

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: February 11, 2016

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met February 11, 2016 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, Dan Mol, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with all Board members present. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning office; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present.

On a motion by Borrell, seconded by Felger, the minutes for the January 14, 2016 meeting were approved with correction to page 17 para. P) insert the word not met the criteria; and page 23, replace the word “night” with “year” in the last para.

Agenda was amended to add #10 action to designate the location of public posting of agendas; also add #11 discussion on Commercial Agricultural Tourism.

1. COREY L. MARTIN – Cont. from 1/14/16

LOCATION: 2886 County Road 8 NW – 6 acre parcel, described as part of N ½ of the NW 1/2, Section 20, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Chatham Twp.) Tax #203-000-202203

Petitions for an “after-the-fact” Conditional Use Permit for commercial outdoor recreation for a group events such as weddings to be held outdoors between the months of May through October.

Present: Corey & Anastasia Martin

- A. Riley summarized the hearings and site inspection that led to action directing Staff to develop a motion consistent with the discussion at the last meeting. He directed the Commission to the Staff Report for a suggested motion which the applicant has seen. The public hearing was not closed.
- B. Mol opened up comments to the public, hearing no response, the matter returned to the Board for questions and comments.
- C. Borrell suggested the condition on amplified music might be extended from 10 p.m. to 11 p.m. and by 12 midnight everyone vacate the property. He asked if liquor is catered in for all events, Martin responded yes. Borrell does not think security would be needed for events that are not serving liquor.
- D. Borrell moved to approve a Conditional Use Permit for commercial outdoor recreation for a group events in accord with the narrative and site plan on file with the following conditions:
 - 1) The maximum number of people on site at any one time must be limited to 200;
 - 2) Events are limited to a maximum of 18 and are only allowed on weekends and during the months of May through October;
 - 3) Events to start no earlier than 11 a.m.; no amplified music is allowed and all music must cease by 11:00 p.m. and all activities must cease by 12 Midnight. Overnight stays or camping on the premise as a result of a business related activity is prohibited;
 - 4) All food and liquor must be catered in with licensed caterers and cannot be prepared on site;
 - 5) Security must be present at all events;
 - 6) Parking is approved

in accord with plans presented, however the County reserves the right to require improved parking in the future, if complications arise. No parking on the road at any time; 7) All events must take place outdoors and the use of any buildings are prohibited (this includes the house and the barn). Tents are allowed for the events and shelter but must be removed after the event is over; 8) Porta-potties would need to be provided for each event and meet County guidelines; and 9) Any changes to these conditions would require an amended Conditional Use Permit. D. Thompson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Felger suggested an amendment clarify that is a maximum of 18 events in any given year. Discussion on the additional hour and Pederson questioned if there is enough distinction between this use and the winery to extend the hours. Borrell noted the applicant asked for it and he would support the additional hours in the CUP issued the winery if they came in and asked. Mol noted there has not been a lot of issues with neighbors. J. Thompson –asked if the applicant has requested these hours. C. Martin stated he was asking for music to Midnight, with everyone vacating the property by 1:00 a.m.

VOTE: CARRIED, J. Thompson voted nay

2. **DUINNICK, INC.** – Cont. from 1/14/16

LOCATION: Part of SE ¼ of SE ¼, Section 14, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, MN.
(Southside Twp.) Tax #217-000-144401 Property owner: Duinnick Bros., Inc.
Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit as regulated in Section 604.4 & 727 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to allow mining and processing gravel/granular materials and processing of recycled materials. Operations to include a wash plant and placement of a hot-mix asphalt plant along with related stockpiling.

Present: Jason VerSteeg

- A. Riley noted the first hearing was continued for a site inspection. He reviewed the zoning and land use maps, noting this is in the Aggregate Resource Area of the Plan. Air photo displayed shows the existing conditions. Plans for the proposed operations and a reclamation plan were submitted. Riley pointed out the contours proposed on the reclamation plan show a 1062 elevation. A pond needs to be deeper or filled in.
- B. VerSteeg stated the request is similar to other uses going on in the area. The plan is to mine and reclaim according to the requirements of the Ordinance. Mol opened comments up to the public, hearing none, the Commission had discussion on the matter.
- C. Pederson asked if they get a bid how many acres would they open up to mine. VerSteeg indicated to begin they would only open up a 4-5 acre area. Pederson stated he is questioning whether they should require the berm around the entire site to shield the operations from the road. With only a small area opened up that is a good distance off the road, would a small operation be offensive to anyone. VerSteeg – noted to begin there would not be enough material stripped off, would only be able to berm a portion. Agreed over time that would be completed. Would start the berm once they start mining. Borrell referred to condition #4. Riley explained the recommendation is to start on 90th Street. The excavation is expected to take place at that location with the place equipment and stockpiles. This is a new pit and it is up to the Commission as to what improvements need to take place. Riley noted Staff have no way of knowing when the mining would begin, where and how much. Would it be done in phases? VerSteeg explained although they do not have phases laid out, the typical operation would strip the material and continue building the berm as they mine.
- D. Lengthy discussion followed on the timing of the berm and establishment of tree screening. Mol suggested getting this screening started this year regardless of whether they mine. They have operators that do that in other places around the County. Riley noted the bituminous plant is usually needed for a season; and, the Commission could have the applicant come back next year to re-evaluate. VerSteeg indicated at this time, they have no project in the area for the coming season and is the reason they asked for a longer time frame. J. Thompson felt the trees should be placed along the perimeter, not on top of the berm; and the screening could be established with cedar trees which are native to the area and do well. VerSteeg stated they have details to show what they are thinking, they are not opposed to cedar, but had noted evergreens on the plan. J. Thompson noted much mining

is going on in Southside Township which she is a resident of. She questioned the depth. VerSteeg stated the resource could go as deep in some locations as 16'. The average mining depth is 6-13'. J. Thompson questioned what the end use might be. VerSteeg indicated at this location it would likely be a wildlife area or put back into farmland. Some areas they have mined, the property develops for industrial or residential uses.

