting and discussed the proposed fire station that would be located on Bethel property. She explained she was concerned with the project timeline. She encouraged the City to further consider the costs for the proposed fire station and recommended another location be pursued.

### 3. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC INQUIRIES

None.

### 4. PRESENTATION

#### A. 2019 Financial Statements

**Aaron Nielsen**, MMKR, provided the Council with a presentation on the City's 2019 audit and financial statements. He explained the City received a clean or unmodified opinion on its 2019 financials. He reviewed the General Fund in detail with the Council noting revenues and expenditures from the past year. He then discussed the City's enterprise funds. He commended the City on its strong financial position and asked for comments or questions.

**Councilmember Holmes** questioned if there was anything the City could do to further delegate the financial responsibilities.

**Mr. Nielsen** stated it was not unusual for a City of this size to have a smaller financial department. He believed Arden Hill's staff was incorporating the appropriate steps to have the proper checks and balances in place. He explained it was more challenging with respect to capital assets or journal entries, to ensure that transactions are posted accurately. He stated he could look at this process again next year if there are additional controls that could be put in place.

**Finance Director Bauman** indicated this was a common comment for cities the size of Arden Hills. She discussed how journal entries are made by two people and how other tasks were signed off by two different staff members.

**Councilmember Holmes** supported the Council discussing this issue further to avoid future audit concerns.

**Mayor Grant** questioned how large the City's financial department would have to be in order to eliminate the segregation of duties concern.

**Mr. Nielsen** reported two or three additional staff members might be required.

**Mayor Grant** thanked Mr. Nielsen for his report. He requested staff place the segregation of duties item on the July worksession for further discussion.

### 5. STAFF COMMENTS

#### A. Rice Creek Commons (TCAAP) and Joint Development Authority (JDA) Update

**City Administrator Perrault** provided an update on TCAAP stating litigation with Ramsey County was ongoing.

**B. COVID-19 Update**

**City Administrator Perrault** provided Council with a COVID-19 update. He encouraged residents to visit the City’s website for the most current and up to date information regarding COVID-19. He reported the Minnesota Department of Health and CDC also had websites with current guidelines and recommendations. He explained the City of Arden Hills remains in a peacetime state of emergency and City Hall will remain closed until further notice. He indicated City staff remains operational and can be reached via phone or email. He explained the Stay at Home Order from the governor has been changed to a Stay Safe order. Information regarding the Stay Safe order was available on the State of Minnesota’s website. He reminded the public about the sheriff’s office COVID-19 help team, and gave their phone number 651-448-3874.

**C. Transportation Update**

**Public Works Director/City Engineer Blomstrom** reported project construction has begun on the I-35W MNPASS project. He stated bridge beams and decking work were being installed on the County Road I bridge. He reported grading work along the central portion of the corridor was being completed at this time and noise walls were being installed. He explained further information regarding the I-35W MNPASS project was available on MnDOT’s website.

**Public Works Director/City Engineer Blomstrom** stated MnDOT conducted a virtual open house on May 19<sup>th</sup> for the temporary closure of the median at Snelling Avenue and Hamline Avenue. He reported additional comments or questions regarding this project can be submitted to MnDOT through May 31<sup>st</sup>.

**Councilmember Holden** asked what the next process would be for the intersection at Snelling Avenue and Hamline Avenue.

**Public Works Director/City Engineer Blomstrom** explained MnDOT would be taking in all of the comments through May 31<sup>st</sup>. After that time, MnDOT would be making a recommendation to staff and this recommendation would be reviewed by the City Council. He indicated MnDOT holds the ultimate authority for making access decisions along their roadways.

