

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF WASHINGTON, FRANKLIN COUNTY, MISSOURI
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2023**

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS:

The Regular Meeting of the City of Washington, Missouri, City Council was held on Monday, June 5, 2023, at 7:15 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	Absent
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
Economic Development Director		Sal Maniaci
Interim City Engineer		Charles Stankovic
Parks Director		Wayne Dunker
Emergency Management Director		Mark Skornia
Public Works Superintendent		Kevin Quaethem
Street Superintendent		Tony Bonastia
Library Director		Nelson Appell

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 May 15, 2023, Council Meeting

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

Approval and Adjustment of Agenda including Consent Agenda:

* Fireworks Display

May 19, 2023

Honorable Mayor & City Council

City of Washington

Washington, Missouri

Re: Fireworks Display Permit Request for July 4th, 2023

Dear Honorable Mayor and Members of City Council:

William (Kelly) Owens would like to request a permit for a public fireworks display on behalf of American Legion Post 218. The permit will be for the evening of Tuesday, July 4, 2023 with a rain date of Wednesday, July 5, 2023 at the fairgrounds.

The issuance of this permit is contingent upon all paperwork and approvals being met by all departments and weather conditions being favorable.

Respectfully submitted,

Blake Marquart

Building Official

* Liquor License Approval – Wortman-Fortner LLC dba Jack Flash

* Liquor License Renewals: Cinema 1 + 1 Corporation DBA Cinema 1 Plus Corporation; I B Nuts & Fruit Too; Creek Side Enterprises of Washington Missouri LLC DBA The Creek Grill & Sports Bar; Fischer's Food Shop; Custard Pie, LLC DBA Cowan's Restaurant; Imo's; Front Street Cellar & Inn; American Legion Post #218; Back Alley Entertainment; Los Cabos; Walmart Supercenter #172; Schnuck Markets Inc DBA Schnuck; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Williams Brothers Meat Market; Hoffmann Hillermann Nursery & Florist; Guffey's LLC; Fas-Trip #102; Fas-Trip #104; Fas-Trip #107; Fas-Trip #108.

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

PRIORITY ITEMS:

Mayor's Presentations, Appointments & Reappointments:

* Industrial Development Authority Reappointment

May 18, 2023

Washington City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, Missouri 63090

Dear Council Members:

I herewith submit for your approval the following for reappointment to the Industrial Development Authority:

Walter Hellebusch – term ending May 2029

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Hagedorn

Mayor

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

* Library Board of Trustees Appointment

May 18, 2023

Washington City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, Missouri 63090

Dear Council Members:

I herewith submit for your approval the following for appointment to the Library Board of Trustees:

Jamie Holtmeier – term ending June 2026

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Hagedorn

Mayor

A motion to accept and approve the appointment made by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Coulter, passed without dissent.

* Library Board of Trustees Reappointment

May 18, 2023

Washington City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, Missouri 63090

Dear Council Members:

I herewith submit for your approval the following for reappointment to the Library Board of Trustees:

Leanne Gisburne – term ending June 2026

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Hagedorn

Mayor

A motion to accept and approve the reappointment made by Councilmember Briggs, seconded by Councilmember Patke, passed without dissent.

* Parks & Recreation Commission Reappointments

May 18, 2023

Washington City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, Missouri 63090

Dear Council Members:

I herewith submit for your approval the following for reappointment to the Parks & Recreation Commission:

Tessie Steffens – term ending June 2026

Gavin Woolley – term ending June 2026

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Hagedorn

Mayor

A motion to accept and approve the reappointments made by Councilmember Behr, seconded by Councilmember Patke, passed without dissent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

*** Proposed Code Amendments – Short Term Lodging**

May 25, 2023

Honorable Mayor and City Council

City of Washington

Washington, Missouri

Re: Proposed Code Amendments-Short Term Lodging

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

At their March, April, and May meetings, the P&Z Commission has been discussing possible amendments to the Short Term Lodging (STR) regulations. There were mainly two scenarios discussed:

- 1. Create a new “tourism/lodging overlay district” that would span multiple zoning districts but would designate an area where STR’s were permitted.*
- 2. Only allow new STR’s in R-2 Overlay District, given that area approximately covers much of what is considered “walkable” to downtown currently.*

There were many recommendations from proponents and those in opposition. The Tourism Commission also showed their support for a designated district that would cover more than just the R-2 Overlay District.

At the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission, held on Monday, May 8, 2023, the Commission reviewed and recommends the following changes to the STR section of City Code.

- 1. STR will be defined as any rental of transient guests staying for less than 30 days and is not owner occupied.*
- 2. STR’s will continue to be permitted by right in C-1, C-2, C-2 Overlay, and C-3.*
- 3. New STR’s will be required to have a Special Use Permit in R-2 Overlay and R-3 Multi-Family Residential.*
- 4. Any new STR shall be 150 ft. away from any existing STR.*
- 5. STR’s will not be permitted in any other zone district.*

Below is the most recent information that the commission reviewed with links to additional maps.

150 ft Buffer - <https://arcg.is/0bfXLm>

300 ft Buffer - <https://arcg.is/10XL5b0>

Also, here is a link to third party occupancy data à [Free Airbnb Data for Washington, MO / Instant Projections \(rabbu.com\)](#)

- Two tabs, one for future projects and one for historical performance. Average occupancy is 43%*
- Two things of note I believe the commission wanted,*
 - There are 31 active hosts with 52 listings (could be multiple apartments in one building)*
 - Average occupancy over the next 30 days is 40%*

Sincerely,

Sal Maniaci

Community and Economic Development Director

Hagedorn: Okay.

Maniaci: All right.

Lamb: Sal.

Maniaci: Yes.

Hagedorn: Go ahead.

Maniaci: So, I'm going to do the presentation from down here so I can run the computer. But as I'm sure you all are aware, when the moratorium was passed about four months ago, at this point on all new short-term lodging in residential areas, part of that requirement was for the Planning and Zoning Commission to send a recommendation to Council after their May Meeting. So, that means they were able to review it for three months straight. And that is what I and that is what they did. They had three different discussion items, one public hearing on the proposed changes. And tonight, I'm here to present you with their recommendation of the Short-Term Lodging Code Amendment. And again tonight, this is just the public hearing. There's not an ordinance on there.