- E. Some Commission members directed the applicant to NCRS for recommendation on tree species and indicated it should be fast growing, cedar is known to be slow growing; and a species that would do well in this area.
- F. Riley clarified that the applicant would not bring equipment to this site before the mining starts. If the applicant plans to prepare things, they need to address dates and times.
- G. Borrell would agree the applicant should get the trees growing and plant the trees along both roads. VerSteeg understands, but stated it could be another five years before they go in and mine. He noted they have had a ten-year permit with no activity.
- H. Felger noted part of the application includes processing recycled concrete and bituminous and asked if there would be any stockpiles of that material on the site before mining starts? VerSteeg indicated that could be possible. He would be agreeable to getting the trees established before they would do that.
- I. Bravinder questioned whether it is a good idea to plant trees if they are farming the land in the meantime. He understood the plantings would not be required until they started to stockpile material in the 2004 permit. Riley noted this permit will end in five years. The other permit was in 2004 and they no longer approve open ended permits. The Commission discussed the trees at their Committee meeting and the difficulty putting the land back into farmland. D. Thompson asked if they would start bringing in materials now? VerSteeg stated no, they would first get the berm built and trees in. Pederson suggested a large shrub or small tree might be easier to remove after it is mined out and before they farm the land again. He would agree to start the berm next to the entrance and build it in both directions to the extent it is needed to strip off the top soil, rather than build it around the entire perimeter. J. Thompson asked how that would solve the view problem for the residents. She pointed to the Maalco location where the trees were only planted along Highway 55 and from the north side there is nothing screening the operation. Pederson – stated he is addressing this from the economic point of view, did not think they would want to strip the entire property, but rather keep farming it. Stripping the entire property at one time would result in a weed patch.
- J. Felger moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit and asked for help to clarify the conditions

DISCUSSION FOLLOWED ON DEVELOPING CONDITIONS:

VerSteeg noted the plans show spacing and type of tree, but agreed to plant what the NCRS suggests. He noted if they only use the topsoil where they strip and begin mining, there would only be enough material for a berm a foot high around the property.

Riley stated if they are thinking the berm and plantings should coincide with the actual mining operations, they could evaluate the progress in five years. The mining will depend on the projects the Company gets and if they get a lot of projects, there could be half the berm and a lot of mining going on. Mol – the unknown makes it difficult and it might be best to wait until they have a project before issuing a permit. Riley summarized what they are looking at is a plan and a five-year mining permit. That is fine to allow work in stages; but, should require they put on paper what has happened before a renewal.

Pederson asked what is the height of the berm? VerSteege the plans show 3' high, similar to the nearby Harddrive pit. Pederson felt if 5-6 acres are stripped off that might be enough to build the berm along the south side. Bravinder agreed, if they get the trees planted and put up the berm as the top soil becomes available, it should be sufficient to start on the west edge of 90th and work east. J. Thompson – but if they should start mining in the other corner, it would not make sense. She is concerned the residents in the nice home on the south should be shielded. Pederson felt what they are talking about should shield those owners. Mol – noted that is the area where the road would be brought into the site.

Pederson the language in #4 could be changed so the berm would not have to be complete. Discussion on hours of operation. VerSteege – requesting 7-7, Monday-Saturday which is consistent with the 2005 permit and included the asphalt plant for the first year. Commission clarified they are only looking at one year permit for the plant. Mol – noted another pit was restricted to the number of Saturdays. Riley –that pit had no consecutive Saturdays. That condition was added because of the particular location and was added over time. The concern in that area was there was more than one asphalt plant. He reviewed the hours requested by the applicant. They did not spell out the hours of the asphalt plant.

Felger **withdrew his motion** because of the potential changes suggested. He questioned if the way the motion reads would require that mining cannot take place until the berm is completed. Placement of an asphalt plant is not mining and if they start any other operations would that mean they do not have to have a berm. Mol – noted they would be using the gravel to make the tar. Felger –clarification on his question is whether crushing some materials that is not mining would that negate the requirement for a berm. D. Thompson – he understood the applicant would have a berm before they crush. A condition could clarify #4, that the berm is required before any operations. VerSteege would agree to that condition. Riley reviewed the location of the homes and to properly build turn and by-pass lanes, the berm would need to be in that location.

J. Thompson – has heard some comments opposed to planting trees at this time; however, considering the aesthetics of the area she did not think it was too much to ask the applicant to put trees in to prepare the site ahead of mining. The use will detract views. As a resident of Southside and representing those residents who have had their share of pits, if there is anything they can do to ease that pain it should be done. The applicant be willing to contact NCRS and she felt a natural barrier should be required.

- K. Bravinder moved to approve a conditional use permit for mining and processing of gravel and granular materials and operation of a wash plant, crusher, and placement of a

temporary asphalt plant, in accord with the plans presented and description provided by the applicant on the record with the following conditions: 1) Any requirement of the County Highway Engineer for use of the access to the County Highway must be met, including the location of the access and the construction of the right turn and bypass lanes; 2) Mining is not to proceed deeper than elevation 1062 except for the wash plant sedimentation pond which may be constructed as shown on the plan; 3) A temporary bituminous plant is approved for the 2016 season only; 4) No mining or operations shall take place including asphalt, crushing processing or mining until the berm and trees are completed within that general area of that activity; 5) All mining operations are limited to 6 days per week (Monday-Saturday) from 7am to 7pm; 6) The permit shall be good for 5 years with a Township review in 2 years; and if after five years the proposed plan of berming and trees is not complete the Planning Commission will review what has and has not been done with the berm and trees at that time; 7) Finished depth of the wash pond shall comply with WCZO 727.7 (3), or be filled in during reclamation and; 8) The applicant shall provide a performance bond or other financial assurance from a reliable surety institution in the amount of \$37,000. The purpose of the bond shall be to insure that restoration of the property takes place in accord with Map C, End Use Plan, filed and of record, in accord with the Wright County Zoning Ordinance, and in accord with all the specifications of the plans submitted and approved by the Planning Commission. Further, the bond shall be for the purpose of assuring that restoration of the land takes place timely, as required in the conditions. The obligee of the bond shall be Wright County, and it shall be utilized in the event of any significant violation(s) of the above conditions. The County may contract with a third party to have the corrective and remedial actions taken in accord with Map C, End Use Plan and the other requirements of this conditional use. Once remediation efforts are begun by the County, only the resources necessary to cover restoration costs shall be utilized from the bond. A copy of this conditional use permit order, including the above conditions, shall be appended to the bond document. The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining the specified bond at all times for the duration of this permit. D. Thompson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: J. Thompson – trees should be planted now and the berm could be built once the mining started. She noted they are going to spend the money on that anyway. She urged the Commission to consider adding that. Riley – noted the motion states: “No mining or any other activity until the berm and trees in that general area is completed”. Pederson – asked that they add: a species of trees as recommended by the NCRS. A compromise might be to get something started one row near the right of way. Borrell felt that information should be available before the meeting and maybe they can address that on the next request before them. Pederson he is just trying to avoid what happened on a nearby pit where half of the trees are dead.

