



Watertown Planning Commission Minutes

Donald Hendricks
Elizabeth Schulze
Jennifer O'Connell
James Rivord
Jim Sandquist
Jim Kasheimer
Ali Parsons-Towle
Dan Schuette

6/8/2023 - Minutes

1. Call To Order & Roll Call:

Commission Chair Kasheimer called the Watertown Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. on June 8, 2023, in the council chambers of City Hall.

Commission Members Present: Donald Hendricks, Jennifer O'Connell, James Rivord, Jim Sandquist, Jim Kasheimer, Dan Schuette, and Ali Parsons.

Commission Members Absent: Elizabeth Schulze.

Staff Present: City Administrator Jake Foster, Administrative Services Director Maggie Reisdorf, and City Planner Mark Kaltsas, Amy Schmidt City Attorney.

Others Present:

Craig McCullum - 1011 Trebbiano Lane North
Tim Mahoney - 635 Industrial
Sandra Ladino - 1020 Trebbiano Lane
Becky Reinemanu - 1038 Trebbiano Lane S
Joe Mildenderger - 1038 Trebbiano Lane S
Russ Lalim - 1023 Trebbiano Lane N
Angela Lalim - 1023 Trebbiano Lane N
Raul LaVarra - 685 Sienna Drive
Brandon Stein - 107 Shepherdia Court
Shawn Nelson - 699 Sienna Drive
Mary Jech - 1044 Trebbiano Lane
Jake Hodge - 443 Hunter Drive
Steph Hodge - 443 Hunter Drive
Connor Ploen - 2910 Highway 25
Linda Berg - 1980 Sally Ave

Brad Kipp – 1053 Trebbiano
Doug Boyum – 1041 Trebbiano N
Mike Icks – 501 CO 10 SE
Diane & Scott Chapman – 1035 Trebbiano
David & Mary Sloneker – 1047 Trebbiano Lane N
Mark J. Huber – 1012 Trebbiano Lane
Claudia Taylor – 2930 HWY 25
Donna Kipp – 1053 Trebbiano Lane
Mike Walters – 832 Quail Pkwy
David Mandt – 303 Monarda Way
Rob Hanson – 809 Madison ST SE
Scott & Danette Painschab – 509 CR 10 SE
Greg Pearson – 1017 Trebbiano Lane N
Paul & Joan Nesvold – 3995 Quaas Ave
John & Deb Van Tassel – 932 Deerfield Rd
Mark Stutsman – 912 Dutchmans Way
Jenny & Joe Elkjer – 1032 Trebbiano Lane S
Jason & Kim Jewison – 916 Dutchmans Way SE
Nancy Burns – 1002 Trebbiano Lane N
Matt Havlik - 837 Dutchmans Way
Raul LaParra - 685 Sienna Dr
Ann Bimberg - 303 Arnica

2. Adopt Agenda:

PARSONS MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. O'CONNELL SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 7-0.

3. New Business

3.A. 3A - Minutes - March 2, 2023

HENDRICKS MOVED TO ADOPT THE MARCH 2, 2023; MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. PARSONS SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 7-0.

3.B. 3B - Adjustment Of Regular Meeting Schedule

Foster introduced this item to the Planning Commission. He informed that due to upcoming and permanent conflicts with the schedule of the City Planning Consultant, Mark Kaltsas, that staff is recommending moving the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meetings from the fourth (4th) Thursday of each month to the second (2nd) Thursday of each month.

Foster explained that a motion would have to include the recommended change to be changed within the Planning Commission Bylaws.

RIVORD MOVED TO AMEND THE CITY OF WATERTOWN PLANNING COMMISSION BLYAWS AS RECOMMENDED TO CHANGE THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS FROM THE FOURTH (4TH) THURSDAY OF THE MONTH TO THE SECOND (2ND) THURSDAY OF THE MONTH. HENDRICKS SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 7-0.

3.C. 3C - Site Plan Review For 635 Industrial Blvd.

Kaltsas introduced this item to the Planning Commission. He informed that applicant, Tim Mahoney, and Rice Lake Development III, LLC (landowner) are requesting that the City consider the following action for the property located at 635 Industrial Blvd (PID 85-4610010) in the City of Watertown.