But as you can see in my letter, there are two kind of scenarios that they really went back and forth, back and forth with and reviewed at their three meetings. The first of which, which was to create a Tourism Lodging Overlay District that would span multiple zoning districts and designate an area where short-term lodging was permitted. And there was a lot of discussion on how far reaching out would be and in the areas of that.

And then the other discussion was to only allow new short-term rentals in the R-2 Overlay District and R-3, given that approximately covers much of what is considered walkable in the downtown currently. So that R-2 Overlay was created years ago for a reason that it was downtown adjacent neighborhoods that often have single and two-family uses and so there was a lot of discussion that that overlay district why reinvent the wheel of that boundary has kind of already been set of what is considered almost downtown, adjacent and walkable to downtown.

And so at their last at their May Meeting, they did make a recommendation of the following, and it would be to make an amendment to the code to allow short-term rentals defined as any rental of transient guests staying for less than 30 days and is not owner occupied. That was an important designation that we didn't have before, where if it was a more traditional bed and breakfast where the owner actually lived in-house that would remain as a Special Use Permit across all residential districts. If it was more short-term rental where the owner is not occupying the home at the same time, it would have to fall under this new definition.

The second would be short-term rentals would continue to be permitted by right, meaning they don't need a Special Use Permit in C-1, C-2, C-2 Overlay and C-3. So, that essentially is commercial districts where they're already permitted today. And our C-2 Overlay is this darker blue that it was created again years ago as an overlay district of kind of our Fifth Street Corridor that allows for single-two family as well as commercial uses. So, most often business downstairs, residential up top, kind of that mixed use and then our C-3 which is our down to ours, our actual downtown designation zoning. And so basically what you would be able to see is a lot of this blue and this corridor as well as our downtown district would continue to be able by right, meaning that you don't need a Special Use Permit and you don't have to be a certain distance from one another.

So, new short-term rentals would be required to have a in the R-2 Overlay in our R-3 Multi-Family District. So again, just the same process we have today. But now short-term rentals would only be permitted in this pink. This is the R-2 Overlay District that was created, I believe in 2012. Darren, if I'm not mistaken?

Lamb: Yes, it was about the time when we recognized that single-family and two-family could both be permitted uses.

Maniaci: Yes. In that area on both it straddles both sides of downtown and goes south of downtown is you know often seen as downtown adjacent and walkable to downtown. And so that was kind of the boundary of utilizing that existing overlay district for new short-term rentals to be able to apply for Special Use Permits. And then on top of that, any new short-term rentals shall not be within 150 feet of any existing short-term rental. And that is what this map is showing you today. Charles in our Engineering Department put this together for us on GIS and it shows what boundaries today would actually disqualify the parcels that could not apply for a Short-Term Rental Permit.

The reason we chose 150, they went back, we went back and forth between a couple different 150, 300, even, we looked at a map that was at 500 and just to look at what different boundaries would look like. And 150 we thought was the most appropriate. And I think the best example actually is right here. There are two short-term rentals, catty corner from each other on High Street and the discussion was with this 150' buffer that would remove the homes pretty much directly adjacent to it on Rand, but then would still open up homes on Rand to be able to apply for it on the other side of the street. Once you got more than 150', all of these homes on Rand, the property owners would not be permitted to apply for a Special Use Permit if they wanted to. And we thought it was unnecessary for someone on Rand Street to not be able to apply for that use because someone all the way on the other side of High Street that they may or may not even know that is an operation is over there. And so there's 150' you know our blocks downtown are not all the same. You can see here there are different shapes depending on where they're at. But 150' is pretty generally a half of a block. And this gave a good example of that this house actually is dead center on the block and you can see it pretty much says that is the one that it's going to be printed it permitted on that block. And so if you can imagine that in the future, if you were to put one further down on High Street, that would kind of take up on that block.

Lamb: So, the question would be as if that like, for example, where you have it on High Street, those two that are there Sal, if one of those discontinues, how would how do we reassess that or how do we know that?

Maniaci: Yes. So, that was discussed as well. You have to remit your tourism tax quarterly, and we'd have to write that into the ordinance. But it was discussed possibly if you don't pay for two quarters. So, if you're not hosting for six months out of the year, you will become inactive, allowing this buffer to go away.

Lamb: And so then other properties could go ahead and apply?

Maniaci: Correct. And again, these would be grandfathered in. So, as you'll see some of these buffers already overlapping, that does not affect anything existing. That is just the new requirement for anyone wanting to apply.

And then the last recommendation was that short-term rentals would not be permitted in any other residential district. So, that being essentially downtown and this corridor on Fifth Street in commercial districts still permitted, everything you see in pink here would be a Special Use Permit as well as this light blue, because this Market Street is all zoned multi-family, that could still apply for special use. But any...

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Maniaci: Yes with the buffer, and then anything else would not even be permitted to request a Special Use Permit. It's just not a permitted use. And so obviously anything in yellow here would no longer. We have some outliers here that approved previously that would no longer be able to do that. There are some gaps here. Essentially Elm and Cedar specifically for whatever reason were always stayed single-family probably because historically they were single-family that never got brought into the R-2 Overlay District and so you would have a gap here in the middle in between the two that would not be permitted. And so that was a lot of the discussion, but that is just how that recommendation played out.

And there was one other thing that was requested of staff to be able to, because we talked at one point about having a percentage of rent or percentage of total housing units in the City that could not be more than, you know, you take a percentage of your total units and that's your maximum amount of short-term rentals that you allow in your City and then build 100 homes in a year. Then that cap gets raised up. Well, when we're talking about creating an area that this is the only space that you can do it, we thought the buffer was a better idea and the the buffer is going to kind of cap itself out anyway as people continue to request it. There was a question about a general range of what that cap may be. Charles and I tried to play with the mapping system to figure out an idea of how many more we could fit. It's very hard because that buffer depends, you can see these buffers are based on property shape. And so if you have one larger property that chooses to do so, the buffer is going to be bigger. And so, you know, a very large range. If you just put 150' buffers in here, shoulder to shoulder and fit them in here, you could probably fit about 50 more. But again, that's probably an unscientific way of saying that's the absolute maximum that if...

Unknown: Right.