J. Thompson asked for a friendly amendment to strike mining in #5 and clarify “all operations”; and that Duinicks ask for recommendation from NCRS on an appropriate shrub or tree for the area and plant those along the perimeter, 90th Street and Nevens at this time. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Bravinder amended his motion: to change the word “mining” in #5 to “all operations”; and to add: the applicant to consult with NCRS on the type of species that would be appropriate for this area. D. Thompson amended his second.

VOTE: CARRIED, J. Thompson opposed
Mol recessed for five minutes and reconvened at 8:55 p.m.

3. **COLIN J. HAWKINS**- Cont. from 1/14/16

LOCATION: S ½ of SW ¼, Section 7, Township 120, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota.
(Buffalo Twp.) Tax #202-000-073300 Owner: MN Municipal Power Agency
Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit as regulated in Section 505, 604.4 & 762 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to locate a 10 MW solar farm on approximately 45 acres (east side) of the 91-acre parcel.

Present: Jeff Underwood and Sam Meersman, representing MN MP; Timothy Kelly, Atty.

- A. Riley noted the Commission made a site inspection. The motion failed because of a tie vote at the last meeting and continued for a full Board which is present. Presented the maps and diagram of the ground-mounted solar panels, drainage and site plans were viewed. Applicant provided additional information that is attached to the Staff Report. Project overview 1-5.
- B. Kelly –his letter dated February 4, was provided to the Staff and the Commission in which he addressed the comments raised at the last meeting. The main focus of that discussion was the Town Board objection to the placement of this type of project. They understand the Township have a part in the process, but as the Commission’s legal counsel pointed out at the last meeting, that is not a legal basis to deny the project. The applicant is entitled to a vote on whether this project meets the County’s regulations for the project, they believe it does. This will uniquely preserve agricultural land, light impact project and has no permanent impact on the land and allows the restoration to the original condition at the end of the term which is 30 years. If approved, this means this property will not be developed for 30 years and remain an agricultural property. In addition, the applicant will look at ways to have co-existing uses. The site is 90 acres and there are 30 acres for co-existing uses such as hay gathering or grazing. The project is consistent with the goals of the land use plan, will result in higher property taxes with no public investments. Benefit it will provide is clean renewable energy for Wright County residents. The Commission approved a project last month for a similar project that was also in the AG zone and this project should have the same standards applied and treated the same way. Additional concerns were raised about screening from an owner and the applicant has agreed to put in screening. Drain tiles were questioned and the applicant has agreed to replace any damaged tiles. The bond the applicant has agreed to put up is \$125,000, more than has been received on other projects. Will be posted within 90 days of construction and the County would have money to draw on for any unforeseen problems at the end. The record supports the project, meets County regulations and asked for a vote based on that.
- C. Borrell was concerned during construction they may not know they hit a tile line. He felt these tiles should be located. The Company building a solar farm in Woodland Township has agreed to locate and replace all of the tiles so they know where they are at. Underwood agreed they could also do that.
- D. Don Schmidt – Town Board member – estimates the field road around the boundaries that is 25’ wide, not including two eight-foot shoulders would remove 9000 sq. ft. from ag. The plan calls for removal of all organic material under the road bed. They are not told where

the dirt is going to go; will it be removed off site. The land to be returned to farming; however, with that much black dirt taken out, will not be good for farmland, unless all the Class II is removed and black dirt brought back in. The slopes for this road and compaction will also effect the ability to farm. He noted he has experience with trying to farm work in the road beds around his farmland. He would estimate a cost of \$25,000 to excavate the road and level that area back off to return it to farming.

- E. Underwood stated they do not want a permanent road nor need it; but the Fire Department has asked for that. They do not want the fill or need to develop that road. This requirement comes from National and State Standards and may not be needed here. Borrell – stated noted that was not the case in Woodland and asked if they have to meet the fire requirement. Underwood – felt it is a matter of educating them. Kelly they are willing to put in an access road to meet the local requirements creating the least impact.
- F. Borrell noted the solar project in Woodland Township is next to his farm. The Township had come up with a certain type of shrub to shield it from the road and the applicant has agreed to that screening. Underwood – noted they have agreed to shield the closest neighbor to the west, although he has an elevated property. They are going to fill in the tree line and would get advice from SWCD.
- G. Pederson asked Town Board Supervisor, Schmidt, if the Town Board would approve a project that would not take agricultural land out of production. Schmidt – absolutely, it is what the Town Board recommended. Not against solar but taking prime farmland. He referred to the Star Tribune article today that the Obama Plan is done, they cannot shut down the coal plants. Another article last week reported a vote of 5/0 by the Public Utilities Commission to continue a project in Marshall, Minnesota for 1,000 acres because they are looking at the prime farmland. There is a State Statute on protection of prime farmlands. They would be receptive to these projects in non-agricultural areas. Another project coming in the Township is 70 acres on Eaken Avenue on prime farmland. The combination of the two projects removes 120 acres of prime farmland out of their Township in one year. Borrell – at the County Board level, they stated the Township could establish a moratorium although it does not affect this case. Schmidt – have obtained legal advice and looked into a moratorium. There are pros and cons and might need to get into doing more of their own planning and zoning and looking at other options. Borrell – he cannot speak for the rest of the County Board, but personally would support them on the planning and zoning portion.
- H. Borrell moved to close the public hearing and direct Staff to develop Findings, a motion for approval consistent with the discussion. D. Thompson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Riley referred to the February 4, letter items 2 and 5, offering both the conditions for fill in existing tree line to screen property across the road. Includes everything they offered to do. Borrell agreed and noted if anyone has suggestions on helping Riley, they should contact the office.