**Councilmember Holden** questioned if the City would be required to give municipal consent on this item.

**Public Works Director/City Engineer Blomstrom** reported this access closure would not require municipal consent.

**6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. April 27, 2020, Regular City Council
- B. April 30, 2020, Special City Council Work Session
- C. May 11, 2020, Regular City Council

**Councilmember Holden** commented she had one correction to the May 11<sup>th</sup> Regular City Council meeting minutes and this correction was provided to the City Clerk.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve the April 27, 2020, Regular City Council meeting minutes, April 30, 2020, Special City Council Work Session meeting minutes; and May 11, 2020, Regular City Council meeting minutes as amended. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Motion to Approve Consent Agenda Item - Claims and Payroll
- B. Motion to Approve 2019 City Financial Statements and Audit
- C. Motion to Approve Temporary Layoff of Recreation Coordinator
- D. Motion to Authorize Prorated Refund of On-Sale Liquor License Fees Due to COVID-19
- E. Motion to Approve Proposal for Engineering Services – HVAC Replacement/ Upgrade

**MOTION:** Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve the Consent Calendar as presented and to authorize execution of all necessary documents contained therein. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

## 8. PULLED CONSENT ITEMS

None.

## 9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

## 10. NEW BUSINESS

### A. Resolution 2020-022 – Planning Case 20-008 – 3244 Sandeen Road - Variance

**Associate Planner Hartmann** stated Richard Priore (“Applicant”) is requesting flexibility with the floor area ratio requirement (FAR) to build a house with a FAR of 0.34. The maximum FAR allowed under City ordinance for properties in the Subject Property’s district is 0.30. The Subject Property is zoned R-2, Single and Two Family Residential District and is guided as Low Density Residential in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The Subject Property is currently a vacant lot on Lake Johanna. The former owners demolished the existing house on 3244 Sandeen Road prior to selling the property to the current owner. The current owners previously received approval to build a single family home with a 30 foot front setback. At its January 27, 2020 meeting, the City Council approved a 10 foot front yard setback variance for the subject property.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** reported the Subject Property is a legal non-conforming lot as it is 50 feet in width and has a gross lot area of 9,900 square feet. The R2 district standards require a minimum lot width of 85 feet and 11,000 square feet. In addition, a bluff is located on the Lake Johanna side of the Subject Property that further restricts the buildable area on the parcel. The

proposed variance will not impact any setback requirements and the property will otherwise conform to all of the provisions for the R-2 district.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** reviewed the Plan Evaluation, Variance Requirements and offered the following Findings of Fact:

1. City Staff received a land use application for a variance request to increase the allowable FAR on a single family dwelling at the Subject Property 3244 Sandeen Road.
2. A single-family detached dwelling is a permitted use in the R-2 district.
3. The Subject Property is non-conforming with the R-2 districts standards for minimum lot width and area requirements.
4. The proposed additional floor area would be below grade and wholly within the principal structure of the house.
5. The proposed development of the subject parcel would conform to all other requirements and standards of the R-2 district.
6. A variance may be granted if enforcement of a provision in the zoning ordinance would cause the landowner practical difficulties.
7. Variances are only permitted when they are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** stated the Planning Commission recommended approval by a 7-0 vote of Planning Case 20-008 for a Variance at 3244 Sandeen Road, based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans in the May 6, 2020 Report to the Planning Commission, as amended by the following conditions:

1. A Building Permit shall be issued prior to commencement of construction.
2. The proposed building shall conform to all other standards and regulations in the City Code.

**Councilmember Holden** asked if the applicant was aware of the fact they would need a variance to build a home on this lot prior to purchasing the land.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** explained the applicants were aware of this fact. He discussed how the requested variance would allow for more livable space.

**Councilmember Holden** questioned if the City had rules about livable space above garages.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mroska** discussed how the City calculates FAR for finished space above garages.

**Mayor Grant** asked if someone driving by this home would be able to visually see a difference if the variance were approved.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mroska** commented a passerby would not be able to see a difference. He explained the proposed building meets all other buildings requirements and could be built per the normal building process.

**Mayor Grant** inquired where the additional floor area would be located.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła** indicated the extra floor area would be located above the garage and in the basement.

**Mayor Grant** asked if there were homes in Arden Hills that have livable space above the garage.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła** stated there were homes with livable space above the garage but noted these homes met the City's FAR ratio.

**Councilmember McClung** questioned why this item was being brought to the Council now and not with the original variance request.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** explained the applicants originally wanted the 30 foot front yard setback to have more space to build the house. However, since that time the plans for the house have changed in order to create more livable space which created the request for an increased FAR.

