

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: September 29, 2016

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met September 29, 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 the following members present: Mol, Charlie Borrell, Ken Felger, Dave Thompson and Dan Bravinder. Absent were David Pederson and Jan Thompson. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning Office; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present.

MINUTES

On a motion by Borrell, seconded by Bravinder, all voted to approve the minutes for the September 8, 2016 meeting as printed.

1. PAUL & TATIANA BLUHM – New Item

LOCATION: 3380 Darlington Avenue SE – Part of the E ½ of NW ¼, Section 22, Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-100-222402 & - 222403

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a personal dog kennel for a maximum of 12 adult dogs (no boarding) as regulated in Section 155.027, 155.003 (73) & 155.054 (B). Applicant is proposing to build an insulated kennel building with outdoor runs.

Present: Paul & Tatiana Bluhm

- A. Riley reviewed a location map of the two parcels owned by the applicant along with an overview of the recent rezoning/subdivision. This property is one of five lots recently approved and is located off the county road. The applicant is asking for a CUP for a personal dog kennel for up to twelve dogs.
- B. P. Bluhm explained he has scaled the proposed structure back from 40' x 60' to a 14' x 32' and is moving it closer to his house. Using the air photo he pointed out the location behind the house. He has taken steps to combine the two tax parcels as one. The building will be used only for the kennel with eight stalls. He originally had planned a combination of a storage/kennel building.
- C. T. Bluhm explained these are their show dogs and are a German Shorthair Pointer breed. They will not be boarding other people's dogs. Currently, they use bark collars and the dogs are kept on their own property and kept quiet. They currently have three adult dogs and two puppies and they are asking for up to twelve, so they don't have to come back for expansions in the future. The kennel building size has been cut back and will be insulated. They also have invisible fencing installed on their property and the dogs do not run off the property. They keep the dogs as they age and switch out younger ones coming up.
- D. Mol opened up the hearing for public comment. The following neighbors expressed concern for the number and barking.

Rodney Erickson 3444 Darlington Avenue SE – reported on Saturday afternoon he could hear the dogs and puppies barking. If they are given a permit for up to 12 that will add to the noise they have to put up with.

John Fritz – 3336 Darling Avenue SE –the applicants are nice people; but is concerned that living on adjacent property the noise will be a problem. He submitted a letter from his wife, who addresses the disturbance and how it affects her and their nine-month old daughter. This area is turning into a residential area and did not think it reasonable to have 12 dogs here and affects their quality of life.

Elaine Windsperger - 3369 Darrow Avenue SE – has purchased one of the new lots and will be living to the east. She can now hear the dogs barking and does not want to listen to more barking.

Steve Erickson - 3314 Darling Avenue SE – has had experience living by dog kennels in the past. One dog starts barking and it sets off the rest. He has two hunting dogs, and although they have bark collars he questioned the quality of life for the dogs. He did not think the Commission should open the door for this.

Kari Miller 3282 Darlington Avenue SE – owns two small dogs herself, but does not think the proposal is a good situation for the dogs. She also hears the applicants’ dogs barking and does not want to call the animal control when it becomes a problem. She does not think 12 dogs on one property should be allowed in a neighborhood.

Audra Etzel – 3487 Darrow Avenue SE – they can hear dogs barking, although she could not say for sure where it is coming from. If the Commission allows this number, who would they register noise complaints with.

Jared Bunn 3167 Dalton Avenue SE- he has a large family that includes a dog; would agree the applicant’s dogs are barking.

Mol questioned with other dogs in the neighborhood, how do they know who’s dogs are barking. Bunn noted his house location, directly north and can hear the direction the barking is coming from.

- E. P. Bluhm stated he can hear barking come from all around him at all times. If owners spend time with the dogs that won’t be a problem. T. Bluhm added when she is out working her dogs on their land, hers are not barking but hears other dogs that are. Their dogs have bark collars which are used to correct the dogs immediately if they bark. These are pure bred hunting dogs that do not leave the side of their owner.
- F. Borrell assured the neighbors that if the kennel is approved, the permit will be followed up on. The Town Board will be asked to review and report any problems. He would suggest the neighbors stop by and talk to the applicant if there is a problem. P. Bluhm stated he would encourage that. Borrell – noted in addition to the review, he felt the dog collars work. The Commission could look at the permit again if the applicant does not keep the dogs under control.
- G. Bravinder – stated as a supervisor on the Cokato Town Board – he could speak to the two dog kennels in his Township. The kennels are monitored and can have inspections. If there are complaints that is forwarded to the County. If there are enough complaints they would not approve it. He lives on the edge of town and understands the concern.
- H. Felger asked if the applicant is pushing the limits on the size building. P. Bluhm stated he has reduced the size and taken out the cold storage area. The size is compliant.