VOTE: CARRIED, Pederson and Felger opposed

- I. Borrell moved to continue the hearing for action on a motion at the March 17, 2016 meeting. Bravinder seconded the motion. VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
4. **SUSAN V. MULVANEY** – New Item

LOCATION: 2226 85TH Street NE – E ½ of E ½ of SW ¼ of NW 1/4, Section 21, Township 121, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (Monticello Twp.) Tax #213-100-212306
Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a personal dog kennel as regulated in Section 302.(72), 505 & 604. of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance. Applicant currently has ten adult dogs.

Present: Steve Conroy, applicant's attorney

- A. Riley reviewed the zoning and land use maps that designate the property AG General Agricultural. The pictometry and air photos were displayed to show the property and kennels. A report from Crossroads was received. He received word the applicant was unable to attend tonight's meeting, so the matter would be continued. He suggested a site inspection may be in order as that is common for these requests.
- B. Conroy requests that his client receive a kennel permit for the dogs she has had for many years. She has had a minimum of seven dogs for the past 26 years. She is retired and this is her full-time occupation. Understands there has been a complaint from a resident who is directly east. Bark collars have been purchased for some of the dogs to try and alleviate some of the problems. She welcomes a site inspection so they can see what the situation is. She is willing to meet any conditions for the CUP.
- C. Faye Vorgert - 8592 Cahill Avenue – lives a quarter mile away and her main complaint is there is a lot of barking, that continues in the middle of the night for 2-3 hours at a time. This makes it difficult to sleep. Is there a way she can alleviate that because the extensive barking sounds like there are 20-30 dogs. The problem has been on-going.
- D. Kaitlin Eisler, attorney with the firm of Gries-Lenhardt-Allen, representing Peggy and Michael Klein who live next door to Mulvaney; with Peggy Klein present – referred the Commission to her letter dated February 10, where she emphasized how pervasive and consistent the barking is and how much of a burden and hardship it is to her client. The Kleins cannot go outside and it impacts them in their home. She pointed out the kennel buildings that are in close proximity to their home. Three dog collars are not enough for ten dogs. There is no significant distinction between when the dogs are in and outside, so there is not sufficient insulation. She noted if someone can hear these dogs miles away, what it must be like next door. Her client has talked to the Township and made calls to the Sheriff's Department which speaks to the severity of the problem. This has a great impact on her client's health. Ms. Klein – stated when she moved in she asked her neighbor to do something about the barking. Nothing has been done, the three bark collars have not made a difference. She has recorded this noise from last August until this morning. Because of the topography she is in the middle of it. Eisler –they have nothing against dogs, this is not a business and feel that she can open this somewhere else. Ms. Klein – stated the neighbors are afraid to complain or approach her and feel too intimidated to pick up the phone. Borrell asked if it makes a difference if the dogs are in or outside. Klein – stated she has

recorded the noise, even inside with her fan and a TV going, it is unbearable. Eisler – clearly the buildings are not insulated adequately.

- E. Evelyn Austin and her daughter Kelly Austin – pointed out her property two doors to the east. She has owned her lot since 1980. During the summer months it becomes more of a nuisance. They have a fenced yard and have three dogs which is allowed. Her daughter returned home, has a medical condition, PTST and has a support dog. Their dog goes in and out and becomes anxious from the dogs barking and then cannot calm her daughter. Kelly Austin – stated this operation stirs up her health support dog which has a negative impact for her. The barking is excessive, often starts at 2 a.m. and they bark all night long.
- F. Craig & Cathy Mead – live to the west and moved in the neighborhood two years ago and agreed the barking is constant. The dogs have gotten loose and come up to where their dogs are kenneled. They are concerned about the safety of their grandchildren with these dogs on the loose. Cathy Mead –the past two years they have put up with this. Although they did not want to complain, were not going to put up with it this coming summer.
- G. David Vorgert- 8592 Cahill Avenue – described the barking is similar to a team of sled dogs at feeding time. These dogs are barking continuously like that. He could not understand how anyone could live next door to that kind of noise. If the County has a limit , this owner has 2-3 times as many; and only now coming in for a permit, he felt the County should say no.
- H. Bravinder moved to continue the hearing to March 17, 2016 for a site inspection as recommended by the Town Board. Felger seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **CURTIS M. JENSEN** – New Item

LOCATION: 4036 55TH Street SE – The West 333.00 feet of the South 659.59 feet of the West Half of the West Half of the NW ¼ of Section 35, Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. Franklin Township - Tax #208-300-352303

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a “contractor’s yard” to allow a lawn and landscape business to operate at this property as regulated in Section 505 & 604.4 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance.

Present: Curt Jensen

- A. Riley reviewed an air photo showing the location of the property. The parcel is zoned AG General Agricultural and in the Land Use Plan for AG. The applicant is asking for a Contractor’s Yard to operate his landscaping business on the site. This appears to be a modest operation and most of the activity would take place off site. The plans are to build a future building to put most of the equipment inside. Now there are trailers and small pieces of lawn equipment.
- B. Jensen – explained he has a small lawn care business and equipment includes two enclosed trailers, one dump trailer and five mowers. No equipment is laying around outdoors. Eventually wants to build a pole shed for his equipment and personal vehicles and items. He has talked with his neighbors and they did not seem to have any issues.
- C. Mol – asked if the applicant would have refuse or compost materials stored outside. Jensen – none, he hauls everything to Carver County.
- D. The location was reviewed.
- E. Mol – opened the hearing for public comment, hearing none brought the matter back to the Commission for action.
- F. Borrell moved to approve a conditional use permit for a contractors yard to allow a lawn and landscape business in accord with the plans and narrative submitted by the Applicant with the following conditions: 1) Outdoor storage that pertains to the business is limited to what is shown on the site plan submitted by the Applicant; 2) If there are any changes or expansions proposed in the future a new conditional use permit would be required with the exception of the building of the “future” building as proposed in the plans; 3) Screening be completed within 6 months from the date of approval on the east side of the property as proposed; and 4) All signage must conform to Wright County Sign Ordinance. Bravinder seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **MID MINNESOTA HOT MIX, INC.** – New Item

LOCATION: 8779 Oliver Avenue NW – Part of the NE ¼ that lies north of the highway and except tract..., Section 22, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Southside Twp.) Tax #217-000-221100 Property owner: LAMCO Land LLC

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit as regulated in Section 505 & 727 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to locate a hot-mix plant in the existing pit with related stockpiling and recycling of materials for a period of three years. Temporary permit issued through the 2015 season has expired.