Maniaci: 150 here, do another one, do another one, more realistically, you're going to have buffers that start overlapping and you're going to have gaps that just don't fit. So, I would say realistically, you could probably do another 30 that without having any problem.

But essentially that is the recommendation from Planning and Zoning with those five that I put in the letter again, with 150' buffer and to reiterate that we didn't have before, if it is owner occupied, then it can still be in any other residential zoned district.

A good example of that is south of 100. We have one here off of Steutermann. This is an owner occupied one that was approved for a Special Use Permit. They had a basement that they wanted to have as a more traditional Airbnb. That was permitted there. That would still be able to be permitted today and in R-1A if they were owner occupied.

Unknown: Okay.

Hagedorn: So, they're grandfathered if they're owner occupied, is that correct?

Maniaci: Correct.

Lamb: Bed and Breakfast...*inaudible*

Maniaci: Everything existing is grandfathered.

Lamb: Right.

Hagedorn: Okay.

Maniaci: That's the only way you can get grandfathered if you're existing. If you're owner occupied, it's still Special Use Permit but you can do it outside of the R-2 Overlay District. I mean you could do it; you know, we have a couple over on the east side of town. As you can see, these buffers you know, here on Eighth Street. This I do not believe is owner occupier that's grandfathered in. If they wanted to come in and say this is approved, if they wanted to come in and request that same thing, it would have to be owner occupied in order for them to be able to get a Special Use Permit.

Wessels: So, if it's not owner occupied...

Maniaci: You have to be this...

Wessels: There aren't any in R-1?

Lamb: You're prohibited.

Maniaci: Prohibited.

Wessels: Prohibited

Maniaci: And R-1B, so, you would any residential district that's not R-2 Overlay. So, that is essentially saying we are putting short-term lodging in this pink area on the zoning map and that is essentially our downtown district is what this recommendation would say.

Now, two things. The last thing actually I want to say before I open it up for questions for me, is that we have from the get go said to Planning and Zoning as well as we're seeing this as a step one, as a possible temporary change. Our Comprehensive Plan is still in motion with our consultant, the issue of short-term lodging, short-term rentals and how to deal with those have come up at every public forum we've had. Every business roundtable, the Steering Committee. So, our consultant knows that is something that they maybe want to write into their recommendations. And I just want to throw out that we could have a recommendation from our consultant this fall that they could come up with a better solution. And so, we did let P&Z know that, hey, this is what this is what they are recommending to lift the moratorium and get this back open in these districts. And then when the Comprehensive Plan comes forward by the end of the year, we just have to do it by the end of 2023, that we could be looking at this again. Our zoning code is always a living document.

Wessels: And Sal, did P&Z look at the criteria, the 10 criteria for Special Use Permit?

Maniaci: We looked at it. Obviously, it was pulled up. It was difficult. It was decided not to write new criteria just for this one use. The Special Use Permit is those 10 criteria are for all special uses.

Lamb: Correct.

Maniaci: You know, whether it's a gas station in C-2 or short-term lodging in R-2, so you know I think if you're going to write new criteria, have new application, that's where you go back to that first option where you say, hey, here's your district, here are the rules. This is it, completely separate from a Special Use Permit. But I think the recommendation was to stray away from that from now and just utilize our existing code in R-2 Overlay.

And later on your agenda is the ability to revoke a Special Use Permit not related necessarily to short-term lodging, but right now we have no ability to revoke a Special Use Permit. We just

ticket, and sometimes the judge, you know, it takes a while for that process to go through. And so now Council would have the ability under certain circumstances to revoke Special Use Permits of any kind if they are not following the rules set forth in their ordinance.

Lamb: Mark, if I could ask the question with regards to if you have an existing short-term rental and you're in an R-2 Overlay District and assuming that the Council would pass would follow long on the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission has recommended, are those buffers that are there for those homes, are they there forever or if those also become no longer use the short-term rentals, do those buffers go away?

Piontek: If they're no longer used...

Lamb: Put your mic over there.

Piontek: If they're no longer used, then those buffers would go away...

Lamb: Okay.

Piontek: Because the Special Use Permit would disappear.

Lamb: Just making sure right.

Piontek: Right.

Patke: And that's going to be possible if they don't pay for two quarters, then they're Special Use Permit...

Maniaci: So yeah, we are creating a master list of what is considered active and paying just to get everything in order as we've gotten a lot of these in the past few years. We can pretty easily say, okay, it's been two quarters without this person remitting any tourism tax, meaning they have not rented it out at all, is now considered inactive. It can just go back to long-term rental.

Patke: That's also a way of policing our short-term rental fees, I mean, are your bed tax fees.

Maniaci: Yes.

Patke: If you're not going to pay, you're not going to get allowed to continue...

Maniaci: That's right.

Patke: Approach.

Maniaci: And that doesn't they could it's very possible, we've had short-term rental owners decide to go back and forth between, hey, I'm going to do long-term rental for one year and then go back to short-term rental. They could still do that. But in within that one year period, if a neighbor comes and asks for it, then they could lose that. That's just the risk of turning off your short-term rental at that time.

Patke: Okay.

Behr: So, the way I'm reading it and I think Mr. Patke asked too, I just want to make sure, even Downtown, C-1, C-2, down Fifth Street, the overlay still 150' apart for anything new?

Maniaci: Not inside the commercial districts.

Behr: Okay.

Lamb: Because it is we have did we did look at adding a buffer in the C-2, C-3 District as well downtown because there was concern of taking away too many apartments that could be considered market rate, you know, workforce housing. The issue with that is that a lot of the buildings downtown, you have multiple units and so say you have six units in a building and you're deciding to do one of them, a short-term lodging, well that would take out the entire block. And so, it was determined, let's not do a buffer downtown. If it becomes a problem where we are having no long-term rental downtown and only short-term rental, I think it's something

that we can address. But at this point, as you can see, you know, there are quite a few dots downtown.

Behr: Right.

Maniaci: But it's not the majority of our parcels. And a lot of these that are on here have multiple units and have decided to just offer maybe one or two other units. A good example is where the old Droege's Building, John G's. That's three stories. They have six units on the second floor that are all long-term, two units on the third floor that are short-term. We don't think that them or the neighbors should be penalized because they're mixing it, which is the whole point of downtown. It's mixed use.