- I. Riley stated the other buildings are now combined with the other parcel for a total of 4.12 acres which allows a maximum accessory structures of 3,200 sq. ft.
- J. Mol suggested a site inspection to view the property and neighborhood to see the proximity of the other homes.
- K. Felger moved to continue the hearing to October 20, 2016 for a site inspection. Borrell seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **MIKE J. SPODEN** – New Item

LOCATION: 7369 160TH St. NW – NW ¼ of NE ¼, except West 2 rods of the South 2 rods, Section 14, Township 122, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Clearwater Twp.)
Tax # 204-100-141200

Petitions to rezone from AG General Agricultural to A/R Agricultural-Residential and a Conditional Use Permit for an unplatted three-lot residential subdivision (one lot to include existing farmstead) as regulated in Section 155.027, 155.028 & 155.047 of the Wright Code of Ordinances.

Present: Mike Spoden and Shirley Spoden

- A. Riley reviewed the property that is zoned AG and in the Land Use Plan for A/R/ The A/R zone requires a minimum of ten-acre lots and 300' in width on a public road. Existing homestead was viewed on an air photo that sits in the middle of the 40 acre tract. If rezoned, the applicant proposes three lots. A survey completed shows what a proposed subdivision might look like. A photo shows the property looking south. Soil information was just received today and Staff need time to review this information. Commission must first decide on the rezoning request which is a recommendation to the County Board. If the Commission is ready to make that recommendation, he would suggest laying the Conditional use Permit over for County Board action, further soil test review; and, wetland observation by the Wright County Soil & Water Conservation District indicates that the lots should be feasible.
- B. Mol noted if building on the eastern lot were to take place in the back, they would have to try and skirt around the wetland.
- C. Kryzer warned the applicant the County Highway Department may not allow them to keep the current loop driveway. M. Spoden indicated the existing driveway would not have to be a loop with two entrances. He furnished a letter from the Highway Department that approves one access for each lot.
- D. Mol – member of the Clearwater Township Board – reported the applicant has met with them. The Town Board supports the rezoning because it complies with the Land Use Plan for A/R and pointed to the existing development shown on the map. There are one-acre lots that have been split up and already developed to the northwest and lots exist on the eastern border.
- E. Borrell asked if Mol would recommend a site inspection. Mol – stated he is familiar with the property, but it is up to the rest of the Commission.
- F. Bravinder moved to recommend approval of the rezoning to the County Board of Commissioners to rezone the property from AG Agricultural to A/R Agricultural Residential because it meets the criteria laid out in the land use plan and the Town Board approves.

D. Thompson seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- G. Bravinder moved to continue the hearing to October 20, 2016 for the subdivision portion of the request to allow time for the applicant to finalize survey work and other required information for subdivision approval and for the County Board to act on the rezoning.

D. Thompson seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **BRENDA PILGER** – New Item

LOCATION: 5331 33RD St. NW – Part of the S ½ f SE ¼, Section 18, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #210-000-184305 Property owner: Szczesny

Petitions to rezone approximately 19.47 acres from AG General Agricultural to R-2a Suburban-Residential and a Conditional Use Permit to allow a two-lot residential unplatted subdivision to divide the property in half (approx.) and allow one new residential building site in addition to existing dwelling as regulated in Section 155.027, 155.028 & 155.051 of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Applicant not present

- A. Riley informed the Commission the applicant was unable to meet with the Town Board and a written request for a continuation to October 20, was received.
- B. D. Thompson moved to continue the hearing to October 20, 2016 at the request of the applicant in order to meet with the Town Board. Felger seconded the motion.

Mol opened the hearing for public comment.

Emojean Marquette pointed out the location of her farm directly south. Because she raises livestock is concerned with the rezoning. In response to a question on the number, she said she just has a few and it is not a feed lot. She was interested in where the lots were proposed. Riley noted how the division was proposed to avoid the wetland. Mol suggested she also attend the Town Board meeting to express any concerns she might have.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Kryzer suggested since the Commission has another site to look at they could add this.