Present: Tim Ferrell

- A. Riley reviewed the location of the property and noted there is a permanent gravel mining permit for the property. This was reviewed by staff member, Deckert, which has indicated the applicant is in conformance on those permits. Request is for an asphalt plant. The history of previous plant placements was noted. The last CUP was granted for three years.
- B. Ferrell as noted they had been given several one year permits and the last time was for a three year permit. He is asking again for three years with the same conditions. Operations between, Monday-Saturday, with hours 7-7. Although they have never operated on a Saturday, as it is not their practice; would like that option in the event of bad weather. He explained the average plant operation is 45 days a year, on an average of 4 hours a day. Some days they operate it 8-10 hours and another day it might run for an hour.
- C. Mol opened the hearing for public comment. Hearing no response the matter was brought back to the Board.
- D. D. Thompson moved to approve a the placement of a temporary bituminous plant for the 2016-2018 seasons, only; and in accord with the plans submitted and the description provided by the applicant on the record. Pederson seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. **HELEN C. MATTILA** – New Item

LOCATION: N ½ of SE ¼ and SW¼ of SE¼ and Gov't Lot 1, Section 19, Township 120, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Albion Twp.) Tax #201-000-194100
Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit to allow two new “entitlement” divisions near the existing dwelling along County Road 5 (grouping of three or more dwellings in one location of farm requires a Conditional Use Permit) as regulated in Section 505. & 604.6(5)a of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance.

Present: Helen & Roger Mattila, their surveyor, Josh Stern, Bonnema Surveys, Inc.

- A. Riley reviewed the location of the farm that is zoned AG and in the Land Use Plan to remain AG. Air photo showed three divisions of the property and reviewed the history of when they were made. The Ordinance allows two additional “entitlements” that have not been used and the request is to put them in a cluster. The Conditional Use Permit is required when there are three or more homes in one location of the farm. He noted the location of the existing house with one new lot to the north and the other south of the existing “lot of record”. The Commission is to decide if it is appropriate to cluster them. A narrow sliver of property across the road and between the lake and road was noted. One lot description would extend to the lakeshore.
- B. Stern explained the applicant is not asking for any additional entitlements, but to place them on this side of the farm. Mattila stated the Town Board had questioned the number of building entitlements and since Staff have verified those and responded to the Town Board’s question. Mattila stated she had researched that prior to applying and wants to use the two remaining. Riley further explained that the applicant had met with the Town Board and the question came up and they did their best to answer their questions. A representative of the Town Board is present and can speak to that.
- C. Phyllis Mattson – pointed out her property that includes a sliver of shore, some of which runs between the Mattila property and the lake. Her primary concern is protecting the trees along the shore. She has owned the property since 1983 and explained the importance of these trees to protect the shore and quality of the lake. She felt it will be normal for new owners to want to remove trees to try and gain a view of the lake. She has lost 6-8’ where the water has undermined the trees and there are trees laying in the water. She had submitted a letter with other concerns she has and was concerned they might develop more lots. If this is advertised as shoreland property buyers might assume it includes this strip. She noted the area she owns. The Lake Association has worked hard to reduce water runoff into the lake. She noted a drainage area and would the new home not make that situation worse. That drainage areas is one of the first projects the Lake Association addressed.
- D. Borrell –asked when an application comes in for a building permit would Staff look for a retention area because it is within the shoreland district? Riley – noted the lot of record and the balance of the farm that includes some shoreline. As far as drainage, ponding and water they do not usually address this on small residential lots. Mol – noted this would

not need a variance, otherwise, the Board of Adjustment might address that. Mattson noted the group of trees and some drainage that goes through there now. Riley – someone who is building a house and does not impact that would not be required to improve it.

- E. Mattson – this is going into a separate program. Felger asked Mattson if she owns those trees. Mattson stated yes, Wright-Hennepin had taken out some trees because of the power line which opened up the view some. She wanted it on record the trees should be maintained.
- F. Stern, using the air photo, referred to the lot that would not have any lakeshore attached. The lot to the south would. On the existing lot of record, there would be some land added.
- G. John Uecker – explained the Town Board had little time to consider the request and needed more information. Mattila – DNR will not control the remainder parcel and explained the program is RIM. Uecker – if the land is not going to be in agricultural, he suggested the lots be larger. The three Town Board members are present, although they have not taken a vote, they are in agreement and could take action next week. Mol – noted the Commission may make a site inspection and the matter delayed for their action. Uecker noted although the lots could have been larger, the survey is done. Borrell – agreed larger lots might be more appropriate and would allow larger sheds. Uecker – noted the agreement has been made on the acreage with RIM.
- H. Dwight Hammer – Town Board Supervisor present – noted the drainage flow and the culvert location. This was put in by the County through a SWCD project and can only handle the amount of water that is coming from the highway. The size of the culvert has not been adequate to handle the amount of water during a couple of rain events the last two years. More development will create more impervious surface and additional watershed. Agreed to hear this again next Tuesday.
- I. Andy Wilde –referred to his written letter submitted. He lives to the south on a point on the lake. He outlined three points in his letter. He is opposed to potential impact to the lake, increased density and the importance of preserving trees that provide a buffer and lessen impacts. Another concern is safety due to the speed of traffic on the County road. There is a curve and foot traffic to get to mail boxes, etc. is a concern. Currently, this is a quiet area because they are bordered by agricultural land and increased activity will impact him, especially if the new residents recreate along the lake. He felt these lots could impact his values and enjoyment of his property.
- J. Bob Neumann – Town Board member – asked for clarification on the number of “entitlements” for the original 160 acres. Riley – stated Staff verified the history and through the research found two are left for the acreage. He explained the age of the “lot of record” does not reduce it. Mol added – that lot was created prior to the Ordinance.