Kaltsas said that the applicants are asking for a site plan review by the Planning Commission to allow for a new commercial building and the associated site improvements on the property.

Kaltsas stated that subject property is located within the City's Business/Industrial Park. He informed that the property is located along Industrial Blvd and abuts up to properties located in Watertown Township. Kaltsas said that the property is currently vacant with no structures or improvements.

Kaltsas reviewed the zoning as MU-BRLI (Mixed-Use Business, Residential, Light Industrial) Subzone C. He said that the 2040 Comprehensive Plan has it as Mixed Use and that the acreage is .64 Acres.

Kaltsas explained that the City Code requires a Site Plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit for the construction of any building or intensification of any building or use within the jurisdictional limits.

Kaltsas reviewed the proposal. He informed that the applicant is seeking a site plan approval to construct a new shop/auto repair shop that specializes in specific types of vehicles. He explained that the shop would have four indoor service bays as well as a workshop, office, and lounge/break room.

Kaltsas informed that this use is permitted within Subzone C of the MU-BRLI zoning district. He explained that outdoor storage is not permitted and would, if desired, require a Conditional Use Permit. Kaltsas said that the applicant is hoping to locate two storage containers on the property that would provide for outdoor storage.

Kaltsas stated that the city has performed a detailed review of the proposed building and site plan development. He informed that there are still several aspects of the development that need additional information to be submitted to the city. This includes revised plans. Kaltsas said that a more in-depth review of the site plan has been completed by staff.

Kaltsas reviewed the MU-BRLI, Subzone C requirements and how the plans met those requirements, and which were asked to be resubmitted. He reviewed the Site layout/parking, utilities/stormwater/grading, fire department comments/landscaping and tree preservation requirements, lighting/signage, and building architecture.

Within those items, he noted that setbacks would be met, there would be seven (7) parking spots, 30% impervious service, curb and gutter, stormwater review from the City Engineer and submission of stormwater plans to the Carver County Water Management Organization. Kaltsas informed that the Fire Department is recommending a drive isle around the entire building for fire emergency access. Kaltsas also went into detail about planting four (4) trees and hedges around the parking area. Kaltsas reviewed the lighting plan and the need for a signage permit if the applicant were to desire an onsite sign.

Kaltsas reviewed the architecture of the building and the design standards required for the MU-BRLI District.

There was discussion on the outside building materials. He informed that the building would have a shingled roof and be a post frame building.

Kaltsas informed that the Planning Commission is to hold a Public Hearing on the Site Plan and provide feedback to staff.

KASHEIMER MOVED TO CLOSE THE REGULAR MEETING AND OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:54 PM.

Kasheimer stated general guidelines for the public hearing process:

1. If coming to the podium to speak, state name and address. Each person limited to three minutes of speaking.

2. Reduce redundant comments.
3. Sign In at the door on the sign in sheet.
4. Direct comments to the Commission Chair.
5. Be Respectful
6. No interruptions

Claudia Taylor – Taylor Meats asked that the height of the building would be and if it met City Code. She asked if a brick apron was required to go around the entire bottom of the building. She asked if the Fire Department were to respond to an emergency if they would have to use her property's driveway to gain access. She asked about plowing in the winter months.

Kaltsas informed that the building would be 18 feet tall (wall height) with an additional 6 feet (roof) for a total height of 24 feet. He said that this was well within City Code.

Foster informed that there were not submitted comments before the meeting on the site plan.

KASHEIMER MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND REOPEN THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AT 6:58 PM.

O'Connell asked Kaltsas to review the Fire Department request in more detail.

Kaltsas stated that the Fire Department currently has adequate access at the North and South of the building in the case of a fire, but that they are recommending more space on the West and East sides of the building (about 16 feet) for emergencies. Kaltsas said that the site plan does not currently reflect something that the Fire Department recommends, but that staff will continue to work with the applicant to find something that works. Kaltsas said that the intent is not to use offsite driveways for access.

Kasheimer asked about snow plowing if the site were developed.