Behr: That's, yeah, that's why I'm asking, because just reading your bullet points here, the way I read it, it says any new short-term, but you're saying any new special use for a short-term then would be 150' apart?

Maniaci: Yes. I'm sorry.

Behr: Okay.

Maniaci: I should clarify that. Any special use in the that is required is 150', correct.

Behr: Thank you.

Hagedorn: No other questions? Okay, we need a motion to accept in the minutes.

Lamb: No, it's a public hearing. We're going to open it up to the public.

Hagedorn: Okay, great. Okay, folks, we're going to open it up to the public. Ground rules tonight, as you can tell, there's lots of folks here. Let's limit our comments, please, to three minutes and speak your piece in those three minutes, because there's not going to be an opportunity to return to the microphone after you state your piece. When you step to the mic, please say your name and your residence, please. So, without further ado, do I have a comment on the STR's?

Tyann Marcink: I'm Tyann Marcink Hammond, owner and Manager of Missouri House Vacation Rentals. Good Evening, Council and Mayor, my residence, 680 Scenic View, Union, Missouri. I am a sixth generation resident, well, not resident, sixth generation of Franklin County. So deep roots. Everybody graduated from high school here. I know you guys always like to hear that. And half my family have businesses in Washington as well. And several of my family also live in Washington. So, coming from residents as well as business folks.

I know a lot of folks look at short-term rentals as taking away housing affordability. So, I do want to say that. It is found from Oxford Economics Study that STR's are not a significant driver of rising rents and housing prices. This is information I had sent you all in February and happy to send this all to you again, including majority of short-term rentals are purchased off market or have been sitting on the market for weeks or even up to a year and then completely rehabbed or major renovations done to them. So, a lot of work going into making these homes and beautifying the community.

Claims that short-term rentals are unsafe and dangerous to neighbors and poorly maintained and degrade the neighborhood character. Facts, short-term rentals are bound by the exact same safety codes as long-term rentals and owner occupied residences, and we are incentivized to keep the properties beautifully maintained for our guests so they meet and often exceed Washington community standards of property care and appeal

Claims, short-term rentals don't contribute to local economy and don't support jobs, which also is untrue. I found vibrant responsibly *inaudible* and Vacation Rental Managers Association that 74% of operators employ at least one staff member or contractor and rely on services of a local folks as well. And we distribute tourism dollars to local businesses outside the commercial hotel areas. Money spent by guest are kept here.

As far as the area personally and business wise, I would love to see it larger because we have folks coming in for wedding venues on the outskirts of town. They're not staying in Downtown Washington. They want to be closer out to the other areas. Folks coming into Purina Event Center from all over the world. They want to stay close to Purina and Downtown Washington is not where they want to be either.

And I really think it's a residential use, whether it's three nights or three years that someone's staying. These are amazing folks coming in to visit family and relatives, dog shows and the tourism. Any questions? Okay, thank you.

Hagedorn: Thanks Tyann.

Mike McFatrigh: Good evening. My name is Mike McFatrigh, I live at 1514 First Parkway here in Washington. I didn't graduate from Washington High School or Saint Francis Borgia, but I am from Missouri. As many of you know, I have been engaged in this conversation for quite some time. I'm not particularly enamored with this solution, but I support the solution. I think this is a compromise.

The information that was provided at the P&Z Meeting with regard to occupancy, which was derived from a commercial website, which I think is probably overstated. I was when I initially spoke, I was speaking in terms of wanting to use the data that's developed from tax receipts, but regardless, you currently have an occupancy at or below 40%. So I don't necessarily think that they're opening the whole of Washington to STR's is necessary. And I certainly don't think that if I owned a short-term rental, having this solution provides me some stability with regard to my investment, knowing that there isn't going to be a blanket opening of STR's throughout the community.

And as I've said before, if in fact, the notion of supply and demand holds, the more STR's you have, the opportunity to lower the value derived in terms of revenue, both for the short-term rental owner as well as the City in terms of tax receipts is a real possibility. As you increase supply, you know, as you increase the supply, obviously there's going to be a more fight for demand. So, I think that this is a reasonable solution. And as Mr. Maniaci said, that this is something that can be revisited. So, I support the notion of engaging in this approach to the ordinance.

Hagedorn: Thank you, Mike. Anyone else?

Kim Obermark: Good Evening. My name is Kim Obermark. My address is 1418 East Fifth Street in Washington, and I am a realtor with Berkshire Hathaway. Some of the concerns that I have with the proposed short-term rental regulation in the City of Washington, the use of residential homes as a short-term rental would be limited to a very small area with special zoning and buffers applied currently to the operating short-term rentals.

There are no buffers nor zoning restrictions for long-term rentals. The City of Washington has only 35 operating short-term rentals in the City limits, with over 6,000 housing units. The short-term rentals are barely 0.6% of the housing and much needed lodging for options for

visitors. The proposal the proposed buffer is 150' around any short-term rental in the special R-2 Overlay near the downtown area.

A property must submit for a Special Use Permit within the zoning, and a Special Use Permit may be declined. I understand and support reasonable regulations for short-term rentals. However, the proposed regulation is severely restricting the property rights of homeowners in the City of Washington, Missouri, and effectively placing unreasonable low cap on the number of short-term rentals.

The property rights of both sellers and buyers are a concern for me. I had a buyer come in, he ended up buying the property next to Hawthorne Inn because I could not put him in a position where he would be going to Planning and Zoning and nothing else would happen. He was a cash buyer. The negative effect on my career and income and the legal ramifications for the realtors, which there are plenty in this meeting tonight.

The current information that would affect the use of the property. I have a very strong concern with the 150'. If I'm writing a contract for somebody and I don't know every single thing that's involved where their what their plan, what they're going to do and have to go out and figure out if it's 150' or not, really affects my career and the way that most of us do business.

In this market right now you write a contract because the properties are going to be gone in a minute. So, for us to make sure that it's 150' and figure out if there is another property that is used for short-term rental, I just don't even know how that we would be able to gather that information.

So those are some of the concerns that myself and many realtors in Franklin County have talked about and have taken to the board, hoping that they will come up with a decision that we can move forward. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you.

Hidritch: Sal, is there something that we can put on our website stating where and I believe we have more than 35, don't we? That we know of.

Maniaci: There are 35 currently active that are paying the lodging.