- K. Deb Uecker – Town Clerk – stated she did get the letter addressing entitlements and has forwarded that to the Board members. The Town Board cannot legally act on this until their next meeting, the following week. She confirmed there is room on that agenda.
- L. Mattson clarified the Granite Lake Association worked on slowing the water because of so many inlets to the lake and the drainage was designed to slow down the water.
- M. Wilde – stated the proposed lots meet the zoning requirements as shown on the surveys.
- N. Mattila addressed the RIM program which they have been working on for four years. The property is not tiled out, but on the one corner is going to be dissipated by the program. There is a plan to cut off any drainage leaving the property. The entire property will have the natural ponds that existed historically. A culvert put in 50-60 years and drained toward the Segner property, did not continue through because the neighbors could not agree. Another wash will be corrected. She explained it will take two years to complete the project, is contracted out for planting the natural grasses; and this is an easement to be given and the property will continue to be privately owned. The contract is perpetual with very specific conditions with repercussions if not abided by. She noted there are woods on the property and those cannot be cut, unless they are dead. Borrell asked if the land remains on the tax rolls. Mattila stated they will continue to own it and pay taxes. The land is not open to the public.
- O. Felger moved to continue the hearing to March 17, 2016 for a site inspection and Town Board action. D. Thompson seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. **JOSEPH MEYER** – New Item

LOCATION: 4890 Highway 55 NW – Part of W ½ of SW ¼, Gov't Lot 4 & 5, ..., Section 5, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Maple Lake - Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #210-000-053210 Property owner: Pristine Holdings LLC

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a welding/fabrication business along with construction offices to operate out of the existing building on this property as regulated in Section 505 & 612.8(3)(m) of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance. Property is zoned S-3 Commercial-Recreational Shoreland District.

Present: Applicant not present

- A. Riley stated the applicant has not met with the Town Board and he requested a continuation to March.
- B. D. Thompson moved to continue the hearing to March 17, 2016 at the request of the applicant who has signed a continuation form. J. Thompson seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **JAY A. JOHNSON** – New Item

LOCATION: Part of Gov't Lot 2, Section 32, Township 120, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Buffalo Twp.) Tax #202-000-322200 & 202-000-322201

Property owner: Johnsonville LLC

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit as regulated in Section 505 & 610.2 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to process and store sand, gravel, other related materials and equipment used to recycle asphalt and concrete and a use of the existing building for a contractor's shop for maintenance of their=own equipment/vehicles.

Present: Jay Johnson & Sheila Johnson, their attorney Steve Szarke

- A. Riley reviewed the location of the property zoned I-1 General Industry and in the Land Use Plan for Transition. The map was displayed to show how over time the property has been surrounded by the City of Buffalo. The property had been a Bjorklund trucking business. The air photos over the past years were displayed to show how the area and property has evolved. The road servicing the property has been changed for the recent "round-about" between the County and State highways.
- B. J. Johnson, manager of Johnsonville, explained in 2011 he bought the Bjorklund Trucking components and in 2013 purchased the property from them and commenced to cleaning up the property. He provided a drawing to extend the parking lot and clean up the property and two construction projects that were happening on his property, one in 2014 for a City street project when sewer lines were extended through his property. He was the contractor who re-did the streets and brought the material on this property, processed it and put it back on the streets. In 2015 they were the contractor on "Settler's Parkway" and again used the site to store and process the material and put it back on the road project. The materials for the other sub-contractors were also stored on this property along with project meetings held on his property. The County Zoning Administrator, Riley, contacted him about the need for a permit. He submitted an application for long-term use and is asking for 50 days to process the material currently on the site. A document was provided that requests hours of operation 8 – 5:30 p.m. Monday-Friday, no Saturdays; and a long-term permit for a Contractor's storage yard. The type of equipment would include his backhoes, trucks, trailers and shipping containers. After this December the entire site would be leveled and a new parking lot put down. This coming year he is doing the construction projects around this site and once done, it would become an equipment storage yard. He would put down a Class VI material for the lot, put in a berm in on the edge and plant trees 25' on center. Preparing material involves dust and he has a water suppression system to control dust. If the wind is in the wrong direction and directed to any residential area, he would not operate. The material stored here comes directly off the City road projects. Although the City is complaining about it, it has come from City projects. The City wants to annex the property before he gets his permit. The City Attorney sent a letter around to the neighborhood (he noted she is in the audience) that states they were directed by the City Council to pursue annexation. He was at that meeting and it was not voted on, unless it was later. The Attorney's letter gave six examples on how to complain so he would not get his permit. He has been on the site operating for two years. He asked the County

Administrator if any complaints were registered and none were brought forward. At the City Council meeting the City Administrator stated he has had numerous complaints, but does not know if they were against him. With road construction projects there are often complaints and he does not doubt there were some; but not sure they were specifically directed towards him. If he does not get a CUP the City plans to rezone his property into high-density housing. Because of the nearby residents he has operated respectfully to avoid complaints. These jobs are attached to his property which does not require a permit, his property is the job. The construction meetings were held on his property. He has talked with all his neighbors and many present would likely speak on it.

- C. Szarke – stated somehow someone has circulated a hidden agenda. He suggested the Commission listen to the City Council meeting of February 1. He has listened to that and heard nothing directed from the Council to address annexation, even though the letter that came from the City Attorney states she was directed from the Council to propose this annexation. Riley made it clear to the applicant and himself that the Commission is not concerned about annexation.

