

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF WASHINGTON, FRANKLIN COUNTY, MISSOURI
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2023**

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS:

The Regular Meeting of the City of Washington, Missouri, City Council was held on Tuesday, February 21, 2023, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber. Mayor Doug Hagedorn opened the meeting with roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor:	Doug Hagedorn	Present
Council Members: Ward I	Al Behr	Present
	Duane Reed	Present
Ward II	Mark Hidritch	Present
	Mark Wessels	Present
Ward III	Chad Briggs	Present
	Jeff Patke	Present
Ward IV	Mike Coulter	Present
	Joe Holtmeier	Present
Also Present:	City Attorney	Mark Piontek
	City Administrator	Darren Lamb
	City Clerk	Sherri Klekamp
	Police Chief	Jim Armstrong
	Fire Chief	Tim Frankenberg
	Emergency Management Director	Mark Skornia
	Economic Development Director	Sal Maniaci
	Public Works Director	John Nilges

Originals and/or copies of agenda items of the meeting, including recorded votes are available on record in the office of the City Clerk. Each ordinance is read a minimum of twice by title, unless otherwise noted.

Approval of Minutes:

* Approval of the Minutes from the February 6, 2023, Council Meeting

A motion to accept the minutes as presented made by Councilmember Holtmeier, seconded by Councilmember Hidritch, passed without dissent.

* Approval and Adjustment of Agenda

A motion to accept and approve the agenda accordingly made by Councilmember Wessels, seconded by Councilmember Hidritch, passed without dissent.

(Remaining of page intentionally left blank)

PRIORITY ITEMS:

Mayor's Presentations, Appointments & Re-Appointments:

*** Proclamation – Recognizing Lieutenant Joe Bolte**

Recognizing

Lieutenant Joe Bolte

First WFD Firefighter boxer at Guns 'N Hoses

Whereas, Joe Bolte joined the Washington Volunteer Fire Department on February 27, 2019, is a Member of Section 1 at Fire Department Headquarters, and became Second Lieutenant for Section 1 on August 25, 2021; and

Whereas, each year, first responders from the St. Louis area compete in the Guns 'N Hoses Charity Boxing and MMA Tournament all to raise money for BackStoppers. This dedicated group trains and works diligently to prepare for the now St. Louis infamous Wednesday before Thanksgiving tradition, under strict supervision for the safety of the participants. Since 1987, there have been approximately 700 bouts and 1,400 first responders compete in the event to help raise money for the families of St. Louis area first responders killed in the line of duty; and

Whereas, Lieutenant Joe Bolte competed in the Guns 'N Hoses event on November 23, 2022, as the first Firefighter to represent the Washington Volunteer Fire Department; and

Whereas, Lieutenant Job Bolte traded jabs and uppercuts with Kirkwood Police Officer David Muehl for three one-minute rounds of boxing and won his fight by judges' decision.

Now Therefore, I James D. Hagedorn, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Mayor of the City of Washington, and on behalf of the entire City Council hereby extend Lieutenant Joe Bolte our congratulations and extend this token of affection and admiration with which you are regarded in this City.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Seal of the City of Washington, Missouri this 21st day of February 2023.

James D. Hagedorn

Mayor

PUBLIC HEARINGS

*** Short-Term Lodging Moratorium**

February 21, 2023

Mayor & City Council

City of Washington

Washington, MO 63090

Re: Short Term Lodging Moratorium

Mayor & City Council,

At their February 13th meeting the Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to recommend a 6-month moratorium on all new Short Term Lodging Establishments in residential districts. They will review revised codes at their next two meetings and have agreed to send new recommendations to Council by May 2023. The moratorium on your agenda tonight would give Council an additional 3 months to finalize new laws by August 2023.

Short Term lodging establishments can still be approved by City Staff in C-2 and C-3 zoning districts during this period.

Feel free to reach out with any questions.

Sincerely,

Sal Maniaci

Community and Economic Development Director

Hagedorn: Folks, before we start, I'd like to ask everyone who does speak about anything in the public hearing section to please state your name and speak into the microphone and your address. And I'd also like to add state your point passionately, but respectfully, please. Thank you. Sal, take it away.

Maniaci: All right, thank you. So, I'm going to give a quick presentation just on what led up to the proposal of the moratorium, some quick facts of our existing situation and then what P and Z voted to do last week. I'm not going to make any recommendations on changes to the code. That's obviously what we're creating the moratorium for so that the staff can go back to P and Z and have some changes to the code.

So just an overview. Here are a list are a map, a kind of a heat map of dots of all of our existing short-term lodging establishments. We have 35 that are active. We have approved over 40. But that doesn't mean, you know, someone can get one approved and then after a year decide I want to switch it to long-term lodging and so it becomes inactive.

But you can see here they are congregated around the downtown area, but that does not disclude some areas. Keep in mind, hotels are considered short-term lodging. So that's why you see a dot over the Best Western over the Super 8. But you can see there are some outliers here for some short-term lodging that are outside of the downtown district but wanted to show that for where they congregate naturally or for applications over time.

And then you can see here, I zoomed in a little bit how that overlays with our zoning map. The light blue is our C-3 Downtown District. The dark blues are C-2 Overlay, which is kind of our 5th Street corridor in the downtown district. And then you can see there's a majority of that do kind of go right outside of that district and then some of the ones you see here are actually in commercial districts. They are permitted in commercial. It obviously doesn't show the ones outside that are in R-1A, but in the most popular area, you can kind of see where the most popular zoning is for them.

So just some existing conditions on short-term lodging. So, per the last census, we have 6,048 residential units in the City limits, and that's based on the 2020 Census, and according to that census, we are 72% owner occupied, which is actually just other standards. That's pretty good number. You know, you want to try and keep you want to have rental options with try and keep a high percentage of owner occupied. And so, we've been able to maintain that over a long period of time. And then per that percentage, that means you can assume we have 1,693 rental units in the City limits and of that 35 currently are active short-term lodging establishments. So, it is a pretty small percentage currently of our rental units that are active short-term lodging. And that 35 again is based on the most recent quarter where we had a bed tax remittance come in.

So, I want to mention that because we understand that there are most certainly and until we really find a way to get them working on a contract with this Granicus company, there are most certainly some property owners are some short-term lodging establishments that are operating

illegally in the City limits. As you remember, about four months ago we entered into a contract with this Granicus company. They are short-term lodging monitoring software firm that basically identifies anyone who is advertising a short-term lodging across eight plus different websites and determines cross-reference it with our data and determines if they are one. Certified it with a special use permit, with a business license and then third, and most importantly, if they're paying the bed tax.

The goal of that originally was just to level the playing field. First and foremost, even if you're downtown and it's legal, but you're not paying the bed tax, it's not fair to your neighbor across the street who's running a B&B and is doing it legally. And they thought we had possibly upwards of 17 that were operating throughout a given year that we're not paying the bed tax. Now, that seems like a high number given we only have 35. The reason it possibly could be up towards a 17 because of fair week, one person decides to turn their house on Airbnb for that one week but not do it the rest of the year that's still technically triggers that and they should be following the rules just like anyone else, even if you're doing it for one week or weekend. And so, we are still waiting on that. There's a lot of software that has to there's a lot of information they have to go through to get that.

Emily Underdown our Tourism Director and I have been working with Granicus. We have sent them the properties we believe to be exempt, meaning they have already gone through it legally or they are a hotel or, you know, an existing operation. And so, by our March 5, 14 P and Z Meeting, we fully intend to have the list from them of all of our active and the ones that they are thinking are either legal or illegal.

We knew when we signed that contract with them, they told us by Q2 of 2023, that's when everybody they thought would be able to come online. So that would be in March. So, I just want to point that out. It's not the worst timing for this. We don't want to have a moratorium go too long because the whole point of finding these ones that have been operating illegally is to get them into compliance. If there is one that's been operating illegally for two years and the neighbors have never known, and we try to get them into conformance, but there's a long moratorium or they can no longer do it, I could see a concern. It's like they've never raised any concerns with the neighbors. No one's even knew it was here. But now you're telling me I can't do it. I want to do it legally. So, I think this is good timing. I don't want the moratorium to go on too long, but this could be good timing. In the meantime, to find more information next month, the next two months at P and Z that we can see from an out from a third party what our actual short-term lodging economy looks like.