Hidritch: Right, that we know.

Maniaci: Yes.

Hidritch: So, could we somehow put that on a website so somebody in that situation could just...

Maniaci: Absolutely.

Hidritch: Pop up a map and...

Maniaci: If this were to pass as recommended, we would publish this site and update it as needed. So, just like our zoning map is open to all citizens and realtors, they could pull this up and see what the buffers are.

Piontek: Mark...

Maniaci: We would need to use it for our internal...

Piontek: Yeah, they could also, and we get these occasionally. Sal probably has a better handle on it than I do, but sometimes we'll get a request from a realtor, or purchaser asking for a zoning letter, and they'll want a zoning letter from Sal that says, here's what the property is zoned and here's what it can be used for. It would be very simple to do the same thing with regard to short-term rentals.

Maniaci: That's correct. For the sake of easy, we would publish this map and keep it updated so people can see the buffers.

Hagedorn: Anyone else wish to address?

Cindy Johanning: Hi, my name is Cindy Johanning. I live at 134 Ladera Lane in Washington. I've been a realtor here in town for 23 years with Coldwell Banker Premier. I'm opposed to short-term rentals being limited to only a small portion of town, the R-2 Overlay. There are many other reasons people come to stay in Washington other than to visit downtown or to go to the fair. There are other wedding venues, there's Purina Farms, the wineries, the hospital, and lots of other reasons. People may want to stay in Washington but don't necessarily need or want to be in the downtown area. I think if short-term rentals were allowed throughout town with a Special Use Permit, of course. I think that just makes a little more sense in that they would be more spread out and they wouldn't all be in such a concentrated area. That's it, thank you.

Patke: Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you, Cindy.

Bonnie Martin: Hi, my name is Bonnie Martin and I live at #4 Riverview Court in here in Washington. We can see from the map today of where these are, they are primarily downtown. That's where they are today. And there are a few elsewhere. And they'll be grandfathered in with the new ordinance, which I support. Nobody that is operating a business today will be forced to stop operating their business if they're got one now, they can continue to have it even if they're not within or, you know, closer than 150'.

But what this does is give peace to the people who live in the residential neighborhoods. That's where we all bought our homes. I looked at the zoning map published by the City when we purchased our home, and that was a deciding factor in where we lived because we didn't want to live where there was business.

And this overlay and this proposed ordinance, this new ordinance would protect the residents who live here. And there is still I think it's a wonderful compromise. There is still a huge area and still lots and lots of properties that can be turned into more short-term rental if the City needs them or if people want to open them up here.

Like we've heard that there's only occupied like, you know, less than 40% of the time. So, I don't know that we need more than we have now, but the opportunity for them is there and it's there in that zone.

And, you know, Washington is not I didn't grow up here either. So, I grew up in a much bigger place. Washington is small. You can get from one end of town to the other in a few minutes. You can get anywhere in this town with a car, any, you know, in less than 15 minutes. So nowhere is too far to go to Purina Farms or to weddings or whatever. But, you know, they're not a lot of these sit vacant a 60 or more percent of the time as it is.

So, to open it up beyond where they already are, that's where they are. That's where they're open right now. It doesn't make sense because the residents, they have rights as well. And that's where they bought their homes in a residential neighborhood to be amongst neighbors, not somebody else's customers. And that's all, I guess all I have to say.

Hagedorn: Thank you, Bonnie.

Maniaci: I just want to touch on it and kind of clarify a little bit the occupancy that keeps getting brought up. We did talk about that at the previous two Planning and Zoning Commission

Meetings. They requested a little bit more information about maybe how often these were used. As Mr. McFatrigh brought up, we looked at utilizing our tax data to determine how often these are leased out next is derived from okay, this person paid X amount this quarter. Here's what their nightly rent is and could figure out how many nights they stayed. But we quickly realized that was not a statistically valuable option because the nightly rentals fluctuate so often. Barbecue and Blues Fest can have one nightly rate and then in February it is significantly cheaper, and so we couldn't necessarily figure out exactly a good occupancy of how often these were rented via our tourism tax.

We did find we had Ms. Marcink sent us a link to that third party website for listing basically all Airbnb data, and that's where we were able to find that it hovered around her average. The last year is about 43% of the year occupied. That just means that properties that were listed on Airbnb were blocked out, meaning they could not be rented. They were full 43%. And then our average occupancy over the next 30 days, which I put in the letter as well, was about 40%.

So, that's where those numbers came from that we sent you. That was that link in your letter was from a third party that we thought was our best chance of getting some type of occupancy data. So, and it was full disclosure. It was brought up at Planning and Zoning Commission. There were some members that thought that was not relevant data into making a decision because we don't regulate usage based on how often they are used. I think the example was if a bar is doing well or not, we're not going to say the bar, if some want to do a bar next door, you can't open this business because the business next to you isn't doing well. And so that was also a discussion where the occupancy didn't necessarily come into the recommendations as much, which is why I added it to the letter. But it didn't really affect the recommendations from Planning and Zoning Commission.

Matt Hammond: Good Evening, Everyone. My name is Matt Hammond. I'm a resident at 680 Scenic View Drive. I'm also an owner and operator of Missouri House with my wife. So, I just wanted to ask when you got that data that was just Airbnb.

Maniaci: Yes.

Matt Hammond: Okay, so it doesn't take into account VRBO and direct bookings. It's probably almost reverse of that so, a lot more than 40%. So, I also wanted to kind of jot some stuff down. In 2018, the City of Washington spent \$12,000 on a study to determine if more lodging was needed. The study concluded that more than 100 hotel rooms need to be added to meet the demand within. And that was five years ago. According to the article in the Missourian in May 2022, only 11 hotel rooms have been added.

STR's are a major contributor to the Tourism Tax Fund and is exclusively used to promote tourism in Washington. STR's have been meeting and meeting the growing demand of visitors in the area. STR's also meet the increased change of how we a person travels and lives. All homeowners that use their property for any length of time rental within a reasonable, you know, guardrails, they don't they don't strip the property rights of other responsible hosts.