**Councilmember McClung** recalled there being a discussion of livable space and FAR and he was concerned this request was just coming forward now.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła** reported the applicant made a request in November to have a FAR and front yard variance. He explained in November the Planning Commission tabled action on the item to allow the applicant to do more research. At the time, the applicants hired a different architect and did not pursue the FAR variance and only requested front yard setback variance.

**Mayor Grant** commented the applicants were aware of the lot size when they purchased the property. He asked if staff would characterize this lot as being narrow and sloping to the lake.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** explained the lot was narrow and there were topography issues. He indicated the property did not meet the minimum lot size for this zoning district which restricted the amount of buildable area.

**Mayor Grant** questioned if there were any issues of water or sewer lines crossing the property.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** stated he was not aware of this concern.

**Councilmember Holden** commented the applicants have designed a house that meets building requirements that does not require a variance. For this reason, she would not be able to support a variance at this time.

**Councilmember Holmes** stated she saw the practical difficulties for this lot and for this reason she supported the home having the additional useable space. She indicated she could support the requested variance given the fact the outside of the home would not look different one way or the other.

**Councilmember Scott** reported if the variance were not granted the home would look exactly the same as if the variance were granted. He explained the extra space was being requested to accommodate a child with special needs.

**Councilmember McClung** stated he did not support the variance request.

**MOTION:** **Councilmember Holmes moved and Councilmember Scott seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-022 approving Planning Case 20-008 for a Variance at 3244 Sandeen, based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the two (2) conditions in the May 6, 2020, Report to the City Council. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried 3-2 (Councilmember Holden and McClung opposed).**

**B. Resolution 2020-023 – Planning Case 20-004 – Venus Avenue - Variance**

**Associate Planner Hartmann** stated the Applicants are requesting a variance to build a deck and walkway structure in the front of a single-family detached dwelling on the Subject Property that would encroach into the front yard setback. The Subject Property is zoned R-1, Single Family Residential District and is guided as a Low Density Residential use in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The existing walkway and deck is original to the Subject Property and predates the adoption of the Zoning Code. The Applicants are requesting flexibility on the front setback requirement to build a larger deck that would exceed the dimensions of the current deck. The Subject Property is a legal non-conforming lot.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** reported the Subject Property is 120 feet in length and has a lot area of 12,500 square feet. The R1 district standards require a minimum lot length of 130 feet and a minimum size of 14,000 square feet. In addition, the topography of the front yard is unique due to the courtyard designed by the original owner. The proposed variance will not impact any other setback requirements besides the front setback flexibility requested and the property will otherwise conform to all provisions for the R-1 district.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** reviewed the Plan Evaluation, Variance Requirements and offered the following Findings of Fact:

1. City Staff received a land use application for a request to build a replacement deck for a single family dwelling at the Subject Property 1741 Venus Avenue.
2. A deck on a single-family detached dwelling is a permitted use in the R-1 district.
3. The proposed walkway is necessary as the means of egress out the front door of the house.
4. The Subject Property is non-conforming with the R-1 districts standards for minimum lot length and area requirements.
5. The Subject Property is nonconforming due to the sunken elevation of the front yard.
6. The proposed deck and walkway would encroach into the front setback a combined 28 feet.
7. The proposed development of the subject parcel would conform to all other requirements and standards of the R-1 district.
8. A variance may be granted if enforcement of a provision in the zoning ordinance would cause the landowner practical difficulties.

9. Variances are only permitted when they are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** stated the Planning Commission recommended approval by a 4-2 vote of Planning Case 20-004 for a variance at 1741 Venus Avenue, based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans in the May 6, 2020 Report to the Planning Commission, as amended by the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, engineering department staff shall review a revised landscaping plan to ensure no impacts to the right-of-way.
2. A Building Permit shall be issued prior to commencement of construction.
3. The proposed building shall conform to all standards and regulations in the City Code.

**Mayor Grant** requested further information regarding the existing deck and how this compared to the proposed deck.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** reviewed the new deck plans in comparison to the existing deck.