Some concerns that have come up most recently. You know, we've got we've over the past five years or so have these become more popular heard some concerns from neighbors every once in a while. But obviously that's increasingly become more of an issue with these requests that we've been hearing from the people we notice, is really something that I think we can in the future regulate is going to be the distance from one another. If there's a reason they should be so far apart, there's obviously an affordable home inventory. You know, I think that is a concern that is feasible or relevant that, you know, we are trying to encourage young professionals, first time homebuyers, to start and build their careers in Washington, you know, start their families here. But we hear all the time anecdotally that there is not a housing stock, that people can't find affordable homes and then we see it actually on paper, when you see properties go for sale and

not so much in the past few months, but some of them going 30, 40 over asking price, you know, before they really even hit the market.

Distance from downtown is something we're going to look at just if it needs to be. Is there a reason why it should or shouldn't be on the south side of 100 where it's really not feasible for someone to walk downtown and then traditional neighborhood versus historic neighborhood. That can be subjective, but we do have historic districts. And so that is a point that gets brought up often that this isn't considered part of downtown or a historic neighborhood or it is a historic long-term residential neighborhood. Maybe there's reason not to put it there. And then lastly, the current criteria for short-term lodging is really able to be met essentially in every case. And that was kind of a sticking point that I made at P and Z last month, is that currently we have these ten criteria for special use permits, whether it's a special use permit for a car lot or a special use permit for short-term lodging, there are ten criteria that any of those applications have to meet. And right now, from City staff or my point of view is that it's difficult to see how any of those applications could not meet those ten criteria.

And so what we would rather see is City staff is to be able to make a more informed recommendation on if something is appropriate for an area based on a more non subjective or objective code that we could actually say no according to what we saw over the last few months, now the code says this is inappropriate on this lot because of this reason and I can make a recommendation before hearing from the neighborhood. You know, we don't talk to the neighbors before we write a staff report. We do it strictly based on the existing conditions, proposed conditions and how the code is written.

So last week, P and Z voted unanimously to recommend a six month moratorium. This does a couple of things that it's on your agenda tonight. It allows recommendations from it actually requires recommendations from P and Z to be sent to Council within three months. So that means they have, at a minimum, their next two meetings to have public hearings where they can get input from the public, input from staff, input from one another and draft up City codes. I think two months is more than enough. They can hear public input and then give staff direction and then the next meeting we can bring back a draft and they can again tweak it. But even within that three months, that gives them room to have a special meeting if they need to tweak it a third time before being sent to Council. And then public hearings to review proposals again will be held in March or April. That gives you all the ability to either adopt new codes come May and end the moratorium, or wait until the six months is up and adopt codes then. But I think it gives us a lot of wiggle room to really it gives us a lot of time to sit down and really figure out what needs to be done.

One thing I do want to point out is this moratorium is only for special use permits for short-term lodging in residential areas. So currently, if someone buys a property in the C-3 Downtown District and they want to turn it into an Airbnb, short-term lodging, they can still do so under this moratorium. It's only if you are in a residentially zoned district that requires a special use permit.

So, I just wanted to clear up any confusion there. So, with that being said, I think staff and P and Z recommend approval of the moratorium tonight. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Hagedorn: Questions? No? Thank you, Sal. Folks, I'm going to open it up to public comments. Before we do, we're here to address the moratorium tonight. Not any specific Airbnb or VRBO. Okay? Okay. Would anyone like to talk about the moratorium?

Mike McFatrach: My name is Mike McFatrach. I live at 1514 first Parkway here in Washington, Missouri. I would like to speak in favor of the moratorium. I believe a moratorium would be beneficial in allowing as Mr. Maniaci is indicated, an assessment of the situation with regard to whether there is a concentration to address the potential for concentration of Airbnb's or, excuse me, short-term rentals in the neighborhood, as well as to get an existing understanding of the existing inventory so that it can be assessed whether we indeed are at a tipping point with regard to over permitting of any of these accommodations.

I think the Economic Policy Institute, which is a research policy organization that focuses on economics, has indicated that short-term rentals, their costs outweigh their benefits. I think we've already spoken to the issue with regarding regarding housing inventory and the impact on property values. Yes, they do increase value, but that can be a false flag with regard to the actual value of the property.

I think it's also been indicated that in terms of making tourist trips to a specific location, the addition of more short-term rentals does not necessarily increase the opportunity for tourism. In fact, in a survey done there's only two to four percent of those people surveyed by the Economic Policy Institute indicated that they would that a short-term rental and the availability, influences their decision to visit an area.

I think that the other aspect with regard to short-term rentals is a tax as a shift in tax payments from reliable sources like hotels and motels to unreliable sources such as these STR's.

You know, it was mentioned that the current ten point elements of the ordinance, it's pretty cut and dried and it has and it has been presented before Council that the opportunity to deny a permit with regard to those ten points really is limited. But I believe that if you look at the preamble to those ten points as well as point one, they are open for interpretation with regard to quality of the neighborhood and neighborhood welfare. In other words, how neighbors perceive their neighborhood, how neighbors perceive the area in which they live, and their perception of their safety and welfare, although qualitative is can impact and should impact a decision because that's why you're here to make that decision.

So, I'm you know, again, I think the moratorium would allow us the opportunity to assess the situation. I'm not opposed to short-term rentals. I think it's a great opportunity for Washington, but I do think it needs there is a we are at a point where an assessment must should be made so that a better understanding of what the ordinance can and cannot do, particularly with regard to concentration of these rentals as well as the overall number. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you, Mike. Anyone else? All right, Bonnie.

Bonnie Martin: Hi, I'm Bonnie Martin. I live at #4 Riverview Court. And I just want to add to what Mike McFatrach just said about the preamble to the existing ordinance and the general welfare for the residents.

The number one item in the existing ordinance. It says the compatibility of the proposal in the terms of both use and appearance with the surrounding neighborhood. So there is something in the existing ordinance because it says of both use and appearance. So, while it is subjective that language right there indicates that the surrounding neighbors neighborhood in what we have today should be considered. But I also am in favor of a moratorium so we could enact some better rules, some more concrete rules about where these things should be about in what distance

from one another, so we can make sure that there are homes available to people who want to live here.

All of the things that Mike said, all of the things that Mr. Maniaci said. So, I just want to go on record and say I'm in favor of a moratorium and that we should not ignore the first rule in that list of ten things. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you.

Greg Curran: My name is Greg Curran, and I live at 2 Riverview Court. And I think another factor that might would be helpful as far as clearing the clearing the whole thing, is there's a big difference between an owner-occupied short-term rental and a non owner unoccupied short-term rental. And I think that's gotten at the heart of some of what are some of our personal issues have been. I think maybe a little clarification on those on that point would be a little helpful too, in the coming moratorium.

Hagedorn: Okay. Thanks, Greg. Anyone else?

Tyann Marcink: Tyann Marcink 680 Scenic View Drive, Union, so I'm just outside Washington. Owner/Operator of Missouri House Vacation Rentals Property Management Company. We manage two properties here in town or three properties actually and others in the area as well. So earlier today I emailed you all a few court cases stating residential versus commercial activity. I know that's one of the things that people debate to is short-term rental lodging, residential or commercial activity. And so that list of court cases does set a precedence in Missouri as well as other states that it is residential activity.

There's nothing magic that happens between night 29 and night 30. There's also many folks, many comments. I know there's lots of feelings. And we also have the responsibility to look at the data as well. And Mr. Maniaci put a lot of data up there on the board about the town, and it very much follows the county data that I had sent to you last week as well.

Long term rentals taking up over 20% of housing. One interesting fact on the data I had sent you was that the vacant housing was eight percent in the county. And when you also look at that, a lot of the short-term rentals here in the City of Washington were not affordable housing. They were vacant homes or historical homes that took a lot of money to bring up to the point where they could be lived in, whether it's a couple of nights or a couple of years. So thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you, Tyann.