So, I guess one thing to consider is, you know, we need some more lodging. And that's the other thing I want also kind of emphasizes people working in this industry, the lodging professionals that are that are doing this. Those aren't the only people that are employed. We employ people that do landscaping, we employ people that do the maintenance on these houses

and rehab these houses. This employs a lot of people in this area. And without these people coming to visit these local shops, they don't get frequented. Most people here locally, they're not going to go to these shops as much as people coming from out of town. Everybody else, I'm going to catch all you guys at Walmart or Schnucks at some point. So that's one thing to consider. A lot of people are the tourists are coming around downtown and, you know, rather than Schnucks and Walmart. So please consider that. Thanks.

Hagedorn: Thank you.

Denise Dickinson: My name is Denise Dickinson. I have a short-term rental outside of your proposed boundaries. I've had it for several years. It's 508 Burnside and I would like to say that putting these boundaries keeps from Washington having free trade. If somebody comes into town and wants to purchase a property, they should have the ability to purchase their property wherever they want. The City has securities in place to protect neighbors. Before you can get a Special Use Permit, a letter is sent out to all neighbors. If a neighbor has a problem, they speak up. If neighbors don't have a problem, then you get your Special Use Permit.

I could say for a fact that my Airbnb is kept up better than long-term rental properties on my street. I contribute more to the beautification of the town than some actual homeowners do. I have guests who are traveling nurses who come to my property that's not in your proposed boundaries because they don't want to be downtown. They don't want the hustle and bustle of a downtown area. They want to be in a quiet neighborhood close to the hospital or after a long shift, they can come home and have quiet.

So bottom line, I disagree very strongly with there being boundaries for any future Airbnb's. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thank you.

Delisa Curran: Hi, my name's Delisa Curran and I live at 2 Riverview Court here in Washington, and I appreciate this consideration. I think that this is a good compromise. Like those who've spoken before, we do have. I just looked up the real estate listings. I've heard some tonight about how houses have been purchased for Airbnb's that have been sitting on the market for a long time. We had two in our neighborhood that were purchased before anybody else had a chance to buy them. Looking at the market for home purchases, there's only six available in the price range of under 250,000 which severely limits housing for other people.

As far as nurses and traveling people staying in houses, like Bonnie said it's not far and the downtown area is fine. They don't want to do that, there's other places.

I agree, we need a hotel. We do need more rooms. There's a way to get that done. I strongly recommend it.

Also, as far as employment, residents also employ people. One of my neighbors hired someone to do her yard. She hired someone to come in and clean every week, not just 40% of the time.

So anyway, we appreciate what you're doing and ask for your vote. Thank you.

Hagedorn: Thanks to Delisa. Anyone else?

Emily Hopkins: Good Evening, Council. My name is Emily Hopkins. I live at 421 Watermill Drive in Washington, Missouri. I am the Tourism Director for the City of Missouri. And I just kind of wanted to point out a couple of different things. I understand both sides of this argument. I think that having regulations in place, very firm regulations so that there isn't wishy washy

voting going on is very important. I think that where I get hung up is not realizing how important tourism is to the City of Washington and the fact, as many people have said behind me, there are a lot of use, there's a lot of use for having STR's outside of just the already proposed zoning.

And I think that using the I forget what the yellow district is...

Maniaci: *Inaudible*

Lamb: *Inaudible*

Emily Hopkins: Okay. So, where Cedar and Elm as we discussed, having that block right there to me shows straight forward right there why we need to consider a Tourism Overlay. I think that there is just some oversight going on as to exactly the uses for where these short-term rentals should be and could be. And I think it's very important to consider that.

I am obviously immersed in tourism. I'm the Tourism Director. I see where this money is going. I see also the tourism dollars that are coming to me to be able to market Washington. Those dollars are significantly increasing year over year. In 2022 over 2021, we had more than a \$50,000 increase in our tourism bed tax. And if anyone would like any of those numbers, I'm happy to provide them. But that was without a significant increase in short-term rentals. Our short-term lodging establishments coming into town that weren't already previously existing.

In my opinion that's going to cap out eventually, which therefore means we are not going to have the rooms available for people when they come to town. The lodging study that happened in 2018 got mentioned and we do we are in need of more rooms. And like I said, with the increase in lodging tax that is happening consistently year over year, even in a post-pandemic world.

We are in need of those rooms excuse me, in need of those rooms. And so whether that is a hotel or short-term rentals, I think that that's something that we really need to keep in mind. And limiting those to just our Downtown District, I think is very much an oversight in my opinion.

I am in favor of regulations. I am in favor of having very strict rules. But I do think that not considering the Tourism Overlay and just where exactly those boundaries would fall is a little bit of an oversight, in my opinion.

Hagedorn: Thanks, Emily.

Emily Hopkins: Thank you.

Hagedorn: Anyone else?

Chelsea Allen: Hi.

Hagedorn: Hi.

Chelsea Allen: Chelsea Allen, 210 Macarthur. I actually just have a question for clarification. You brought up earlier that there was a change in the law that was going to be processed, I believe, with this request to change it from having to go before a judge to being able to have the City Councilmembers revoke a Special Use Permit. Correct?

Maniaci: That is the next item on the agenda.

Chelsea Allen: Okay.

Maniaci: Correct, yes. So, the proposal is to allow Council to be able to revoke a Special Use Permit. And when I say go before a judge right now, we can just do a zoning violation as...*inaudible*

Chelsea Allen: Sure, and you have to wait for the judge to respond. So, and my understanding of this, if you take that consideration, and before you take this consideration and allow you gentlemen to start making decisions based on usages after they've been permitted, then you're not punishing someone for what you think could happen and you're allowing people to show you how the business will thrive. And then if there is an issue, you all have the decision-making abilities to revoke that. And to me, that makes more sense than putting this very strict map in order to not be able to offer other things.

And I think also when we were talking about, you know, the usage of Purina, and I don't have that information, but the amount of income that happens from those shows at Purina, I know people that work there, it's insane the amount of money that goes into that facility. And when you do restrict people to only being able to go downtown, they can't stay downtown with their dogs. So, if you're using a Special Use Permit that's in more of a residential area, they're going to want to stay somewhere where they have a yard and they have the ability to let their dogs out, let them roam, run, you know, whatever. And obviously, these are very well-trained dogs and very high-end things. But I think you have to take into consideration that as well when you're looking at different areas than just say you can go downtown with concrete if you have kids or dogs.

Hagedorn: Thank you. No one else? Okay, discussion?