- C. D. Thompson agreed a site inspection would be helpful and made a motion to include a site visit by the Commission. Borrell seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **DAVID A. CLARK** – New Item

LOCATION: 8150 20TH Street SE – W ½ of SW ¼ of Section 9; and E ½ of SE ¼, Section 8, Township 119, Range 24, Wright County, Minnesota. (Rockford Twp.) Tax # 215-000-084400 & -093300 Property owner: Sacred Portion Foundation

Petitions to amend a Conditional Use Permit issued September 19, 1996 that included a restriction that the 240 acres must stay together and portions of it cannot be sold separately, unless reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. The proposal is to sell up to 80 acres on the **west** side and a determination on whether there are any available building “entitlements” for the entire property. Proposal is to sell one “entitlement” with said 80 acres, as regulated in Section 155.027, 155.028 & 155.047 of the Wright Code of Ordinances.

Present: David Clark

- A. Riley displayed maps to show the original property of 240 acres with six entitlements. The history of the past hearings was summarized that allowed this under a “Resort” classification. Later that classification was removed from the Ordinance and this became a “non-conforming” use. The use commonly known as “Youth with a Mission” has been operating on the property since 1996. The original Conditional Use Permit (CUP) required the Planning Commission review any land sale. In 2013 the Planning Commission acted on a request to sell the east 80 acres with two building “entitlements”. That 80 acres included a farmstead that had a horse operation. The remaining 160 acres was outlined and the location of the original house that has been added to; and a dormitory complex for sleeping quarters pointed out. Riley noted at a minimum three entitlements are being used with these structures. The question is if more land can be sold and is there an “entitlement” to go with it; or are they tied up with the existing buildings.
- B. Borrell asked if the applicant has the right to assign entitlements. Riley – explained because the Conditional Use Permit was issued to 240 acres with the overall operation and complex, it is up to the Commission. The property has a unique use and history. Borrell asked if the sewer was addressed when the east 80 acres was sold. D. Clark stated that they reserved an easement. Riley confirmed it had to meet the conditions on the sewer system.
- C. Riley reviewed the land they are considering selling includes wetland and pasture. That part of the property is in the Land Use Plan for AG.
- D. Clark stated during the hearing in 2013 some members visited the property. He explained before the property was purchased it was the Koch family property who had secured additional land in the late 1980’s for a total of 240 acres. Then sold it to the Sacred Portion Foundation who leases it to Youth With A Mission. He further explained they applied to the Planning Commission in 1996 to get the property designated a “Resort”, a category of the Ordinance. The Commission found it fit, even though it was not on a lake, the recreational character of the property. Since “Resort” was removed they have been operating as a non-conforming use for 19 years. They have had to come back to make changes. He noted the east 80 acres was allowed to be sold with two entitlements in 2013. As Riley noted, the west 80 acres is low and pasture. It seems there was a recognition that there were six entitlements when they were allowed to sell two with the east 80 acres. Under that assumption, they feel they have one left

- they can sell. They are happy with the facilities they have and would consolidate a bit. He understands they could not make any other big changes with all the entitlements used up; but, this would give them some revenue they need to make improvements to some aging structures.
- E. Ed Rudenberg with his wife Claudia in the audience – live directly across the road at 7913 20th Street SE - stated the applicant has been a good steward of the property and good neighbor. His only concern is if the 80 acres is sold, could it be developed. If it is a farm that is great. He understood there would not be any changes when they bought their property. Don't want to see a residential subdivision. Mol – zoned AG now, but cannot say what new owners might petition for. Riley further explained the land is zoned AG and in the Land Use Plan for AG. The Town Board, Planning Commission and County Board would all have to agree with any change. There is Transition Area just beyond this.
- F. Borrell when they visited the site, felt the organization looks well run. Rudenberg – the applicant has added prairie areas and enhanced the property. They are happy with the current situation. Now with more land being sold, are concerned for the future.
- G. Mol – this cuts the original site down to a third of what was planned. He had wanted to see the property in 2013; after seeing the east 80 acres was a separate operating farm, had gone along with the sale. This 80 acres is open land which has been used by the people on the property for quiet study or reflection. Clark understood, and agreed it is up to Commission if they can maintain that on 80 acres. They feel that will still be a large piece of land with a lot of natural areas on it. Do not think it will alter the character of what they do. Right now they have no big plans to expand at this time. Mol – asked if 5-10 years there is a large residential development next door would that impact their operation. He noted there is a nearby Transition Area. The Board has rezoned land designated AG in the plan to other zones. Once they sell the land it is gone, lose control and it is important to the campus to have the quiet reflection atmosphere. The concern is once it is gone it could be a risk to the applicant and the Commission. Clark they understand the risk and are willing to take that.
- H. Borrell – if the applicant cannot make things go, it would still continue as a Resort for a new owner. Riley – might be difficult to find a buyer for a non-conforming use for this kind of property. Borrell – felt another owner would come back and probably get approved. Riley – perhaps if it gets sold it goes back to a residential use? Borrell – members of Boards change and Mol makes a good point, if you have a housing development next door they are not going to be happy with that. Clark – changes the character but would not prohibit what they do if the neighborhood changes. There are five acre lots across the street and the neighbors get along. Riley – if an 80 were to get developed; it would be more likely be the east because it is in Transition and is more suited. Borrell – in seeing the property he felt development of the west 80 acres would impact their operation. Noting if they own the land, they own the view. Clark felt 80 acres is a lot of land for a retreat center or campus.
- I. Felger asked if the middle 80 acres with the buildings is in Transition. Riley – stated yes for Hanover; only the west 80 is in the Plan for AG. Mol – felt they could have a strong argument for rezoning since it abuts Transition. Riley – there would also be a strong argument against. Felger – three years ago a few members were concerned and the Commission continued to allow all Board members present to make the decision. Borrell – wants to approve this, but it might be best to keep it together. Bravinder – was uncertain on this, but hearing the testimony