Tyann Marcink: Yep.

Hagedorn: Anyone else?

Delisa Curran: Delisa Curran 2 Riverview Court. Hadn't planned to speak, but I had a question about the these are the short-term rentals are, I would argue not residents. They are customers. Does it make want a resident to sleep in a place that's just it's just not the same thing. Vacant housing eight percent, I'd like to know what the price range is on those houses because I know people looking for houses in the 100 to 200,000 price range can't find one. The upper scale because I have looked frequently myself. There are houses that sit vacant because they're not affordable for most people. So, to spend a lot of money to update an Airbnb is great and I understand the investment. But anyway, I just would like to consider that as well.

Hagedorn: Thank you. Anyone else? Council, anything?

Matt Hammond: I'll say something.

Hagedorn: Go ahead.

Matt Hammond: Just something to consider.

Hagedorn: *Inaudible*

Klekamp: *Inaudible*

Matt Hammond: My name is Matt Hammond, I live at 680 Scenic View Drive in Union, Missouri. And one thing to consider is these short-term rentals actually do provide lodging that's unique and not like the same things like hotels and motels. Some people want that family experience like they're at home, but in a neighborhood with people that they feel safe around and they can enjoy things like family dinners and game night with their kids, especially if they're, you know, people that are also related to others in the area, like, you know, people's aunts and uncles, grandfathers, sisters, brothers that visit the area.

They need a place to stay, and it might be easier, and probably even there's also health benefits to it because they're not involved with some of the germs that pass between people at larger facilities. But they had that quiet, safe space where they can enjoy and build bonds.

And the other thing is that short-term rentals also provide, you know, employment for a lot of the people in the area and people that earn a living like myself.

And despite what the previous lady just said, there is no difference between what those people do in those houses on three nights versus three years. So, I have to emphasize that. But thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you. If that's it, let's move on. Go ahead, Sherri.

With no further discussion, a motion to accept this item into the minutes made by Councilmember Behr, seconded by Councilmember Patke, passed without dissent.

Bill No. 23-12744, Ordinance No. 23-13709, an ordinance enacting a Moratorium on development and issuance of Special Use Permits for Short-Term Rentals.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Patke.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-aye, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

* Special Use Permit – RV Park – 1399 West Main Street

February 13, 2023

Honorable Mayor & City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, MO 63090

RE: File No. 23-0202-1399 W. Main Street-Special Use Permit-RV Park

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

At the regular meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission, held on Monday, February 13, 2023, the Commission reviewed and recommends approval of the above mentioned Special Use Permit.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Holdmeier

Chairman

Planning & Zoning Commission

Maniaci: All right. Before I begin, I do want to point out we'll have to make an amendment to the ordinance. If approved, the address, 1399 West Main is in the wrong location. That's what we had on our county records but in reality, we have fixed it. It's between the 1500 and 1600 hundred block. So going forward, this lot will be 1550 West Main Street. So, I just wanted to clarify that.

All right. So, before you tonight is a request for a special use permit for an RV park. This is actually a use that we added to our code back in 2019, I believe, was not specified before. And when we amended the code at that time, we added it as a special use permit in every zoning district just because it is such a unique use that it's going to have to be looked at on a case by case no matter where it's at. And I think this is a pretty good indication of why it's that we don't have very many agricultural zone properties. And so, the fact that it just didn't go an AG or industrial we'll have to look at it on a case-by-case basis.

But this property is located on the corner of Westlink and West Main, you can see here, and it's currently an undeveloped piece of property. The main portion of it is actually open field, but it does have some vegetation. It has access to the creek here on the west side and it is also buffered on the east side by our Miller Post Nature Reserve. Actually, our hiking trail has an access point to West Main Street and there was a 30-foot piece of property that separates the properties to the east and the subject property, which you'll see on the site plan they are proposing to utilize as well.

You can see here, as for the proposed zoning, it is zoned agricultural. It is actually this property was subdivided off whenever the Miller Post property was donated to the City for a nature reserve. They broke this off for this exact reason, I guess for the potential for additional development, possibly for industrial development, given its junction to Westlink Drive and the industrial zoning.

So, you can see here to the north, there is industrial zoning northwest and then, you know, as you get to the south, this is AG still, which is our nature reserve which is deed restricted to not be developed and will remain so. And then to the east you can see there is R-1A Single-Family Residential on Carmel Lane.

These gold here still it's single-family attached that those three could be built as duplexes if proposed. But that's the only reason you see that difference in zoning there.

As for the site plan, you can see here they have 35. I'm sorry, 38 units here with a one way in are these are full access points on Westlink and West Main, but you can see here it narrows down to 20 feet here as it wraps around. This did get brought to our site plan to review with our fire department present. And they did review and approve this plan given that there is no parking on this section of this. And I'll show you in a second that the turn radius's are met by our fire truck, that this meets the fire code as well.

You can see they do have some parking stalls here for that. They have the bathhouse, dog park and then there's a shed maintenance shed here, as well.

As the typical lot layout, you can see here, this is the typical lot of each one of the pads. They have the access point for the RV, a concrete pad or hard surface pad. I believe they're planning concrete, but they have the ability to concrete or pavement as long as it meets the specs. We just require it be hard surface and not gravel. And then they also have a parking area here for two cars and then some recreational area here and a firepit on each pad.

This is there's a lot going on in here. This slide here, it does show the proposed topo for the grading plan. You can see they do plan to utilize the area that is current cleared as much as possible. And so, you can see where it gets a little bit dense with those lines. That's the proposed grading to get this area as flat as possible for that. They're obviously still will be a little slope but you can see the grading here and here specifically is what's proposed.

And then here is the utility plan, which we require to be reviewed at site plan as well with water and sewer present. Given that each pad is proposed to have connections for water, sewer and electricity, you can see they have two access points with existing lines on West Main as well as Westlink Drive. These will essentially serve as private sewer laterals. So just like when we have a line come off of the house and connect to a house, that's their responsibility. This will not be a public water sewer line. It's just an internal lateral that runs through the length of the property. And there's no there was no concern that it couldn't be handled with the existing water and sewer there. Those are pretty large sized pipes given that runs to our industrial park.

Here is one of the turning radius plans that they propose, as well as fire hydrant map to show that they have adequate fire access. That was one thing that got brought up at site plan and at P and Z, but you could see here, this one here they have a fire truck. This is actually, BFA did this with them and used the AutoCAD of the Washington Fire Truck to show that it actually does, our current truck that we have does meet these ready turning radii and then these red boxes here are possible locations for a dumpster. That was not shown on here, but they just wanted to we asked them at P and Z last week to show that they'd be able to place that and still meet the fire lane, which they can clearly do here in either location. That doesn't necessarily mean they're going to opposed to, but they just were demonstrating that when they get to the point, they'll have adequate space for a dumpster outside of the fire lane.

And then this is just a second turning radii that we got this week as well that shows that the full access on West Main is also available through here.

They submitted some structure examples that was asked what type of building material they'd be using. We don't have architectural guidelines, but in a special use permit you can require them to submit examples or actually get as specific as you want. They explained verbally at the meeting what they were, what they were proposing and then submitted this after P & Z.

So, you can see here what two different types for a maintenance shed and a bathhouse shower. You can see here, you know, block with the metal roof and then same here, metal siding with some block foundation.

So, one thing I want to bring up and we've been talking about this a lot lately, is when you get to a special use permit, there's obviously these ten factors of consideration that have to be met and so staff reviewed the application and there's a lot going on the slide here but I was trying to fit all ten, so staff reviews the applications and reviewing meeting these needs, these factors of consideration.