Patke: I would just like to say thank you to the Planning and Zoning Commission. I know it was a few months' worth of meetings and public hearings, etc. I was part of some of those in the Mayor's absence, but a lot of intelligent conversations went into making it happen. We looked at a cumbersome map that had 150 and 300 and 500', and it covered everything. So again, I think it's a great compromise.

I do understand Emily's point, where we have the one circle like we don't want to have that in our zoning where we have bubble zones out there. But in this case, we leave that go. That is something here but something we can look at again, I think, in the future.

But again, I just want to say thank you to Planning and Zoning Commission for their hard work and putting it forward, and I think it definitely makes sense so, thank you.

Behr: Yeah, I'd agree with that. And I also, you know, thanks everybody for your input tonight, because it's important to hear all the different sides of everything as we sit here and think about it. So...

Patke: Yes.

Behr: I think good points all. And it is, as Sal said, you know, it's a living thing that can be changed and if this is our starting point, then so be it. If it's not and we still tweak it, we can still do that now. But I think it's always going to be changing depending on what that occupancy is and where we're at going into the future.

Hagedorn: We talked a little bit about tonight. Some of you did too, about having the new hotel and we're very aware that the City needs one.

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

* Proposed Code Amendments – Special Use Permit Revocation

May 25, 2023

Honorable Mayor and City Council

City of Washington

Washington, Missouri

Re: Proposed Code Amendments-Special Use Permit Revocation

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

At the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission, held on Monday, May 8, 2023, the Commission reviewed a proposed code change that would allow Council the ability to revoke any Special Use Permit under certain circumstances. The attached code amendment, written by City Counsel, explains the situations where it could be necessary. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the change.

Feel free to reach out with any questions.

Sincerely,

Sal Maniaci

Community and Economic Development Director

Maniaci: Again, as stated this is an amendment to the Special Use Permit section of the code that allows Council under certain circumstances to be able to review an existing Special Use Permit and be able to vote on revocation of that Special Use Permit just as a Special Use Permit sounds like its name, you are able to conditionalize that with certain parameters that a business or that that user property owner has to abide by. And if they are not abiding by that currently, we just have to send them a zoning violation, give them 70 days to respond and then ticket, which is a way to handle that. But sometimes that can take some time. And in this case, if it becomes problematic, if we have repeated calls from a neighbor that they're not following the conditions of their Special Use Permit, we can open up another hearing at City Council to be able to revoke it.

And again, this goes across the board for all special uses in Planning and Zoning, actually two months ago decided that this was something to move forward with and was is a good code change regardless of what happened with short-term lodging.

Piontek: I would add, it's not just revocation, it's also you could do a suspension instead of revocation. So, you don't automatically go to revocation.

Holtmeier: I think it's a great idea.

Patke: Sorry, Joe.

Holtmeier: I think it's a great idea to have this available not only for short-term lodging, for any other permits we had allowed that we can come back and if we have problems and we could revoke them, that's a great, great amendment to add.

Patke: And so, elaborate just a bit, Mark, suspension or revocation of the Special Use Permit is what we've got written here...

Piontek: Correct.

Patke: So, we can regulate whether it's suspended for days, months...

Piontek: Right.

Patke: Or that's a decision of us as a Council also?

Piontek: Correct.

Patke: So, it's not just a they don't pay or they don't follow, we revoke...

Maniaci: I think a good example would be, if say there was screening that was required, they needed to put up fencing or landscaping and then if it were to be torn down, we've had that happen before on Special Use Permits and we've had to send them notices saying you have so many days to put it back up and if they don't comply, we'd have to send a ticket. And then that has to go before a judge. And in this case, we could say, hey, you are, you know...

Patke: *Inaudible*

Maniaci: You're out of compliance...

Patke: Sure.

Maniaci: And we'll bring it for before Council, and they could suspend it until it gets brought in back into conformity.

Patke: Okay.

Lamb: Mark, a question I have with regards to the how this was written up and just so the Council is aware of this. So, items you've got item number three and item number let's item number five, for example, failure of the permitted to pay any tax fee, fine or other governmental charge required by law.

Piontek: Yes.

Lamb: If you apply for a Special Use Permit, I get one, let's just say, to operate a gas station. I've got other properties within the City. As this Council knows, every year you get a list of people that are behind on their taxes. If I don't want somebody if I was a somebody that was opposed to a Special Use Permit for a gas station, I'm just using that again as an example. Can I go ahead and file this to go through this procedure because that individual didn't pay taxes on another piece of property that has nothing to do with the Special Use Permit?

Piontek: No.

Lamb: Okay.

Piontek: No.

Lamb: All right. That's just clarification...

Patke: Only on that piece of property?

Piontek: Yes, it would only be on that property, and it's not instituted by the public. It's instituted here.

Lamb: Okay. Did does that need clarification or could that need I guess because when I read this, I'm looking at violation of anything and then if you look at number three also says violation of any ordinance of the City regulating the permitting.

Piontek: Yes, but if you look at C. 1...

Lamb: Okay.

Piontek: City Council decides whether to refer the matter to Planning and Zoning for record recommendation. And then if it's referred to Planning and Zoning, you go through the same project process for a hearing as you would with the City Council and then ultimately it comes back to the Council for a decision.

Lamb: So, it can't be used as, you know, a vendetta for somebody...

Piontek: No.

Lamb: That didn't get the vote that they wanted to say, hey, they're not paying their taxes over here.

Piontek: It only applies to that part.

Lamb: Okay, just making, and you all understand that.

Wessels: I think that could be clarified. That number five could actually say, you know, tax fees, fines related to

Patke: That property.

Wessels: Yes, that property.

Lamb: My concern is just because Sal or anybody here at City Hall could start to get inundated with people that are like I said, they don't they didn't like the fact that somebody got a Special Use Permit and they want to go ahead and like I said, just do anything within their power to go ahead and stop or revoke it or suspended it.

Piontek: We can clarify it if you want. I think it's already covered because it talks about the failure of the permittee...

Lamb: Okay.

Piontek: To pay the tax. And if they're getting the permit for that parcel...

Lamb: Okay.

Piontek: That's the parcel that it applies to.

Lamb: Okay.

Patke: The Special Use Permit is for that parcel only?