MEETING WAS OPENED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: Commission heard from the following:

- D. Susan Kadlec, City Attorney for Buffalo – the Commission has seen the letter sent out to some City residents because the City is highly concerned about the CUP. Wanted to address the misconceptions. The City did not permit the storage of materials on this property. What they are talking about is a MN DOT project for State Highway 25 which the City had no control over. The City was opposed to it and many residents complained. The property is not quite as pretty as Johnson makes it out to be. She circulated pictures to show what the nearby residents are subjected to. The pictures were taken by City Staff over the last 60 days. These pictures show piles of debris as high as three-stories. These residents are subjected to increased traffic. truck traffic, sounds of loading and unloading by heavy equipment and have complained about debris and dust emanating from the property. Some residents may be here to speak on it. The memo from the City Engineer addresses concern about the roads leading into this property. Riley stated it was included in their packet. Kadlec noted the main concern is Settler's Parkway was not designed and does not have a turning radius or turn lanes large enough to carry this truck traffic. The other streets are residential. City Engineer points out other agency reviews the proposed use would have to go through for this use. A few letters from residents, note that even the cemetery would be impacted because people go there for quiet reflection and this is what they have to look at and hear. The sounds would impact surrounding property; and from a City standpoint, they feel this would have a negative impact on future development. From a City Planning perspective, this would deter development. If this is a permanent permitted use when it comes into the City, they cannot do anything about it. This property is guided for residential development. The City has no plans for multi-family residential; that would be spurred by a developer. The land is planned for residential and part multi-family residential which is not compatible with this use. City Administrator, Merton Auger, is present and he could confirm the annexation plans. Borrell asked if at the Feb 1, City meeting did the Council vote on annexation and what was the vote. She was not at that meeting and her direction comes from the City Administrator. Borrell felt her letter was

misleading and objected to the letter stating that it came from the Council when it was from the Administrator. He felt the City should let him have the permit and let him crush his material. Kadlec the concern is he did it without the permit and how long is the permit going to last. Felger also noted the letter is not from the City but from a law firm. Kadlec stated she is the attorney on-behalf of the City and she was not trying to mislead. The criteria in the letter is taken from the County Ordinance and alerted people as to what are the criteria for this permit and encourage people to come forward. Borrell asked who was notified. Riley – the County notified 500' within the City limits.

- E. Mike Cappiello directly adjacent – stated he was bothered when this first started and opposed the road going through. However, the applicant has done everything possible to be respectful to the adjacent owners. He wants to get the project done and property cleaned up. The people closest have no problem with what he is doing but would like him to finish it and return the property back to the way it was used. They don't have a problem with it. He is speaking for the people directly adjacent who don't oppose the permit.
- F. Pat Scanlon – 607 Ingalls Dr. – he is in the backyard of this operation and the applicant has been respectful to the neighbors. He thinks what the City is doing to railroad this is wrong. The City letter encourages them to come and complain. The City knew he was doing this the past two years; they want to annex the land. If the wind is not in the right direction, the applicant does not operate. The applicant has a plan and brought this to everyone's attention, he supports giving him the permit.
- G. Jill Warhol – 700 Ingalls Dr. she is new to the development and they all had complaints about putting a road through. Living on a corner she heard it all day long. She wants to look at what is best for the land and would not be thrilled to have multi-family units that would increase traffic. Setting a reasonable timeframe and hours for clean up of this property with limits on the noise and traffic that it could generate would be appreciated. They should be able to enjoy their property. The traffic is a concern with the number of children that live in this area.
- H. Jason McKinzie is at 611 Ingalls Dr. - this operation includes the debris pile and crusher which are directly behind him. The dust was a problem until he talked with the applicant who agreed to crush and lay some concrete down to control it. The dust issue will be controlled by the concrete put down on the lot; debris pile that has been a problem will be removed; and the view will be improved once the berm and trees are planted. He feels he is the most impacted because it is out his backdoor and he has been there the longest. However, he has zero problems with Johnson who he has been a good neighbor. Originally, when he first moved in he had concerns about a construction company.
- I. Maggie Jacobs - 711 5th St. So.–pointed to her property location – she met last summer with the applicant when suddenly there were piles of dirt (sand), she provided a picture to show the material to show the sand was higher than the trees. Johnson complied with her request to lighten the load. That is a City lot. Johnson responded, he leased that lot for all the material related to the project. At this time, he could not say whether he would be doing the future project, there are still 7-8 blocks to the west to be completed this coming season.

All construction on that lot and his lot would be leveled off by December and then would go into a park-like setting. No more dump trucks banging or crushing after that. At the City Council meeting the Administrator said that this would be zoned into a high-density housing etc. Jacobson – further asked what the plans are for the lot he is renting. This is very close to her and the operation has created a mess; her cars and house have been covered with dust. Mol – stated this is not the project in question. Riley – concurred that the property is not part of the request and is located in the City and if there are problems with dust and other matters, she was directed to the City. Jacobson – stated she was invited to this meeting and wants to know who she talks with. Johnson agreed to talk to her after the meeting.

- J. Kenneth Lancaster – 503 8th Avenue S.–owns the last house on 8th Avenue near the “park”. He has lived here for ten years and bought the lot because it was quiet. He has complained to the City about the activities. He asked if 8th would ever continue through. He has been looking at the material for months and if they have not had a permit, what has the City been doing about it. The County has to give the permit. He was not concerned about the dust and people who keep cars outside should expect dust. He is not opposed to the applicant getting a permit, he has completed the streets and noted the changes. The cemetery is about full and understands the applicant will be cleaning up his property which is in his view. Occasional truck goes into the property but the applicant has to have a place to dump the material for the streets, he has done a good job in there. He does not get answers from the City council and feels the City council has an agenda to annex this property off of Johnson and does not think that should be allowed. They want the streets to go through. He thinks there is adequate residential development sitting empty or is not selling within the City now. Noted the difference in his taxes and property values since he has purchased his property. Noted 8th Avenue is a street that the residents do not want to continue through. The attorney out of St. Cloud has no idea, they have been retained and want the land to be annexed so it can be built on. Johnson owns the property and wants to use it for maintenance; feels he has done a good job for the City. Although he is tired of looking at the piles, but is happy to see it will be cleaned up. Should be given a permit.
- K. Sean Glenz - 633 Caroline Pass – they are within 500’ and received the notice. He looked at the City meeting video and they did talk about annexation. He felt the applicant could continue using this for his construction equipment. This will not wreck property values. He would rather have him as a neighbor than many residents.
- L. Carl Connors – 710 5th St. So. - asked about the lot he is renting and asked if he would be done in December. Johnson – that project would be done this year and lot cleaned up and is he responsible for that. His application includes a pond and tree planting and a retention pond. Connors asked what that is zoned for. Mol – stated this Commission can only address the Johnson property.
- M. Julie Sanderson – 806 5th St. So. - a 16 year resident felt the property has been an eyesore since day one. She asked if operations would continue after the lot is cleaned up. Trucks are lined up along the road. This is a residential neighborhood and they have constant noise. Understandable during construction, but if it continues she will have a problem.