So, the first one, obviously the compatibility of the proposal in terms of both use and appearance with the surrounding neighborhood. So obviously like I showed here, you have to go back to the area, and we switch in a lot here, but you have a variety of uses in this area. This is obviously Westlink Drive. It's one of our major truck routes that goes in and out of our industrial park. It connects to Bluff Road, Vossbrink all the way to the highway. And so, this is a major trucking route. We actually have in our in our City code designated industrial truck routes and

Westlink and West Main are one of them. And so you can see you have heavy industrial here in this area and then you have existing...did my thing die? I think it might have. We have existing agricultural or recreational to the south that is deed restricted, that will remain that way. And you do have residential to the east. But I think you can show that there is an adequate buffer in between there. And when you talk about compatibility of use, when you're talking about compatible with the industrial or the residential, you're going to have to pick one and I think this actually ends up being a pretty decent transition use, kind of being a lodging type, but does have access in and closer to the industrial uses via access. And then on the residential to the east, you do have a nice buffer of landscaping and everything in between.

All right, I won't do this every time I swear. So, the comparative size floor area and mass of the proposed structure in relationship to the adjacent structures and buildings and the surrounding properties, the neighborhood. So, what they're proposing with the floor and massive infrastructure is actually quite small. Most of it is asphalt or concrete space. And when you look at the proposed structure, or the structures in the area with them being heavy industrial that are most visible, we think that this meets that that condition.

The frequency and duration of various indoor and outdoor activities and special events and the impact of these activities in the surrounding area. They have not proposed any special events specific to this. The use itself is, I guess, a special use, but there's not any different activities or events, again, with the potential of how intensive and industrial use in this area and off Westlink could be, we think this is a compatible and reasonable proposal that's not going to detriment the surrounding properties.

The capacity of adjacent streets to handle the increased traffic. Again, this is a designated industrial truck route. I don't think you can get more compatible with that, you know, with increased traffic, especially when it comes to RVs and something that has large turning radii and pull behinds. That's really best-case scenario without being on the highway is they have access to industrial truck route.

The added noise level creative by activities associated with the proposed use. Again, we have nuisance laws in place to make sure that they meet all noise levels. I don't think that the proposed RV park is going to create any possible increased level significant to the neighborhood that couldn't be done by an industrial use.

The requirements for public services where the demands of the proposed use are in excess to the individual demands of adjacent land use. So this is for police and fire protection. Is this use going to put too much demand on our police and fire? And I think that that's an easy one to meet that again with the access to the industrial park, there's no reason to believe that our police and fire is going to have a stress on demand because of this proposed use.

Whether the general appearance of the neighborhood would be adversely affected by the location of the proposed use on the parcel. Again, they're using much of the open space there. They have shown on the site plan they're trying to keep as much of the existing vegetation as possible and having it be across the street from industrial and then buffered and below significantly by topography it's below the residential. We think it meets that in the appearance as well. Again, I don't if someone was coming to you coming to staff and asking for an industrial rezoning, I think that would be a feasible rezoning given the surrounding property. And so again, this is less intrusive than industrial.

The impact of night lighting in terms of intensity and duration and frequency of use, they have not proposed any lighting on their plan at all. We only require parking a lighting a parking lot after you'll have 30 spaces. They don't have that. And so, if they do decide afterwards they want some additional lighting, we have current places in our code, sections in our code that allows us to make sure it is not a detriment to surrounding properties. There's so many foot candles and lumens that it cannot be, and it can't be directed towards the surrounding property. So, we have a way to protect the integrity of a neighborhood already without that. So, I think we work good there.

The impact of landscaping of the proposed use, again, they're trying to utilize the existing landscaping as possible and not proposing any additional landscaping that I think will have an adverse reaction to the neighborhood. And then versus the buffers and screens, we understand that they are requesting to basically use our trail access as a buffer, but we think that's an okay request given that it is deed restricted and that's how it's going to be in perpetuity. I think it's an okay request to say you have a 30-foot buffer already in place, and that's part of this case-by-case with a special use permit.

And then lastly, the impact of significant amount of hard surface areas for buildings, sidewalks, drives, parking areas, and service areas. Again, this is for mostly water, but noise transfer and all that with hard surface and heat generation. So, with noise transfer and heat generation, there's not nearly enough hard surface proposed to have an issue there that's for much larger, maybe massive parking lots retail uses. But for water runoff, obviously there is going to be an increase in water runoff. We don't allow per code to have any detriment on the surrounding properties. They have to submit some type of plan to our engineering department to verify there won't be an increase in runoff on to neighboring properties. Luckily, they're in a pretty easy position to do that with the having access to the creek and the creek being so close to the river, they do have they will have to retain some to make sure that, you know, it's done appropriately. But I think our adjoining departments are to reviewed part of it and it seems like it'll be an easy site for them to retain.

So with all that being said at P and Z with staff's recommendation, well, I guess before I get to that, I just think what part of our recommendation with this was looking at these ten categories. Yes, we think it doesn't have, there's no proof or evidence that it's going to have a negative detriment on surrounding properties that can't be conditioned above and beyond to protect the neighbors in that case. So, staff recommends and agrees to that point.

Also look at more of a 30,000-foot level. You know, there's been discussions on where to put an RV park and talk about the significant need for an RV park in the City limits for quite some time with the Chamber and the City, as you are all aware, the Chamber and the City at one point actually had discussions about doing it themselves, having it be a City operated use. And it was difficult for us to find a use that was appropriate for it, that was City owned or that was available for purchase, and that wouldn't have a detriment to the neighborhood. And when the applicant came to the City and the Chamber, I just want to throw it out there. You know, from our point of view, I think it would be hard to find another property in town that wouldn't be better suited for this proposed use given it does have walkability to downtown it is quite a walk, but it does have it. It has access to hiking trails as recreational access to the creek and through that hiking trails, access to our fairgrounds, our largest event space. And it is on an area that has

industrial truck traffic for these larger vehicles. And so I think from that point of view, I think there's a pretty good case made for why this is a good location for this use, especially when looking at comparable available properties in the City limits.

And then so last week at Planning and Zoning, there was a unanimous vote of approval to recommend the issuance of the special use permit. They did have the following conditions to be added. They requested no more than 30 days per stay, that quiet hours were from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. Sunday through Monday, so seven days a week, and then that pavement thickness, stormwater and lighting standards must all meet City code and pass by the Building Department. I will say that one is a little redundant. We require every department to do that, every development to do that anyway. But it was brought up. There was questions about the dumpster location. If the pavement thickness was going to meet fire truck standards. We just wanted to add that condition in there so it's made clear that they will have to meet those conditions just like everybody else.

And so I'm happy to answer any questions. The one thing I will add that no more than 30 days that did come up as a discussion, it was asked what when the City and the Chamber were requesting, we're studying to do this as their own development, what the proposal was at that time and it was 15 days.

Lamb: Ten, ten.

Maniaci: Oh, I'm sorry, it was ten days with a certain days in between.

Lamb: I think the idea behind the ten days was that that would cover two weekends. If somebody was here for the fair event that could be here during the parade and all the way through the fair.

Maniaci: The concern is that you don't have it become there's a, I think, a thin line between an RV park and a mobile home park. And so, you have to, you know, once it's over a certain amount of days, at what point are they just paying rent to stay there? And so, and one thing we made clear was that and I know we talked to the applicant about this, it's not it's an RV park, not RV storage. So, it can't be someone who pays you to keep your RV there while they live here in town because they don't have a place to put it. Two different uses in our code, RV park for RV storage.

Hidritch: And if I can add one thing, Sal. There's only other mentioned that was about the amount of trees that we're going to be taking down. And that's when we addressed that situation and said if they wanted to, they could take down every single tree that they want on that lot. There's, you know, they could do whatever if they own it.

Maniaci: And it's AG so it could be logging today without, you know.

Wessels: Sal, did they figure out the other thing they were talking about was a hydrant? Did they figure out a...?

Maniaci: Yes, so we have sent them the hydrant, the engineer, our hydrant spacing requirement, and they have to meet that before they get Building Department.

Holtmeier: Also, Sal, I would like to go by the state parks since they've been in business longer. There's is 15 days...

Maniaci: Yeah, I heard that.

Holtmeier: And, and once you leave it's got to be ten days before you return. So that'll keep people from living there basically and then different things. If we could add that to it that'd be...

Maniaci: Yeah, so the point tonight is obviously to hear from the public or the applicant first and then the public, but then these conditions are what is written currently. Obviously, you can change that on the fly, and we can type that up tomorrow.