**Mayor Grant** noted the new deck would be wider than the existing deck. He questioned how the walkway width would be changed with the new plans.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** reported the existing walkway was 3.8 feet wide and the new walkway would be 12 feet wide.

**Councilmember Holden** asked if the applicant was informed as to the City's front porch standards.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** indicated this information was discussed with the applicant.

**Councilmember Holden** inquired if the applicant had a patio or deck on the back of the home.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** stated the applicants had a patio on the back of the home.

**Mayor Grant** questioned if applicant was aware of the fact the deck would cover the windows in the basement.

**Jennifer Granick** 1741 Venus Avenue, explained the current deck covers three windows and noted the new deck would only cover two windows. She indicated the windows that were being covered were for the laundry room.

**Councilmember Scott** asked if public safety (police, fire or medical) could respond to the home if the walkway were not in place.

**Ms. Granick** stated without the walkway public safety would gain access to the house through the garage. She commented the straightest access to the home was across the bridge and into the front door.

**Councilmember Holden** indicated the plans for the deck were beautiful but she could not support a large deck in the front yard. She understood the home currently had a deck, but she didn't support the expansion of the deck.

**Councilmember Holmes** explained there were no decks in front yards in Arden Hills. She did not understand why this home did not have a porch. She explained she could support a front porch and bridge/walkway but did not support the oversized deck on the front of the home.

**Councilmember McClung** stated he feels similarly. He reported the Council crafted a front porch ordinance and this was brought to the applicants' attention. He indicated the expansion of the deck was not something he could support. He encouraged the residents to consider a front porch. He explained he could not support the requested variance. He believed approving this variance would set a dangerous precedent.

**Councilmember Scott** asked if the neighbors had provided any feedback on the request.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** stated in general the neighbors supported the variance request for the expanded deck.

**Councilmember Scott** discussed how the new deck railing system would have a more sleek design and would be less visible.

**Mayor Grant** asked if this were a porch how far out could it go from the house.

**Associate Planner Hartmann** reported per City Code a porch could extend out 10 feet from the house. He noted a deck could extend out from the front of a house 6 feet and the applicants were requesting 12 feet.

**Mayor Grant** stated given the Ordinance the City had in place he would not be able to support the requested deck expansion.

**MOTION:** **Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-023 denying Planning Case 20-004 for a variance at 1741 Venus Avenue based on the findings of fact and that the property already has reasonable use, there was not a covered porch, the City does not allow decks in the front yard, and the proposed deck would encroach even further into the front yard setback.**

**Councilmember Holmes** stated the deck was a problematic issue. She commented the walkway was not so much of a concern for her. She encouraged the applicant to come back to the City with a new plan.

**Mayor Grant** questioned what the next step would be for the applicants if he plans were denied.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosia** reported the applicants could come back with similar plans in six months or a new plan sooner than six months. He explained if the item were tabled the applicants could revise the plans.

**Mayor Grant** asked if applicants could replace the existing deck, walkway and steps.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosia** indicated the deck and walkway could be replaced as is without increasing the deck width. He noted if the deck were replaced as is this would not have to come before the City Council.

**Councilmember Holmes** stated the Council was in agreement a walkway of some sort was appropriate. She asked if the applicant would be amenable to a porch versus a deck. She questioned if the applicant would consider amending the plans to add a porch versus a deck. She inquired if action on the item should be tabled to allow for the plans to be amended or if the Council should deny the request.

**Mayor Grant** explained if action on the item were tabled the applicants would be allowed to bring the item back versus if the item were denied the applicants would have to reapply.

**William Tourdot** 1741 Venus Avenue, reported he had not considered a porch because this would block a great deal of light coming into the house. He reported he got into this situation because the landscape architect had not taken into consideration the front yard setback. He noted the deck was currently 28 feet from the property line. He indicated he had not considered a covered porch, but he would be willing to consider this.

**Mr. Tourdot** requested the Council table action on this item to allow him time to reconsider the plans.

**Councilmember Holden** requested comment from the City Attorney on how to proceed.

**City Attorney Jamnik** stated the variance request was a Council decision. He advised the Council could table action, but this would require a 60 day extension to the Planning Case. He reported the City was well within this window, so the City did not require the applicant's permission to extend for 60 days.