it his opinion that the applicant is well aware of what he is doing and potential ramifications; so he would be in favor of the request. When it comes to Transition, the 80 acres they are keeping is in Transition. Decisions were made with small residential areas across from it.

- J. Clark – three years ago the concern was they had a riding academy on the eastern parcel and understood they were giving that up. They had hoped they would keep it all together, but there are changes. The community around them will continue to have a voice on what happens around them. They will continue to advocate for the agricultural community around them.
- K. Mol – agrees, but when they bought the property they created the resort/retreat center and set up that way. Like the lake resorts, what tends to happen is they start selling some off until it is gone because it does not fit or work anymore. Don't want to set a precedent. Clark this would be the last sale they make, because there are no further entitlements available. How much land is sufficient for a resort is subjective. In 2013 the Commission had discretion as there is no definition. He believes they can continue to function as they have for 20 years on the 80 acres. Mol – in looking at their property they could look at splitting off the north 40 acres. Allowed a resort, but need to look at the zoning laws and what was laid out in 1996. Bravinder questioned if the north 40 acres could be sold as a restricted 40 acres or have to be rezoned. Mol – that might be possible. The buildings house a large number of people. Riley – Staff would argue that the north 40 acres has to stay with the resort and would have to come back to the Planning Commission.
- L. Felger asked about entitlements and three are being used up. Riley – answered three at a minimum are used. There are three structures that house people year around and each would tie up an entitlement. One is a multiple unit structure. It is the Commission's discretion whether they can sell an entitlement off. The four-unit complex is primarily bedrooms and communal dining and living in what used to be the residence. Could have debated on the last sale of 80 acres, that there could only be the existing house and not another entitlement.
- M. Mol asked what action the Commission wanted to take. D. Thompson – continue for a full Board like the previous hearing. Bravinder – felt a site inspection may be needed, but members are familiar with the organization. Mol – not so much the organization. What they want to do and how that fits the Conditional Use Permit is the issue. Bravinder – they have scaled it back, so he is comfortable with it. Clark – the CUP limits them to 65 people on the site so prevents an intensive use of center parcel.
- N. Felger – changing zoning and how the County Board might perceive this. The only thing that allows them to consider this is a sale would be “reviewed” and gives the applicant the opportunity to make a petition. They are in the same situation as in 2013 and not making any drastic changes regarding the zoning ordinance. The Commission has a right to hear this and act on it. Borrell – the original hearing there were concerns about traffic and the use, however, the applicant has proven to be a good neighbor. He voted in favor in 2013 and thought the applicant knows what is best. His belief in private ownership rights is strong. Felger – in favor of split, how do they handle the one “entitlement”? Asked the applicant if they were going to sell the 80 acres with one. Clark that is right. If the structures take up more than three, the Commission should have addressed that in 2013. Felger did not think the Commission addressed that in 2013. Riley there was leeway at that point in 2013 and the Commission did not have discussion about it. He wants it to be clear if one is allowed to be sold off, it will be

difficult if not impossible, to do anything more on the middle 80 acres. Borrell – unlikely the Commission would later allow the sale of the north 40 acres. Riley – also, that portion would not have an entitlement and does not have road frontage.