Reed: What do they propose on the on the cuts and there fills on the landscaping there? They said they're going to go with retaining walls or big blocks or did they say what they're thinking on the cuts and the fills?

Maniaci: I will have to let the applicant and or their engineer answer that. They are both here tonight.

Holtmeier: And I guess is there somebody going to be on duty all the time or that's a question...*inaudible*

Maniaci: At P and Z, they said that they would have normal office hours or someone on duty Monday through Friday, 8 to 5. And then what they would have is, I guess, how they do it in state parks or other. I can't say state parks, other RV parks where you book online, you get a code to get access if you come in and check in after those times.

Holtmeier: So, then they would police their own self and we won't have our police out there?

Maniaci: Yeah. So, if they if that includes a gate, then they have to have a lock box for our fire code that if the fire and police can get into it if needed.

Holtmeier: Okay.

Maniaci: Knock box, lock box?

Patke: Knock.

Hidritch: Knock, knock box.

Maniaci: Knock box, thank you.

Briggs: So, they're not going to have anybody on site 24 hours?

Maniaci: No. I don't think it when the City and the Chamber were playing it, we were not proposing to have that either 24 hours. It was there's a system that they did their homework on it another RV park that had a code system that you can check into, pay online. Anything else for me? I can turn it over to the applicant.

Hagedorn: Okay. Thanks, Sal. Gregg.

Rick Rohlfing: Good Evening, Mayor. Uh, Gentlemen of the Council. My name's Rick Rohlfing. I'm an engineer with BFA here in town at 103 Elm Street. Gregg and Brittany Gross came by the office a couple three months ago. Asked us to look at this piece of property, see what a layout of an RV park could be. They had some requirements or request of varying size lots, a check in point, a maintenance shop and a bathhouse, other things on the site. So we came up with this plan with a couple back and forths. Mr. and Mrs. Gross are here tonight too if there's any questions for them.

Sal, appreciate your very thorough introduction of this proposed item. A couple of things I do want to mention. Initially, Sal said 35 lots, and then he said there's 38. I believe 35 was correct and we may lose one lot depending on our trash dumpsters for the convenience of where that might be, it might be Lot 31 there in the corner.

A couple other things I wanted to address that were brought up maybe to answer your questions in and or spar other questions and then try to answer those. From our standpoint, the site is ideal. Sal mentioned the the heavy duty roads and the industrial park, the location, the setting, but it also has the infrastructure of water, sanitary, sewer, electric, right at the sites.

There wouldn't be any extensions for it. We do have the walking trail we were asked to tie to it. So, we are tying to it. We accommodate the fire trucks.

With regard to lighting, we have not shown any lighting. Obviously we will propose some lighting once we get further into this design. It won't be intense lighting. Obviously, it's not going to be a commercial parking lot or anything like that, but I'm envisioning some lower level or smaller light poles more for pedestrians. You know, say they're going to go to the bathhouse in the evening or if there's vending machines up there or something like that. So, we will be proposing lighting.

With the location of the lots though, with within the property, I see no way that we're going to even touch the City's foot handle thresholds for property limits or lighting. So we should be well within that. And whenever that is developed, we'll share that with staff, obviously for approval.

There was a question of retaining wall and slopes the grading. Right now, the plan is the way it's been drawn up is we do not have any retaining walls on the site. We do have some 2 to 1 slopes, so we'll have to get some reinforcement in those slopes. They're not uncommon. A 3 to 1 slope is what all the other slopes you see on the site and those are easily mowed and maintained. A 2 to 1 slope would be the slope like behind the maintenance shop. And we're thinking more like a crown vetchra, some kind of a thicker, dense vegetation there that wouldn't be mowed every single week or things like that.

As far as the conditions that were brought up at the P and Z, I believe we are we're comfortable. We're fine with those three conditions of the 30 day, the 10 to 6, and obviously were going to meet your pavement lighting and the other criteria that's required by your codes.

So those were the the few things I wanted to bring up. Answer some of the questions maybe, or if there are any other questions. And again, Gregg and Brittany are here this evening as well.

Holtmeier: Do you see any problem with the traffic at certain times of the factory letting out with coming in and out of the park? Your opinion.

Rick Rohlfig: I don't just because maybe on a fair weekend, Joe, I you know, I can see maybe people trying to get in right at that time. But it's it's not like you're going to have a rush hour into an RV park. You know, I think they're going to come in and go.

Holtmeier: Is there certain check in hours times or check out times?

Rick Rohlfig: I would say during busy, busier times like that, if people are calling ahead. And I think that, you know, you're seeing a heavier time, there would be personnel out there and maybe even you try to stagger them. I'm not sure the operations

Holtmeier: Okay.

Rick Rohlfig: I I'm not okay fluent in operating an RV park. But I would think that if we know that 20 RVs are coming in in a two hour slot, I think that we're going to want personnel out there and I think Gregg and Brittany would see to that to have people try to usher them in in an orderly fashion.

And that is that is one design element with the two access points, we also have the check in, is we do have so that we get the RVs off of the two side streets, Westlink and West Main Street. There is ample space right around the initial entrances where you can pull in, pull over too, to let

other RVs by. That was something we put in so that you're not backing up traffic. If you did have a run of four people at the same time.

Hagedorn: Other questions? Okay, thank you.

Rick Rohlfing: Thank you.

Hagedorn: Okay. Would anyone like to comment on the proposed RV? Please, hi Wally.

Wally Hellebusch: I'm Wally Hellebusch with Hellebusch Tool and Die. I also live in the Fourth Ward very close to this. Not that that has anything to do with it, but I do cross that particular intersection four to six times a day for the last 50 years. And I want to tell you that between 6 and 8:00 in the morning and from four until I mean, from 2:30 to 4 in the afternoon, the place is a zoo. It is a terrible, in fact, that whole intersection should be reconstructed because the 18 wheelers cannot get through there.

Just today, when I went down to pick up payroll, I came up in the back of an 18-wheeler going up the hill on Westlink. Okay, so there was another 18-wheeler from the Joist Company that was trying to make a right hand turn down onto Westlink. So he was waiting. There was two cars waiting on the right hand side going west on Main Street, and they waited for the first tractor trailer in front of me to get out of the way. Okay, the next one could not make the turn. He would have to go into the westbound lane on Main Street and then into the northbound lane of Westlink in order to make that turn. So, I didn't notice at first the the Joist Company truck, so I pulled up in back of the 18-wheeler when he made his turn, I tried to get out of the way and turn to the right. Well, there was two cars parked on Main Street heading west, and the third one came around and passed him and almost had a head on collision with myself. That was just today. I've been through that intersection for 50 years, and I'm telling you, it's a zoo.

My main concern about this is safety. If you've got kids around here, they're going to be in trouble. They get out on that street, the people, when they get off the work, they are not going slow. Also, if they're going to be riding bicycles, they'll probably ride bicycle down on on Westlink Drive because it's nice and flat. Well, that's a 40 mile an hour speed limit plus 18 wheelers. You're looking for trouble, when somebody gets hurt or even worse than the City will have a big problem on their hands.

I just think it's it's a bad place for it. If you want to have an RV park, why don't you go over to the airport? You got plenty of land over there. They can ride the bicycles out on the Katy Trail and the kids can run around and not be on a main highway right in the middle of the other streets of the City.

I know you guys have been trying to put an RV park in this town for years. Nobody wants it. So what do they do, they move it out to the west end of town. I know we're in Ward Four, but does that mean that we're fourth degree personnel that live up there? It's just not the right place, most of all because of safety. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you, Wally. Would anyone else like to comment?

Harvey Mendez: Harvey Mendez 221 Fair Street. So my question is, is the City going to make any revenue money off of this RV park? Like are they going to put a tourism tax on there? Kind of like with the Airbnbs that we do in town already? That's my question. Or are we just going to let people stay there for free, you know and the City is not going to make any money. So, I just, you know, question I want to throw out there. If anybody has a answer for me right now or no?

Lamb: I would I've I've asked Mark this question, if they're subject to the bed tax. He's indicated that he doesn't think so.