**Councilmember Holden** withdrew her motion to deny the variance request.

**Councilmember Holmes** stated she withdrew her second to the motion.

**MOTION:** **Councilmember Holden moved and Mayor Grant seconded a motion to table action on Planning Case 20-004 for a variance at 1741 Venus Avenue to allow the applicant time to revise the plans to include existing City Ordinance front porch standards. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (5-0).**

**C. Resolution 2020-024 – Allowing Flexibility for Local Businesses During Local Emergency for CODIV-19**

**City Administrator Perrault** stated by the Governor's Executive Order, bars, restaurants, and other places of public accommodation were ordered closed on March 17, 2020. Since the Governor's order in March, a gradual loosening of the restrictions have taken place. During his May 20, 2020 press conference, Governor Walz did encourage cities to work with their local

businesses on how they can assist in re-opening while complying with his directives. The question most frequently brought up is how this will impact restaurants and bars. As of June 1st, restaurants and bars are allowed to offer outdoor dining under certain conditions, to include but not limited to, (a) no more than four persons, or six if a family unit, at a table, (b) reservations are required, (c) masks or shields must be worn by staff, (d) and no more than fifty persons. The City Council may want to temporarily give staff the discretion to administratively review business requests to utilize additional space outside of their building that they would not normally be allowed to use without a variance or otherwise prohibited by City Code. Upon initial review of City Code, flexibility would be needed under section 1325 Subd. 6 J regarding Site Furnishing and Seating Areas; also, flexibility may be needed if businesses will fall below their parking requirements outlined by applicable uses and/or development agreements. Additional uses requested by businesses could include outdoor seating, pick up or drive up service, or other customer service areas. Should the City Council decide to move this forward there were several matters for the Council to consider. Staff commented further on these items and requested direction on how to proceed.

**Mayor Grant** commented the City would not know how long this flexibility would last. He reported some restaurants in Arden Hills have outdoor seating and some do not. He anticipated the flexibility would last until it got cold this fall.

**Councilmember Holmes** suggested the City pass the Resolution this evening in an effort to assist local businesses by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Councilmember Holden** stated she would like to see businesses gaining written consent from property owners in order to have outdoor seating. She commented she did have concerns about electrical wires being placed outdoors to accommodate outdoor seating and feared this may be a hazard.

**Mayor Grant** asked if the City Attorney had a chance to review this Resolution.

**City Attorney Jannik** reported he had reviewed the Resolution and noted it was consistent with Resolutions being approved by other municipalities in the State of Minnesota.

**Mayor Grant** believed the City Council needed to support its local businesses. He appreciated the efforts of staff on this Resolution. He supported the Council taking action on this item tonight in order to support the City's small businesses.

**Councilmember Scott** asked if this Resolution fall in line with the governors executive orders in relation to churches.

**City Administrator Perrault** stated he would have to investigate this further and could report back to the Council at the May 28<sup>th</sup> Special City Council meeting regarding this matter.

**Councilmember Holmes** reported the May 20, 2020 press conference did not address places of worship. She noted this was done in another press conference.

**Mayor Grant** agreed this was the case and noted a separate executive order was signed by the governor for places of worship. He reported the proposed Resolution would reflect the businesses that were addressed within the May 20, 2020 executive order signed by the governor.

**Councilmember Scott** requested the Council consider adopting another Resolution that would address faith based organizations.

**Councilmember Holmes** reported the governor passed an executive order for religious organizations and the City needed to take no further action regarding this order.

**Councilmember Holden** agreed.

**Mayor Grant** stated the rules regarding faith based gatherings were rather specific from the governor and these rules did not require local government approval.

Further discussion ensued regarding the businesses that were and were not included within the May 20<sup>th</sup> executive order from the governor.

**Councilmember Holden** asked if the Council could support passing the Resolution allowing for additional flexibility this evening.

**Councilmember McClung** supported the Resolution having more clear language regarding when the outdoor seating would have to cease or be suspended.

**City Attorney Jamnik** reported the intent would be that what the Council grants temporarily, the Council could take away as a temporary measure. He commented in his view the Council was able to change its mind or void the Resolution in the future.