- O. D. Thompson – moved to continue the petition to October 20, 2016 for a full Board and direct Staff to develop a formal motion consistent with approval with one “entitlement” with the sale of the west 80 acres. The understanding is that the “compound” is using up the rest of the “entitlements”. Felger seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **PUBLIC HEARING: AMEND CHAPTER 152 – FEEDLOT ORDINANCE** – New Item

Consider amending Wright County Code of Ordinances Chapter 152. Including standards that apply to allowing fowl and chickens in all zoning districts except for parcels less than 2.5 acres in the R-1 zone; and to allow feedlots of less than 10 animal units to be located in the shoreland districts, includes amending Section 155. to conform to changes made in Chapter 152.

Present: Tracy Janikula, Wright County Feedlot Program Administrator

- A. Krzyer – Assistant County Attorney – presented the proposed revisions to the Feedlot Ordinance that would allow chickens on lots smaller than 4 acres and other provisions for hobby farms in a shoreland district. He referred the Commission to the draft Ordinance changes #16-6 Chapter 152, Article I (1) adding a subdivision (b) allows chickens on every parcel except for parcels zoned R-1 that are under 2.5 acres. The limit is 30 chickens and 5 domestic fowl. Borrell – noted that would address the people he is hearing from.
- B. Felger asked for clarification on size and zone for chickens. Kryzer explained the number chosen correlates with other Ordinance requirements. Minimum setbacks required are 50' from rear and side lines, 300' from the Ordinary High-water Mark (OHM), meet all road setbacks and if lot is less than four acres, fencing for chickens at least 15' from line is required. The 152.031 is the hobby farm Ordinance for the shoreland district, only. Anyone outside of the shoreland falls under the current regulations. Sub (C) (2) was provided Riley for clarification of what was given the Commission. Sub (1) (2) were read. He explained the feedlot is where there is not ground cover; and, any animal structures would have to be outside of the 300' setback of a body of water. Clarifies animals located on pasture within 300' of water would have to be fenced 50' from the OHM and there has to be a buffer between the fence and body of water. The feedlot would have to be 301' from the ordinary high-water mark. The horses can pasture up to 50' of the body of water. Janikula noted there have been complaints with feedlots that have animals right to or in the lake. Riley added because it is shoreland and lots are small it is defined. Janikula added, it causes conflict when she cannot require a feedlot owner to put up a fence and keep the animals out of the lake.
- C. Kryzer explained the changes to 155 Sec. 1, that defers to other setbacks and relates to the roads. Section 6, deals with the nuisance ordinance para. (b) is deleted because it is a merely an ordinance requirement found elsewhere. Refers to 152.
- D. Riley remind the Commission and audience they had two meetings with a Citizen/Work Group and had a workshop with the Commission. What is in front of the Commission is what came out of the Work Group after the Commission reviewed it. A recommendation for a final decision by the County Board.
- E. Kryzer – had to be sent to the MN PCA and they gave comments. Felt there was not anything new, just restating the State rules and Staff would be in favor of incorporating those.
- F. Felger – asked if a Township wishes to be more restrictive they can. Mol – if they have their own planning and zoning. Riley clarified although they can adopt a more restrictive ordinance but the proper process is needed. Town Boards are notified and we take their input. It is

unlikely a Township would want to go through adopting an ordinance specific to this issue as it is an investment in time and resources. Mol – noted that would be similar to a dog or barking ordinance. Riley – Township dog ordinance not odd, but to take additional ordinance items such as solar and feedlot it would be unusual. They would take input for an individual township on any item. The County does the Wright County Zoning Ordinance, the Townships can be more restrictive, but have to take the proper legal processes.