Piontek: Not currently.

Lamb: Not currently. However, the question could be is could the City amend the code to allow that tax to be implemented on that, so.

Harvey Mendez: Yes, that's just my question, since we're doing what short-term rentals, you know, I don't know why we can do with the RV park. You know, you know, the City can revenue off of that. You know, again, that's just my concern. You know, are we just going to allow it for free or are we going to take advantage of you know using it as a revenue for the City just like the marijuana tax for trying we're trying to do, you know, in the next month. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thanks, Harvey.

Patke: Well Darren, correct me, they're going to pay property taxes?

Hagedorn: Wait.

Lamb: Oh, yeah. We got property tax that you're going to pay if you improve it. Obviously, that rate's going to go up.

Patke: If it's a gas station, the City doesn't make any money on that either.

Lamb: Well, we do. I mean, we get the taxes, you know, real estate tax...

Patke: Oh, we're going to get tax money.

Lamb: Versus undeveloped property.

Patke: Right.

Lamb: You know that difference.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Lamb: You have a sales tax, but you wouldn't have a sales tax on...

Unknown: Rental.

Lamb: Rental.

Hagedorn: Yes, sir.

Kevin Klein: I'm Kevin Klein. I live at 105 Carmel Lane, so back right up against it. Start off when we bought the property, I knew that was zoned agricultural. I didn't know about the special use permit rate ordinance. So that was part of our decision of buying there.

Other issue, and this was just brought up with the traffic issue driving here tonight. We pulled out of Carmel Lane, turned right on Main Street to come here. I was driving up the hill. Car comes along behind me at least 60 miles an hour, passes me going down Main Street. It was just, it was really a bad situation, let alone all the traffic at the busy times.

Other question concerning it was with the utilities. And this is based on the map that we got, the conceptual plan that we got. It shows utility poles going along the trail into the reserve. And I'm concerned that when you put utility poles in, you've got lines running and you got to cut the trees down in order to do that. The buffer that Sal talks about is that 30 feet, a lot of that is trees on the one side, which is really important for blocking out the future lights, which I'm also concerned about.

My one other concern is each one of those pads has a fire pit on it. So, there's 35 fire pits, 35 fires, wind blowing up, blowing out of the west, normally right over our house. It I like fires, but not that much. I think those are the main things.

The last one was, the concern, and I don't wish any business bad, but if this doesn't work, how does it revert back to agricultural and and make sure that it doesn't turn into a trailer park and not an RV park? If there's an answer to that. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you.

Patke: Sal, could you answer that question?

Maniaci: Yeah, so as far as it reverting back, it's still remains agricultural zoning. It's just a special use is an additional use on top. And so, for some reason that the business goes under, there's still property maintenance codes. It can't become an art, it can't become a trailer park, a mobile home park. That is a different use. They'd have to get a different permit and another public hearing and everything. So, if the RV park goes away, it's still agricultural.

Patke: And where do we see the poles?

Maniaci: I believe they're all underground. I think they can answer that. But yeah, all the utilities are underground, so there won't be any utilities go, this line, it may have been this line shows proposed X says it's not, but there's a trail that connects...

Behr: There you go right there, it says UP which I think is underground power if I'm not mistaken.

Maniaci: Yes.

Kevin Klein: Misinterpret it as a utility pole.

Behr: Understood.

Maniaci: An acronym. So yeah, but yeah, it's all underground, so.

Hagedorn: Other questions for Sal while he's up their you guys? Okay.

Maniaci: All right.

Hagedorn: Thank you. Anyone else? Gregg?

Gregg Gross: How you guys doing? I'm Gregg. Just wanted to see if you guys got any questions for me while we're here.

Wessels: Gregg, if there seems to be some discussion about the number of days. I know you said at P and Z that you were thinking 30 anyway.

Gregg Gross: Yeah.

Wessels: If, if for some reason that that is asked to be lowered, would you have any issues with it going down?

Gregg Gross: Well, I mean, just like everybody else, I mean it's just like if the 30 days is, you know, if people want to come in and spend a little bit more time with somebody and their families or tourism, they want to spend a little bit more time than just two weeks. You know, if, for instance, I mean, I had a weird phone call today. I had a person call me and said I seen you in the paper and it was a lady say, hey, is it can you do 90 days? I go, no way. I go 30 days, is it and she's like, well, I do, she goes I go from hospital to hospital, she goes well mine for her job it's like three months or for 90 days. And I was like, well, we don't do that. It would only be 30 days. And she was just like, I was just seeing. I was like, well, no, it's going to be maxed 30 days.

Holtmeier: Would you have problem with 15, because that's what the state parks do?

Gregg Gross: Well, that's state park. I mean, this is we're not...

Holtmeier: It's not different.

Gregg Gross: I mean.

Holtmeier: There's no difference.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Gregg Gross: I prefer 30 days if I can.

Briggs: So how long does somebody have to leave in order to come back?

Gregg Gross: I'd say at least 48 hours. So, you got to find somewhere for at least two days.

Briggs: So, if somebody is only going to be there from 8 to 5, who's going to take care of the park from 5 till 8 in the morning?

Gregg Gross: Well...

Briggs: What if somebody has a fire and it's out of control who are they going to call?

Gregg Gross: Well, I mean, I still haven't planned that far ahead. We're still in the planning part right now, too. I mean, there's still a few things that I got to still plan myself to do. I mean, I just don't know all the answers at the second.

Briggs: That's my biggest concern.

Gregg Gross: There will be somebody there. I mean, it's I just can't say who it's going to be. And when, you know, right at this moment and far as the fires, I mean, you guys, I mean, this ain't we ain't putting bonfire pits out there. It's going to be probably a little bitty ring enough to throw a couple of logs in. Roast a couple of marshmallows or a hot dog or something like that and ain't like what you know, it ain't going to be some bonfire. I ain't going to allow that. I mean, you know, put in little bitty rings and just enough to, you know, you go to the gas station by little logs and, you know, just stuff like that. It ain't too big and out of control, small.

Hagedorn: No more questions? Thank you, Gregg.

Gregg Gross: Thank you.

Rick Rohlfig: This is Rick again with BFA. Just one one other comment to your to your question on the fires. Each of the lots will have a a water hydrant on them too. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Other comments, yes ma'am.

Nancy Walkenhorst: Nancy Walkenhorst #2 Laura Lane. I wasn't really planning on talking, but I do want to support what Butch had to say because I've lived there for 45 years and it's there, although it's close to downtown, I don't recommend walking downtown or riding bikes downtown on West Main because in the morning, at noon and starting at 3:00, there's lots of traffic, lots and there's no sidewalks. Chad knows that he grew up there.

18 wheelers have big trucks. I mean, it's not really conducive for saying, let's walk downtown. That's really all I want to say.

Hagedorn: Okay, thank you. No one else? Okay.

Patke: Just real quickly, Chief, I guess from here, a few things. I guess maybe we need a little added patrol on West Main and Westlink. I guess you're hearing the same thing.

Armstrong: Sure.

Patke: Regardless of what happens here. If we're having people traveling, as said, 40, 60 miles an hour on Westlink then that needs to be an issue anyway. As far as the trucks coming and going, welcome to the terrible world of being a truck driver because it stinks everywhere you go. You can't turn in Bluff Road or out of, people who want to put roundabouts in to hinder that are enemies every day. But it is an issue, there's no doubt about that. Trucks coming in and out. But I guess even if it doesn't happen, added patrol if we have that many people...

Armstrong: Absolutely.

Patke: Driving fast on Westlink for sure.

Armstrong: I'll get to it.

Patke: Thanks.

Hagedorn: Okay.

Cassie Humpert: My name is Cassie Humpert and I live at 103 Carmel Lane. And I would just like to ask. Where do you live? Would you want this behind your house?

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Cassie Humpert: Would you want it behind your house? That's all I got to say.

Hagedorn: Okay, thank you. Okay, if that's all, I'll accept a motion.