**Mayor Grant** stated this would mean the City would retain control over the situation.

**City Attorney Jamnik** reported this was the case.

**Councilmember Scott** questioned if City fees would be passed along to the local businesses.

**Mayor Grant** commented the intent would be to not charge these businesses additional fees from the City. He stated if the Council was in general agreement it would be wise to approve the Resolution, with one change noting fees incurred by the City would be passed along to the business or property owner.

**Councilmember Holden** recommended the Resolution also include language that the City must receive written consent from property owners for bar/restaurants tenants.

**MOTION:** **Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. #2020-024 – Allowing Additional Flexibility for Local Businesses During the Local Emergency for COVID-19 as discussed.**

**Councilmember Holden** asked if this Resolution would be mailed out to local businesses.

**Mayor Grant** suggested this be further discussed under Council Comments and that staff be directed to contact bars/restaurants and those businesses with a liquor license.

**Councilmember Holden** recommended staff speak with John Connelly in order to have him make local businesses aware of the Resolution.

**Mayor Grant** supported this recommendation.

**City Administrator Perrault** commented staff would contact all businesses with a liquor license to make them aware of the Resolution and noted he would speak with Mr. Connelly to see who he is speaking with in the community.

**Mayor Grant** reported the Council would be meeting again on Thursday, May 28<sup>th</sup> and further staff direction could be provided at that meeting.

**Councilmember McClung** stated once this is approved the information should be posted on social media and the City's website.

**A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (5-0).**

**11. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

**12. COUNCIL COMMENTS**

**Councilmember McClung** provided the Council with an update from the Fire Board of Directors. He explained this group met and discussed at length the potential for a future fire station on Bethel property. He reported the Chief was authorized to continue due diligence for the purchase process. He indicated the purchase would be considered by each of the three cities in June. He commented the majority of the board was in support of moving forward with the purchase agreement.

**Councilmember McClung** discussed the automatic aid agreement that was in place for the Lake Johanna Fire Department. He stated as of June 1<sup>st</sup> New Brighton would be added to the mutual aid agreement.

**Councilmember Holmes** explained with all of the activity with the fire station it would be important for the City Council to receive updates from the Fire Board meetings.

**Councilmember Holden** agreed this would be valuable information for the City Council to have. She stated the proposed location for the fire station would benefit Arden Hills. She indicated her only concern was with how COVID-19 would impact the construction of this station.

**Councilmember McClung** reported this station was more of a long term solution and more discussion would be held as the purchase of this property moves forward. He also stated that the fire board had not met since January, so there would not have been other fire board updates.

**Councilmember Holden** asked if the tennis courts have been crack sealed.

**Public Works Director/City Engineer Blomstrom** explained the City has all of the materials and the work would be completed next week, weather pending.

**Councilmember Holden** suggested CTV be utilized to put together an informational video regarding the fire station.

**Mayor Grant** stated the construction of Valentines Elementary seems to be moving along nicely. He asked staff to investigate a watermain leak to the west of the Valentine Hills Elementary School. He explained he was out walking and a slow leak was evident.

**Mayor Grant** reported he has been told by employees at Braussen that construction would begin as early as June 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Community Development Manager/City Planner Mroska** stated he would reach out to Braussen to let them know they would be required to have a demolition permit.

**Mayor Grant** thanked staff for working diligently on behalf of the community through the COVID-19 pandemic. He noted staff was working on the State of the City address and would have a draft for the Council to review in a week or two.

**City Administrator Perrault** asked if staff should contact CTV regarding an information video regarding the fire station.

**Councilmember Holden** and **Mayor Grant** supported this action.

Discussion ensued regarding the information videos that had already been completed by CTV.

**Mayor Grant** requested staff report back to the Council in the Admin Update how many more informational videos the City could complete with CTV, and they would decide on a future date if staff should pursue an informational video.

### ADJOURN

**MOTION:** Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holden seconded a motion to adjourn. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

**Mayor Grant** adjourned the Regular City Council Meeting at 9:28 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Julie Hanson  
City Clerk

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Grant  
Mayor