Piontek: That's right. You've got the permit for that parcel; they are the permittee for that parcel.

Patke: And if they're negligent to pay on that parcel...

Piontek: Right.

Patke: Their Special Use Permit could be revoked for that parcel?

Piontek: Correct or suspended.

Patke: Or suspended, sorry.

Lamb: Or if they had for example, if it was a I don't know if we still have this our code, but if it was a liquor store and they didn't get their state license at that location...

Piontek: You could probably see it, although not often. We probably see it with sales tax...

Lamb: Right.

Piontek: When they don't pay their sales tax and then the state comes in and says padlock them.

Lamb: Yes.

Piontek: They didn't pay their sales tax and then if they got a Special Use Permit, you get suspended or revoked.

Lamb: Okay. But just so you guys know, if they're permitted, that doesn't that doesn't apply. This is just for Special Use Permit case.

Hidritch: That was a great point because we all know that there are some people that have five, six other even more properties that are not way behind.

Lamb: Correct.

Hagedorn: Any further discussion before we vote to send this on...

Lamb: You need to open it up to the public.

Hagedorn: Oh, you're right, thank you for reminding me.

Lamb: No problem.

Hagedorn: Sorry about that. Okay, if anyone would like to talk about this proposed code amendment for the revocation of Special Use Permits, please come forward. Okay.

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

Bill No. 23-12814, Ordinance No. 23-13778, an ordinance repealing Section 400.235 of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri and enacting in lieu thereof a new Section 400.235.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

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

CITIZENS COMMENTS

* Julie Howell addressed the Council regarding 604 Hancock Street.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

* None

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

* Renewal of City's Property/Casualty Insurance & Payment Authorization

May 25, 2023

Honorable Mayor & City Council

City of Washington

Washington, Missouri 63090

RE: Renewal of City's Property/Casualty Insurance & Payment Authorization

Honorable Mayor and Council Members:

Administration received the attached proposal for the renewal of the City's Property/Casualty Insurance from our current carrier The Daniel & Henry Company. After reviewing the proposal, it is staff's recommendation to accept the renewal proposal from The Daniel & Henry Company for July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024, with the following changes:

- 1. Property and Equipment Floater coverages to move from Travelers to Chubb*
- 2. Crime Coverage:*

Enter into a three-year policy with Travelers for a savings of \$365.00

Due to the short timeframe for renewal, staff is requesting payment authorization at this time as well.

Amy Diblasi from The Daniel & Henry Company will be present at the June 5, 2023, Council Meeting to answer any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Darren Lamb

City Administrator

Attachment

A motion to accept and approve the renewal of the City's Property/Casualty Insurance and authorized payment made by Councilmember Hidritch, seconded by Councilmember Patke, passed without dissent.

ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS

Bill No. 23-12815, Ordinance No. 23-13779, an ordinance authorizing and directing the City of Washington, Missouri to enter into an Owner's Representative Agreement with Eagan Building Group, LLC for Construction Improvements including the City Auditorium Roof Insulation.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Patke.

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

Bill No. 23-12816, Ordinance No. 23-13780, an ordinance accepting the Quote from Redexim North America, Inc. for the purchase of a Blecavator.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Behr.

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

Bill No. 23-12817, Ordinance No. 23-13781, an ordinance accepting the Quote from American Ramp Company for the purchase of Skate Park Features at Optimist Park.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Behr.

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

Bill No. 23-12818, Ordinance No. 23-13782, an ordinance accepting the Quote from MTI Distributing for the purchase of a Workman UTX.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Patke.

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

Bill No. 23-12819, Ordinance No. 23-13783, an ordinance authorizing and directing the City of Washington, Missouri to enter into a Sales Contract with Fabick Cat for the purchase of a Caterpillar 953 Track Loader with Extended Protection Plan.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

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

Bill No. 23-12820, Ordinance No. 23-13784, an ordinance enacting Sections 221.010, of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

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

Bill No. 23-12821, Ordinance No. 23-13785, an ordinance amending Section 700.020 of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Hidritch.

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

Bill No. 23-12822, Ordinance No. 23-13786, an ordinance amending Section 700.140 of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri and adding thereto two new sections 700.141 and 700.142.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Hidritch.

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

Bill No. 23-12823, Ordinance No. 23-13787, an ordinance amending Section 700.320 of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Hidritch.

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

Bill No. 23-12824, Ordinance No. 23-13788, an ordinance providing for the approval and acceptance of Minimum Improvements for Maintenance for “The Creek at Koch Farm” Subdivision in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

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

(Remaining of page intentionally left blank)

Bill No. 23-12825, Ordinance No. 23-13789, an ordinance authorizing and directing the acceptance of a General Release and Settlement Agreement by and between the City of Washington, Missouri and Kist, LLC.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

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

Resolution No. 23-13790, a resolution authorizing the City of Washington, Missouri to apply for funding through the Franklin County Transportation Committee for the Third Street Overlay and Improvements Project in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

The resolution was introduced by Councilmember Patke, seconded by Councilmember Holtmeier. With no further discussion, the resolution passed.

COMMISSION, COMMITTEE AND BOARD REPORTS

Bill No. 23-12826, Ordinance No. 23-13791, an ordinance approving the Final Plat of Stone Crest Subdivision Plat 18, in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

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

Bill No. 23-12827, Ordinance No. 23-13792, an ordinance approving the Final Plat of W-W Industrial Park Plat 3, in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

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

MAYOR'S REPORT

- * Please keep Councilmember Duane Reed in your prayers.
- * Next Council Meeting – Tuesday, June 20, 2023, due to the Juneteenth Holiday.
- * Discussion on the July 3rd Council Meeting.
- * Brief discussion on 604 Hancock Street.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- * None

COUNCIL COMMENTS

- * None

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 8:40 p.m. on the following roll call vote; Holtmeier-aye, Briggs-aye, Wessels-aye, Patke-nay, Coulter-aye, Behr-aye, Hidritch-aye, Reed-absent.

The regular session reconvened at 9:25 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn made at 9:25 p.m. by Councilmember Behr, seconded by Councilmember Holtmeier passed without dissent.

Adopted: _____

Attest: _____
City Clerk

President of City Council

Passed: _____

Attest: _____
City Clerk

Mayor of Washington, Missouri