Hidritch: Before we make a motion, Mayor. Now, I sit on P and Z so I voted for this. So, but a resident brought some things forward to me and some questions. And I feel like it's my due diligence to them to to bring it forward. So, I got a few questions. The resident even took some pictures of some local nearby RV parks showing some examples of how they can turn bad and I don't think Gregg, I think Gregg will police it. I know his dad and his family and they're very particular. So, I don't think we'll have this problem. But they wanted me to bring this forward. They had some questions here. Again, the 30 day, we're talking about a 30 day. How do we how do we police this? You know, how do we police the 30 day? How do we how do we know that they're there just 30 days.

Number 2. Can we make them get a 30-day sticker like the old school City stickers from City Hall or the Police Department since there's somebody there 24 hours and, you know, say the month of March is orange or what have you? So boom, they got an orange sticker on there. If the Police Department drives through there and just check things out, they know, well, March is orange. Yep. Everybody's good here with you know, that's that's one of their questions. Can we do that so it doesn't make a residence out of this, so we don't we don't have I'll show you some pictures. I can start passing these pictures around.

This first set of pictures is a local RV park by the Flea Market. Now, I believe it doesn't compare apples to apples here. I think they let people just stay there as long as they want. And then the second one is Pin Oak RV Resort, and they sent me pictures. So, if we can keep those separate. But and then here's just some information about both places as well, if anybody wants to see it. Again, I'm just bringing this forward as they wanted me to.

The reason another day, another thing about the sticker is they don't want to make residence, they don't want to make it, these people make residence of this or hook up and drive down the street and maybe go to the old Sporlan and turn around and drive right back in and go, yep, well, we're going to pay for another month here.

Those are just some things they brought up. He wanted me to he'd like to say he wanted me to to show these things and he wanted me to about trash and there's some trash and stuff in these pictures and extended stay.

Thoughts on a 30-day sticker? He was he was thinking, we brought the gentleman brought up Harvey, brought up a revenue, a 30 day sticker, a dollar a day, \$30 for a for a sticker for March or what have you.

And again, his main question, again was enforcement. How are we going to enforce that this doesn't turn into a long stay, you know?

Maniaci: So, I just stood up and I'll let the applicant...

Hidritch: Right.

Maniaci: Report that and maybe Mark can add a little bit, but we had a lot of special use permits currently that have been conditionalized, that's what we have passed under conditions, and they are enforced strictly by either complaint driven or by us realizing an issue. Not to pick on any one party, but we've had we've had special use permits that have been in violation of their special use permit conditions, and we have given them so many days to come into compliance or threaten to revoke the special use permit. And so, or I guess it was threatened to send the court. We can't revoke a special use permit, correct Mark? Yes, you can't revoke but you can ticket them \$500 a day until they go to court. So, I think that's that's how it is planned. We police on all special use permits. You know if it becomes an issue or something you can see someone is setting up a home there that's there and there's furniture that same ones around the corner every week then there is something that we would be able to enforce given whatever, given whatever timetable you put on it.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Maniaci: Yep. But we would recommend whatever timetable you put on doing some distance in between because you talked about wanting to go to Sporlan and coming back because again, if it comes down to it, because the special use permit conditions, we would have the ability to request that information and say, okay, no this person was here on this day and then they were here the next day, you know, so.

I think it's about conditionalizing it and where you feel comfortable that they know if they break the rules, we have the ability to call them on it. You know, unfortunately, it is just complaint driven a lot of the time but...

Hidritch: In this in this other question he has on here, too, which and this would go to Gregg not so much to you Sal, but he was even asking about have you guys thought about a dollar amount for like a 30 day stay? You know...

Gregg Gross: I haven't even gotten that far.

Hidritch: I was just curious, right, again I'm Gregg, I'm just asking these questions as they asked to me.

Gregg Gross: I get it.

Hidritch: So anyway, like Pin Oak is 825 to 975 for a 30 day stay. All depends the size of the...

Gregg Gross: Yeah, I don't know. I haven't even gotten to that point yet.

Hidritch: Right, right.

Gregg Gross: I need to think about that.

Hidritch: It was just, those are questions that were brought forward. And again, I know your family and I know you guys won't as neighboring people, residents, these guys are particular people. I feel confident that they'll they'll keep it policed.

Coulter: Are there plans to extend the sidewalk down Main Street to get to this park? So, if you want to walk downtown...

Nilges: That's a great question. If you recall the retaining wall that was reconstructed in 2018, we utilized 80/20 federal money to get that retaining wall replaced. Part of that, there was incidental construction to the sidewalk that was constructed. And again, if you go back to the whole concept of connecting subdivisions to our walking facilities that connected the Catawba

Place to downtown, that then could be leveraged at a future date to get another federal grant to repave West Main and then extend the sidewalk down to the park. So that's part of the overall to answer your question. That's part of the overall strategy. There is no plan right now on what that looks like because they need to pave West Main is not quite there, but when that happens, as with any STP Federal Projects, we would look at extending the sidewalk to the Miller Post Reserve.

Lamb: And that would be that would be regardless whether or not the RV park...

Nilges: Correct.

Lamb: *Inaudible*...the Miller Post Reserve.

Nilges: That's a general ten-year strategy regardless of what their use is.

Coulter: In the meantime, if you're going to walk downtown, you've got to walk on the street?

Nilges: Correct.

Lamb: Until you get to a sidewalk.

Nilges: We very rarely ever construct new sidewalks. I know there's been a couple exceptions with some City facilities that we've improved, but that general strategy of connecting subdivisions, not necessarily building sidewalks in subdivisions, but connecting them to other facilities holds true at this location. And quite honestly, we would not probably will get federal money to pave West Main without a sidewalk component to it. When does that application happen? Four or five years out probably.

Hidritch: So back to one of the questions. So, can we recommend a sticker per say?

Lamb: I think you could you could propose a we could ask Mark to go ahead and add an additional condition in the ordinance that basically limits the amount of time that you have in between stays.

Piontek: Yes, you could do that, but you could not require them to have a sticker that they've got to pay for from the City without getting voter approval.

Hidritch: Okay.

Lamb: But I think that would address your concern about our the person that you brought it up about.

Wessels: So, Gregg, I think I think this whole thing would move along a little bit more smoothly if we came up with some days between stays more than 48 hours, I believe. So, I think if you're willing to go, I don't know, 15 days between the 30-day stays, I think this would help move things along.

Gregg Gross: Sure.

Wessels: You okay with that?

Gregg Gross: Well, yeah, that's fine with me...*inaudible*

Wessels: Then I would suggest maybe that we amend this to put that in there on the conditions, we have on the conditions already 30 days and 15 days between stays.

Hidritch: And that if I remember right and maybe it wasn't but at P and Z 61st came up.

Patke: Right.

Hidritch: 60 day and that's what I think Gregg said something about a 30 and...

Wessels: 60 day, long, yeah, yeah.

Hidritch: And also, Gregg, I think it would would help some of the residents. You said this to me that this is your retirement plan.

Gregg Gross: Yeah.

Hidritch: So, this isn't something you're just going to slam in and then walk away from?

Gregg Gross: No.

Hidritch: You're a young man yet, so...

Gregg Gross: Yeah, I still I do I mean, I work in sewers for a living. I know how hard work is and I mean, and that's I'm sticking everything I made.

Hidritch: I think if some of them know that that this is something that your long-range plan that might help.

Gregg Gross: Yeah, this ain't no sure thing I mean I'm not just buying putting it in to flip it.

Hidritch: Right.

Gregg Gross: I'm this for me to you know when I can just up doing sewers and digging ditches and go sit in a check-in office, you know, and collect, you know.

Hidritch: Right, sounds like a plan.

Holtmeier: I still think we should do the 15 days instead of 30.

Patke: 15-day total stay?

Holtmeier: 15 days total stay, 15 days to come back.

Patke: I think Wessels said 30 days stay, 15 in days in between, right?

Holtmeier: Yeah.

Patke: So, we have a just that. Okay. And Mark, I just want to say to the the pictures at Pin Oak, I know for a fact people do live there. There's some two-and three-year people there.

Lamb: Oh yeah, absolutely.

Hidritch: *Inaudible*

Patke: I'm sorry?