Kaltsas informed that staff would have to discuss this further with Public Works staff.

Sandquist inquired to whether the applicant would be having outdoor storage.

Kaltsas stated no that there would not be any outdoor storage and therefore there would be no screening requirements.

Sandquist asked about garbage storage.

Kaltsas stated that staff is still working with the applicant to determine if garbage will be pulled inside each week or if it will be outside. If outside, Kaltsas said it would need an enclosure.

Rivord asked about the two access doors and if the doors required lighting and a concrete pad at the entrances.

Kaltsas informed that it would have to meeting State Building Code. He referenced the site plan including perimeter lights on the building.

Rivord asked about the retaining wall height.

Kaltsas stated 2 ½ feet tall.

Kaltsas discussed building materials and what the applicant is proposing. He informed that later in the meeting, the Planning Commission was going to discuss Planning Code as it related to building materials.

Hendricks stated that the goal of the Zoning Code building material requirements is to have different

materials on the building as an aesthetic.

Kaltsas stated that since materials are changing rapidly and requests for these new materials is increasing, that the Planning Commission needs to review its requirements and determine whether the new materials are acceptable and how.

There was discussion about having two materials on the building and both wrapping around the entire building.

Kaltsas informed that staff is looking for a recommendation from the Planning Commission to City Council regarding the Site Plan. He recommended that any motion include the staff recommendations if approved and recommended to the City Council.

HENDRICKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN FOR 635 INDUSTRIAL BLVD WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND TO HAVE BOTH BUILDING (SIDING) MATERIALS GO ENTIRELY AROUND THE BUILDING. PARSONS SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 7-0.

3.D. 3D - The Cove At River Ridge Preliminary Plat

Kaltsas introduced this item to the Planning Commission. Kaltsas informed that an application was submitted by Robert Machacek (Alliant Ventures X LLC) and Nesvold Farms LLC (Property Owner) for a preliminary plat review at PID 85-0090620 in the City of Watertown.

Kaltsas reviewed the application requests that include the rezoning of the property from A- Agriculture to Planned Unit Development (PUD), and that the preliminary plat and site plan consider the subdivision of the property into 83 single-family lots.

Kaltsas did a review of the property/site information and its location on the east side of CSAH 11 between Tuscany Village and Sugarbush subdivisions. He informed that the land is currently pasture, wetland, and woodlands. He said that there is no structures currently on the property.

Kaltsas informed that the zoning is currently A-1: Agriculture, with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan guiding it as Low Density Residential. He stated that it is 32.83 acres.

Kaltsas provided a review of the background of the property stating that in 2021, the City reviewed a sketch plat of the property. He informed that that applicant decided not to move forward with the development. He said that in 2022, a new developer approached the City about moving forward with a similar design to that of the sketch plat.

Kaltsas stated that the property is located between two residential developments and fully surrounds the Lutheran Elementary School. He informed that the property is zoned agricultural and guided as low density residential. He said that the applicant would like the City to consider the development of 83 new single-family lots under a PUD. Kaltsas explained that 26 lots would be proposed on the north side of the development and 57 would be proposed on the south side. He informed that the net density of the development would be 3.52 units per acre.

Kaltsas reviewed a breakdown of the proposed lots.

Kaltsas stated that the property to the south of the development is zoned PUD-TV (Planned Unit Development – Tuscany Village) and that the property to the north and west are zoned R-1 Low Density Residential.

He referenced the lot standards of these developments.

Kaltsas stated that the applicant is proposing to develop the north and south ends of the development to mirror the developments that they are adjacent to.

Kaltsas went into review of the preliminary plat review process. He informed that the City conducted a formal and detailed review of the preliminary plat submittal. He stated that there are several items/plans that are required to be submitted for the preliminary plat to be complete. He said that those include an approved and final wetland delineation, street lighting plan, and tree inventory list.

Kaltsas provided staff comments to the Planning Commission that were provided to the applicant. They included items related to the Site Plan Review, Landscaping and Tree Preservation, Utilities/Stormwater/Grading, and Building Architecture.