There is no fence around a park and has concerns with that. She is concerned the kids will be going through this property and getting hurt. She asked that he fix the problems.

- N. Brent Stauffer – 304 8th Ave. So. – asked if it is the applicant’s semis that travel too fast through the neighborhood. Johnson explained there was one week sand was hauled in and he did notify drivers that they had to slow down through the neighborhood. Stauffer as late as 9-10 p.m. he hears loud banging. Johnson – City hours allow activity to 10 p.m. and during the road construction, there were activities that late. Being this close lessens the impact to the neighborhood. Mol – noted that is going through the City for City projects, however, this request is outside the City. The issue would be best taken up with the City.
- O. George Sims - 604 Wilder Way – felt the City Attorney had a few misleading statements in her letter about property valuation. He did not see how Johnson being in there would devalue their property. The traffic from the cars would have more impact than the trucks. Also questioned the roads would not take on his vehicles, yet it can take 18-wheelers. No one has opposed the applicant.
- P. Brad Hosek at 404 6th Avenue S. – although he is a good distance away and a 35 year resident, the last couple years there has been disruption and understands that is part of road building. He is not looking forward to more construction and when the infra-structure improvements get down he hopes it ends. He noted the noise is a nuisance and he would like to enjoy his property on Sundays. Borrell noted that issue is within the City, created by City street construction.
- Q. Bruce Thorson 413 7th Avenue So. –is concerned about the piles of rubble and property values. He knows this is part of repairing roads, but questioned putting a gravel pit in the middle of residential. He is all for getting this done in 50 days, but no longer.
- R. Larry & Janet Mattsen - 635 Caroline Path –are close to the Johnson property. He is concerned about permit for storing sand and gravel, commercial storage, the loading and unloading of trucks. If the roads are done would the applicant still be able to do that and the related noise. The hours do not allow for quiet time for this area. They have been upset about how things worked out after buying in Settler’s Parkway and would not have built here if they knew about the dust, noise and vibrations from the equipment operating. His home has cracks that they have determined are not from settling. The vibration and noise has been a problem. It continues behind them and is concerned if that goes on after the 50 days. If it continues to be zoned Industrial, he asked what might come in to that property. There have been some discrepancies about the uses and Jennifer Nash, City Planner, indicated that this will be low-density housing. Johnson has gone door to door to try and win the neighbors over. Then, in talking with the City they say it will be consistent with the single-family residential zone that is there. They bought here thinking that the old farm and buildings would eventually be removed. They have been unable to open windows or enjoy their property and asked what quality of life is that. The noise, smell of diesel trucks will ruin their quality of life. He urged the Commission to deny this use next to residential where there are small children. He would not stay at this site if this continues.

- S. Jason Swanson – 707 Charles Ct. – been here since 2007 and is happy to hear the property will be cleaned up. The condenser to their air conditioner had to be replaced because of the amount of dust and the noise and odors have been a problem. He would like to see a timeframe set for the cleanup, along with limit on the dust coming from the crusher.
- T. John Dirksen - 604 Ingalls Dr. – he felt the letter from the City Attorney seemed one-sided. He would have liked to see a more objective letter. There are a couple homes blocking this site from his view. If the applicant is committed to cleaning up the site he would agree. He would suggest a limit on his operating hours. He would not want operations on Sunday or not as late. Kids run through the property, however, he does not allow his kids to go through the property. Noted the park location, the applicant could provide a walking path to get to the park.
- U. Johnson – clarified his application requests that during February thru December he will process the material and clean up the property. Within that time frame there will be up to 50 days of crushing. The street project, whether he does it or not, will be from May through November. Once the road projects are done, the lots will be cleaned up, this property will be for the storage of his equipment that will come in November and leave in March; include working in the shop and site should be very quiet. Addressed a few issues on the City Engineer’s comments. State Statute states they have to provide him access according to the zoning. Several times at the construction meetings he informed them and that they had to move the mediums back to accommodate the 150’ trailer his crusher comes in on. He gave them drawings and they said they would do it, but never did. The curbs are in now. The pictures of the concrete show material coming off City projects, some were hauled in by the City. He has been working with the City for 28 years and feels attacked. He bid a job in Buffalo and would have donated a trail so the kids could get back to the park if this would not have happened, he would have put a trail in. If anyone has a complaint, asked they contact him. Borrell asked if he could work with the neighbors. He heard a comment on a land donation to the cemetery. Johnson – stated three years ago when he bought the property he was told the previous owner had promised the cemetery that the back of the property would be donated to them. He had discussed a proposal with the City if that were to happen.
- V. Borrell moved to continue the hearing to March 17, 2016 for a site inspection. Bravinder seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. **PUBLIC HEARING POSTING**

- A. Kryzer noted the box being used by the Administrator's office is not large enough to accommodate more notices. The Commission should take action to designate a new box.
- B. On a motion by D. Thompson, seconded by Bravinder, all voted to designate the bulletin board box outside of Planning & Zoning office to be the official location for public hearing postings.

11. **DISCUSSION ITEM:**

- A. Borrell suggested adding another meeting to avoid late hours for the meetings. The Commission discussed the timing of the current schedule. Riley noted the schedule as set only allows 2-3 weeks between meetings and would require shifting the other meeting dates for this year. Mol suggested if the meetings remain as busy, they could address this further for the following year.

B. **Commercial AG Tourism**

Borrell noted the issue is with the Martin item and use of the barn. He is familiar with other instances where people have similar uses and would like to conform. He feels there is room in the Commercial AG Tourism to slightly modify the Ordinance by removing the requirement that it has to be ancillary to the primary use. These uses would still require a CUP. Riley noted the Building Code is something that has to be met regardless, and many cases would not be doable. Borrell would keep the ten-acre minimum acreage. Mol –suggested adding this and two or three other items when they have a shorter meeting. Riley – noted he has been asked for a workshop and more discussion on cleaning up some of the gravel pit details.

Commission scheduled a date for a workshop for March 3, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.

C. **Site Inspection**

Commission scheduled site inspections for March 9, 2016. Members to meet at 1:00 p.m. at the Public Works Building.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Riley
Planning & Zoning Administrator

SR:tp