Hidritch: Pin Oak as well?

Patke: Pin Oak is what I'm saying, yeah, I know that for sure.

Hidritch: Because I couldn't see anything with the information he sent me. That of a time frame...

Patke: Right. I mean that's what we don't want in the 30 days.

Hidritch: Right, right, because the other one that's by the Flea Market, you can see that the people are there are definitely there to stay. They even have a little out houses, little outbuildings, outbuildings for stuff. So yeah, they're they're there for a while. And that's definitely what we don't want.

Holtmeier: Either way I think we, you know, we need an RV park and, and if we could cut down on days, I'd be happier.

Patke: Again Joe, I don't want to disagree with you. You're entitled to your opinion there. I think the days in between is just as important as those. If they have to leave town and come back in two weeks in order to stay again, that makes a big difference in where people are coming and going instead of living. That's that's important to me. No doubt.

Hidritch: And I don't want to disagree with you either, Joe. And I'm not trying to, but I know it happens a lot of times up here, but I, I myself agree we should do a 30 day and instead of 15, maybe a ten day span in between even, but whatever we come up with.

Wessels: Do we need a motion?

Lamb: We haven't even, I don't think you've accepted the the the hearing into the minutes. So...

Wessels: Okay.

Lamb: We've got to get that first and then you start dealing...

Wessels: Okay.

Lamb: With the conditions.

With no further discussion, a motion to accept this item into the minutes made by Councilmember Holtmeier, seconded by Councilmember Hidritch, passed without dissent.

Bill No. 23-12745, Ordinance No. 23-13710, an ordinance granting a Special Use Permit for 1550 West Main Street to operate an RV Park in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

A motion to amend the ordinance under Section 1, Number 2 to read No Visitor or RV shall stay longer than 30 days with a 15-day interim between stays made by Councilmember Wessels, seconded by Holtmeier, passed on a 7 to 1 roll call vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-aye, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-nay, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

With no further discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Briggs-nay, Behr-aye, Patke-aye, Coulter-nay, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

CITIZENS COMMENTS

* Deon Johanning 134 Ladera Lane, addressed Council regarding 612 Riverview Place.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

* None

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

* 2023/2024 MoDOT Traffic Safety Grants

February 13, 2023

Mayor Doug Hagedorn

Washington City Council

RE: Missouri DOT, Traffic Safety Grants for 2023/2024 Budget Year

Honorable Mayor and City Council,

Attached is a memo from Sergeant Mike Grissom. It contains the preliminary highway safety grant applications for 2023/2024 budget year. The usual Hazardous Moving, DWI Enforcement Grant and Youth Alcohol Grant applications are being applied for. All are 100% funded by highway safety funds.

In addition to the manpower grants, the Washington Police Department is requesting funding to send personnel to two different training conferences. An application is being made for funding to send all three of the Department's active Drug Recognition Experts (DRE) to the annual DWI/DRE Conference. Funding has also been applied for to send two officers to the Law Enforcement Traffic Safety/Accident Conference. (LETSAC). The cost of the conference registration and room and board is included in the application. The training is 100% funded by the grant.

Below is the breakdown of those grants:

<i>Hazardous Moving Violation Enforcement</i>	<i>\$7,000 for manpower</i>
<i>LETSAC Conference</i>	<i>\$2,000 for training</i>
<i>DWI Enforcement</i>	<i>\$2,500 for manpower</i>
<i>DWI/DRE Conference</i>	<i>\$1,800 for training</i>
<i>Youth Alcohol Enforcement</i>	<i>\$5,000 for manpower</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$18,300.00</i>

Also included with Officer Grissom's paperwork is an authorization form, which must be signed by each Council member and the mayor to apply for the grants and prior to receiving any grant funding. I request approval to apply for all the safety grants listed.

Respectfully,

Jim Armstrong, Chief of Police

After a brief discussion, a motion to approve to apply for the safety grants made by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Hidritch, passed without dissent.

ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS

Bill No. 23-12746, Ordinance No. 23-13711, an ordinance authorizing and directing the execution of a Landlord Consent to Sublease by and between the City of Washington, Missouri and Missouri Meerschbaum Company.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Hidritch.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-aye, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

Bill No. 23-12747, Ordinance No. 23-13712, an ordinance repealing Sections 210.1800 and 210.1830 of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri relating to possession of marijuana and possession of drug paraphernalia.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-aye, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

Bill No. 23-12748, Ordinance No. 23-13713, an ordinance amending Section 340.110 of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Briggs.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-aye, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

(Remaining of page intentionally left blank)

Bill No. 23-12749, Ordinance No. 23-13714, an ordinance denying the issuance of a Special Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner located at 612 Riverview Place in the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Wessels.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-nay, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-nay, Wessels-nay.

COMMISSION, COMMITTEE AND BOARD REPORTS

* Preliminary Plat Approval – 2238 English Crest Drive

February 13, 2023

Honorable Mayor & City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, MO 63090

RE: File No. 23-0201-Preliminary Plat-Comely-2238 English Crest Drive

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

At the regular meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission, held on Monday, February 13, 2023, the Commission reviewed and recommends approval of the above mentioned Preliminary Plat.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Holdmeier

Chairman

Planning & Zoning Commission

After a brief discussion, a motion to accept and approve this item made by Councilmember Holtmeier, seconded by Councilmember Patke, passed without dissent.

* Preliminary Plat Approval – Stone Crest Plat 18

February 13, 2023

Honorable Mayor & City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, MO 63090

RE: File No. 23-0203-Preliminary Plat & Final Plat-Stone Crest Plat 18

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

At the regular meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission, held on Monday, February 13, 2023, the Commission reviewed and recommends approval of the above mentioned Preliminary Plat and Final Plat.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Holdmeier

Chairman

Planning & Zoning Commission

After a brief discussion on the preliminary and final plats of Stone Crest Plat 18, a motion to accept and approve this item made by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Holtmeier, passed without dissent.

Bill No. 23-12750, TABLED, Introduced by Councilmember Patke. An ordinance approving the final plat of Stone Crest Plat 18 in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

After a brief discussion on getting a Performance Agreement, a motion to table the ordinance made by Councilmember Wessels, seconded by Councilmember Hidritch, passed without dissent.

* Preliminary Plat Approval – Highland Meadows Plat 8

February 13, 2023

Honorable Mayor & City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, MO 63090

RE: File No. 23-0204-Preliminary Plat & Final Plat-Highland Meadows Plat 8

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

At the regular meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission, held on Monday, February 13, 2023, the Commission reviewed and recommends approval of the above mentioned Preliminary Plat and Final Plat.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Holdmeier

Chairman

Planning & Zoning Commission

After a brief discussion on the preliminary and final plats of Highland Meadows Plat 8, a motion to accept and approve this item made by Councilmember Holtmeier, seconded by Councilmember Patke, passed without dissent.

Bill No. 23-12751, Ordinance No. 23-13715, an ordinance approving the final plat of Highland Meadows Plat 8 in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Patke.

With no further discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-aye, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

MAYOR'S REPORT

* Thank you for coming tonight.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

* 100th Year Anniversary of City Hall is this year; celebration is scheduled for May 4, 2023.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

- * Brief discussion on streetlights in town.
- * Brief discussion on street through traffic at Fifth and Cedar Street and East Fifth Street.
- * Brief discussion on possible panhandling ordinance.
- * Brief discussion on possible noise ordinance.
- * Brief discussion on jake break noise at the intersection of Highway 47 and 100.

CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

Public vote on whether or not to hold a closed meeting to discuss personnel, legal and real estate matters pursuant to Section 610.021 RSMo (2000) passed at 8:57 p.m. on the following roll call vote; Briggs-aye, Behr-aye, Patke-nay, Coulter-aye, Reed-aye, Hidritch-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Wessels-aye.

The regular session reconvened at 9:02 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn made at 9:02 p.m. by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Holtmeier passed without dissent.

Adopted: _____

Attest: _____
City Clerk

President of City Council

Passed: _____

Attest: _____
City Clerk

Mayor of Washington, Missouri