Kaltsas summarized the review by stating that the City needs to consider whether the proposed preliminary plat is consistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and in keeping with the character of the surrounding properties. He stated that the proposed layout attempts to establish reasonable transition between the adjacent single-family housing to the north and the existing detached and attached houses and townhouses to the south.

He said that the city will need to consider whether the proposed preliminary plat accomplishes the intent of a PUD with considerations around the preservation of natural resources and open space, and a more efficient use of the land.

Kaltsas explained that at this moment, the City is being asked to consider the preliminary plat for the property and has identified ways that the proposed development could be slightly modified to better achieve the intent of a PUD. Kaltsas stated that modifications could include the removal of a few lots to preserve a significant stand of the existing trees along the east side of the site, the inclusion of sidewalks and a trail in accordance with policy, and a more efficient grading plan for lots that currently have little usable yard space.

Kaltsas said that the following other items would be considered during the final platting process including building architecture, materials, construction details, landscaping, drainage, and grading.

Kaltsas informed that staff is seeking discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission relating to the requested application.

KASHEIMER MOVED TO CLOSE THE REGULAR MEETING AND OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:40 PM.

Brap Kipp (1053 Trebbiano) stated that he was representing many residents from the Tuscan Homeowner's Association. He said that they are all against rezoning the property to a PUD. He explained that the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan doesn't align with this land being developed as a PUD as it is currently platted. He informed that the goal of the Comp. Plan is to maintain high quality, natural environments such as this parcel of land. He said that the development must complement neighboring properties of rural character. He referenced the water, trees, and wetland on the property. He explained that the land is environmentally sensitive, and that the development plan needs to preserve the environmental features more. He said that those within the Tuscan Homeowner's Association are requesting a development that is zoned R-1 Low Density and preserves more natural elements.

Craig McCallum (1011 Trebbiano Lane) informed that the rezone to a PUD would impact neighboring property values and therefore does not recommend a PUD development on the property. He stated that the 2040 Comprehensive Plan proposed an R-1 Low Density Development. He said that 83 homes is not in line with the Comprehensive Plan. He said that he welcomes growth, but that this proposal does not match the city's plans. **He provided a petition with 57+ resident signatures**

Mark Huber (1012 Trebbiano Lane) said that he has lived in the city for 5 years. He expressed concern about security and safety with the proposed PUD Development. He explained that he enjoys the one entrance in and out of the neighborhood, stating that it keeps crime low. He felt that two entrances would increase crime activity. He said that if Sienna Drive access was opened that traffic would

increase heavily. He recommended against it. He said that he appreciated the Planning Commission's consideration. He expressed support for lower density housing and no PUD.

David Mandt (303 Monarda Way) explained that he used to work for the City of Watertown and that he is pro-growth. He explained that he is against the PUD however. He reviewed his participation on previous city comprehensive plan documents and how the documents are heavily supported and drafted with resident input. He said that the comprehensive plan makes sure that planning fits with residential desires and needs and that natural preservation is highly stressed. Mandt reviewed other developments in which the city asked developers to preserve/add natural features and how compromise did happen. He asked the Planning Commission to think back to the residents that commented on the comprehensive plan and what their desires were.

Nancy Burns (1002 Trebbiano Lane N) explained that the trail through the wetlands is priceless and a lovely asset to the community. He expressed concern about 84% tree loss with the development and how tragic that would be for the community.

Doug Boyum (1041 Trebbiano N) stated that he agreed with the other comments. He expressed concern about the lots being 20 – 30 feet from one another and being able to hear neighbors' conversations from their decks. He said that he has never seen houses so close before. He said that the neighborhood is beautiful with beautiful homes and is concerned about the development impacting property values.

John Van Tassel (932 Deerfield Rd) thanked the Planning Commission for serving. He referenced the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and that the Planning Commission approved that document. He asked that the Planning Commission reference and stick to that plan as it was a very intentional planning document.

Danette Painschab (509 CR 10 SE) expressed concern over the impact on the roads that the development would have. She said that she already sees many crashes with the school traffic nearby. She said that adding more homes would increase traffic issues. She also referenced the current "trail to nowhere" and that the street is not safe for children to be walking on. She asked that the trail connection be considered with any development for safety reasons and that it needs to be addressed if more housing is to come in.