- G. Bravinder – years ago a township resident challenged him to be more involved in what is going on at the County level. He felt it is important that the Township representatives show up at the meetings. The Commission is willing to listen to the Township input and consider the concerns. Mol added it does not make sense for Townships to try and do their own – as a Township Board they are not the County, they don't have attorneys or planners on staff. That is the difficulty as they do not get the information at the Township level that they get at the County hearing. Riley noted a Township may have an issue with a specific use, i.e. Buffalo Township with the layout of that solar farm. The process allows them to work with these concerns. Not realistic for one or two townships to be more restrictive on an issue or two. If there is a specific request they have a concern with, they have input.
- H. Ben Dye – the side lot setback was questioned. He felt 50' side setback is fairly restrictive. If 50' is okay for chickens why not horses. With a lot of 4-5 acres considering road, lake and well setbacks it might be difficult. He asked for more clarification on the setback from pasture vs. feedlot. Further explanation from Mol. Dye - no grass or is just a small dirt area okay. Mol – felt this change helps Dye. Riley – you can have pasture and there are circumstances where it is not perfect. Janikula if they do not have anything to eat it is not pasture. Riley – if they are in an area where they are housed or fed that is not a pasture. Borrell – why 100' setback for horses. Riley - chickens would be allowed smaller lots and the setback was changed for them. Some others might feel a horse is more substantial and should be 100 from the line. Currently, what is required is 100' for any poultry or livestock. Kryzer – if there is a practical difficulty that can be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. Dye stated the setbacks could be too restrictive. Bravinder the 100' is what he was referring to. Borrell when you put up a building; that is a feedlot further clarification was discussed.
- I. Suzanne Dye – currently if there is a barn and you divide off area from the open space that could be a problem. It is common to have a smaller fenced area near the barn where they can keep the horses and where the water is. Don't always want the horses out on pasture. A feedlot to her is a large number of horses, where you provide feed and there can be a manure build up. She is interested in two or three horses and noted there could be dirt area around a shed or where they are watered or given supplemental feed. Borrell – for supplemental feeding and water there are exemptions. Riley – there are those things, but preventing horses from the pasture and not having part of the grass to feed, that could be a feedlot. Kryzer – the County is required to enforce the MN PCA regulations, even if it is one horse that creates the feedlot. Mol – added, the County did not write the State regulations.
- J. Riley – questioned why there would be a concern that they cannot have those too close to a wetland or to a lake. Janikula goes out to a lot of sites that are in poor shape and there is need for regulations to address those. The proposal has gone from 1,000' to 300' from water. Borrell stated the setback proposed is 300' and if there is a unique situation an owner can petition the Board of Adjustment. Mol – Dye needs to look at where the County was and what

is being proposed. Borrell had looked at the Dye property and thinks this will work. Suzanne Dye – she has looked at where a shelter could be placed but was concerned there may be some dirt near where the horses get fed or watered. Mol – some people don't take care of their sites like she would. Knows of situations where they are creating a problem for their neighbors. There are a lot of small acreages with horses and there is concern the animals that are not being taken care of. The County is giving a lot of leniencies; can have chickens on small parcels, leeway on setbacks and shoreland. Felt they are going backwards. If Dye is concerned about these setbacks, she maybe should be looking for a bigger parcel.
B. Dye stated Suzanne has a 27 year old horse she wants to take home.

Mol asked for further comment, hearing none, brought the matter back to Commission. See motion made after the following proposed amendment.

PUBLIC HEARING: AMEND CHAPTER 155.103 – HOME EXTENDED BUSINESS –New Item

Consider an amendment to the Home Extended Business, Wright County Code of Ordinances Chapter 155.103 to change the following condition (strike-out words to be removed, underlined words to be added):

(C) ~~No outside storage of supplies, equipment or maintenance items;~~ All all work and work related items shall be kept in an enclosed structure. In very limited circumstances, the Planning Commission may allow for the storage of items in a fully enclosed fence. Trees, plants, and bushes do not qualify as fencing but these items may be required as part of an overall landscaping plan.

- A. Proposed amended is to Section 155.103, Home Extended Business Subp (C).
- B. Riley explained no outdoor items are allowed. He read the language change. This would allow in limited circumstances, the Planning Commission could allow some work related items in a fully enclosed fence.... The responses received were noted. Woodland Town Board response indicates they do not agree.
- C. Mol asked for public input, hearing no response, the matter returned to the Commission.
- D. Felger – when they say structure does that mean a building with roof and walls? Riley – had discussed that before, the definition is pretty open. The intent is a building is needed to get a HEB. Section 159 was read that describes “structure”. Now that they have allowed the potential for outdoor, do they want to say building instead of structure?
- E. Mol closed the public hearing portion of the hearing.
- F. Felger – moved to recommend both Ordinance amendments as presented by Staff, including the revised language presented tonight by Kryzer. D. Thompson seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE INSPECTION

Site inspections were scheduled for Wednesday, October 5, 2016. Board members to meet at the Public Works Building at 2:00 p.m.

2017 Meeting calendar was provided – Riley suggested the members review the dates. Action to be taken at the organizational meeting in January.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Riley
Planning & Zoning Administrator

SR:tp

cc: Planning Commission
County Board of Commissioners
Kryzer
Twp. Clerks
Applicants