Ann Bimberg (303 Arnica) stated that she has lived in the Wildflower Development for about 21 years and plead that the aesthetics of the community be preserved. She informed that the natural lands and wetlands are precious and help mental health. She said that they bring people joy and to please take that into consideration.

Robbie Illies informed that he has been in his house since 2001 and that a developer at that time promised that the land would never be developed behind his house. He said that it is shocking to hear proposals for development and that the promise needs to be kept.

Scott Painschab (509 CR 10 SE) said that the Planning Commission needs to not compare the development lot to the neighboring lots, but to the entire area as well, specifically mentioned the land across the County Road.

Matt Havlik (837 Dutchmans Way) expressed concern about development construction traffic going through his neighborhood. He informed that he had a \$17,000 street assessment for his street to be redone and that construction equipment would damage the street.

Brandon Stein (107 Shepherdia Court) informed that he is approved to the development. He said that he likes the small town feel and that 83 hours is too much. He expressed concern over the tree loss and the destruction of natural lands. He stated that more houses and people increase traffic and reduces neighborhood safety. He said that property values will skyrocket equaling higher taxes. He referenced developments in Delano.

Raul LaParra (685 Sienna Dr) expressed concern about the PUD. He referenced Delano and Waconia Developments and said that the developments there have been all PUD with no trees and natural features. He asked that the Planning Commission pay attention to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and stick to it.

Foster stated that the city received a letter from Jason and Kim Jewison at 916 Dutchmans Way SE. He said that their letter expressed similar concerns to those already mentioned, especially trees and density concerns.

KASHEIMER MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND REOPEN THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AT 8:07 PM.

Rivord mentioned that he has been serving on the Planning Commission for some time. He explained that they are a recommending body to the City Council and stated that many of the City Council members were in the audience as well that evening. He explained that their role is to ensure that current city zoning code is being enforced and met. He referenced the value of housing and tree preservation. He explained that the developer owns the land, and that the city only ensures that city code is being followed. Rivord expressed concern over the development being a PUD; especially with the small yard setbacks proposed. He said that the development would be better with less lots.

Hendricks thanked everyone in the audience for their comments and that they would be considered. He stated that each parcel of land has unique characteristics and circumstances to consider. He informed that he supports affordable and diverse housing options within the city and would like to see more options for young people. He stressed that the city needs diverse housing. He mentioned that the Tuscany Village Development, that many of them live in, is a PUD. He said that the Planning Commission has a lot that needs to be taken into consideration. He said that the developer does have say in what happens on the property because they own it and that the city just ensures guidelines are being met. He said that the land will develop eventually because development is a part of growing cities.

Parsons thanked everyone for their respectful comments and conversation. She informed that she loves the wetlands and natural features. She explained that she felt that developing as a PUD "is a bridge too far" and references the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

O'Connell said that she admired all the comments from the audience and Planning Commission. She said that growth and development can be tough as everyone has different desires.

Sandquist thanked everyone for their comments and stated that this property is difficult because it is an "infill development" and not on the perimeter of the city like most developments. He mentioned that he liked that the developments were matching those of the north and south.

Rivord mentioned that with the Forest Hills development, there were many trees that were removed with that development.

Sandquist stated that he would like to see the full tree inventory report finalized.

Kaltsas explained that the report did indeed need to be finished and that it currently included tree numbers and locations, but not species data. He stated that City Code requires a 1/1 replacement for some trees.

Parsons asked Kaltsas about the intent of a PUD and if under the city's PUD definition and listed requirements, did all need to be met for a PUD to be approved.

Kaltsas referred to the PUD process as a "tool" that the city can use to achieve things that the city desires with a proposed development. He provided examples such as preservation of natural elements and open space preservation. He explained that a PUD doesn't have to be used. He referenced that a PUD was used in past developments as a way for the city to ask a developer for different housing types, saving natural spaces, and asking for multiple housing types instead of one.

Sandquist explained that the current tree canopy is valuable and that more needs to be known about what will be removed and the amount. He also asked about the County Road 10 approval process and if a study was conducted by Carver County and what changes were recommended to provide safety with new growth.

Kaltsas said that the study showed the need of a turn lane to what is currently shown as "Street A". He informed that it was a significant review process by Carver County.

Rivord stated that he preferred to see sidewalks on both sides of the street within any new development. He said that walking trail and connectivity is important.

Parsons said that she would like to see the final wetland delineation plans finalized.

Kaltsas confirmed that some minor adjustments still need to be made to that plan. He did say that no residential lots are allowed wetland buffer or wetland on the property.

Rivord expressed concern about the lots with limited lot space within the back yards.

Kaltsas agreed that all lots should have some usable space to prevent future concerns.

Kasheimer thanks everyone for coming and being respectful. He informed that he supports growth but also is supportive of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan in that there was a lot of community time, effort, and feedback put into the document and therefore it needs to be strongly considered.

Parsons felt that this property was unique and that the developer's current plan does not meet the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Kaltsas reviewed the options to the Planning Commission for consideration. He said that they included approving the preliminary plat with conditions, denial of the preliminary plat citing that it doesn't meet the 2040 Comprehensive Plan or tabling it and providing the developer with necessary changes before bringing back for further review.

Kasheimer said that he is against the current small lot sizes and would like to see those lots increased. He said that he understands that it is the developer's property but has concerns about the number of trees that would be removed. He felt that more could be done to preserve natural elements if platted a little differently.

Hendricks suggested removing some of the current lots.

Rivord explained that there are a lot of unanswered questions, and more information is needed. He asked that the developer redesign to reduce the impact to natural features.

RIVORD MOVED TO TABLE THE APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR THE COVE AT RIVER RIDGE DEVELOPMENT UNTIL MOVE INFORMATION COULD BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION, INCLUDING A REEVALUATION OF LOT SETBACKS AND TREE PRESERVATION. HENDRICKS SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 7-0.

Hendricks added that staff provide more information from Carver County on the driveway recommendations for the lots right off Highway 10.

3.E. 3E - Building Materials Discussion

Kaltsas introduced this item to the Planning Commission. He informed that the city has been approached several times relating what building materials are allowed. He explained that depending on the project, the city must review and discuss siding and roofing materials and determine whether they

meet the City Code and/or design standards.

Kaltsas provided a review of City Code Section 62-476 – Construction Standards and Section 52-213 Design Standards, as well as Highway 25 Mixed Use Design Guidelines: Subzone C – Residential/Commercial.

Kaltsas stated that the city has recently been approached by someone asking about using a textured finished metal panel and asking whether it would be considered a metal or non-metal material. He said that the product is call Strukturoc.

Kaltsas reviewed standing seam metal roofing and roofs throughout the city with concealed fasteners and those with exposed fasteners.

Kaltsas stated that staff is encouraging the Planning Commission to discuss and consider if the City Code should be reviewed to include new and different types of products that are starting to enter the market. Kaltsas said that staff is looking for guidance on the intent of the City's ordinance as it is currently written and how or if an alternative "metal" coated panel would meet the current requirements.

Kaltsas added that staff would also like guidance and discussion on concealed fasteners versus exposed fasteners as it relates to metal roofing.

Hendricks agreed that building materials are changing significantly and therefore the City Code should be reviewed and possibly updated.

Rivord agreed that there is more of a variety today and the city needs to determine where these materials fit within the City Code.

The Planning Commission discussed the current 50% product requirement as it relates to a building design and materials.

SCHUETTE LEFT THE MEETING AT 8:53 PM

The Planning Commission agreed that the City Code needs to be clearer on materials and the percentage of coverage needed for various materials.

4. Staff Updates:

Foster stated that there has been some discussion from a developer about building a hardware store within the downtown of Watertown. He said that no application has been received this time, however.

Foster said that he expected the Spring Mills Development to come back to the Planning Commission in July or August for review.

5. Adjournment:

RIVORD MOVED TO CLOSE THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AT 9:11 PM. HENDRICKS SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 6-0.

309 Lewis Avenue South; P.O. Box 279, Watertown, MN 55388