

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: January 10, 2019

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met January 10, 2019 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, acting as Chairman pro-tem, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following Board members present: Ken Felger, Pat Mahlberg, Charlie Borrell, Dave Thompson & Dan Bravinder. Absent were: Dan Mol & Jan Thompson. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning office; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present.

2019 Organizational Items

A. Riley opened nominations to elect a Chair for 2019:

One nomination was made by Borrell for Dan Mol. The motion was seconded by D. Thompson, hearing no further nominations, a unanimous ballot was cast for Mol.

B. In Mol's absence, Riley opened nominations for a Vice-Chair:

Mahlberg made a motion to appoint Ken Felger as Vice-Chair, seconded by Borrell. Borrell motioned to cease nominations and a unanimous ballot was cast for Felger as Vice-Chair. Seconded by D. Bravinder

C. K. Felger referred to the proposed 2019 Meeting Calendar and asked if there was any discussion regarding the dates or time of the meetings. Riley reminded the Board, that at the November 2018 meeting, concern was mentioned regarding the meeting date of 4/18/2019 being on a holiday week. Amongst the members there was discussion regarding various options of adjusting the February, March and April meetings with the consensus being that no changes needed to be made to the proposed meeting dates.

A motion by Bravinder was made to set the 2019 regular meetings of the Planning Commission in accord with calendar provided; Commission to meet on a Thursday of every month (some months may have two meetings) at 7:30 p.m. in the Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center; and any meeting may be canceled by a majority vote of the Commission, or by the Chairman in the case of severe weather conditions or other emergency. D. Thompson seconded the motion. Carried Unanimously.

MINUTES

On a motion by Bravinder, seconded by Mahlberg, all voted to approve the minutes for the December 13, 2018 meeting as printed.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. **THOMAS W. HOLTHAUS** – Cont. from 12/13/2018

LOCATION: 11693 – Aetna Avenue NE – Part of the NW ¼, Section 6, Township 121, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Monticello Twp.) Tax #213-100-062400

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit as regulated in Chapter 154; and Section 155.029 & 155.047(D)(F) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow an unplatted residential subdivision (7 lots proposed, one to include the existing homestead). Property was rezoned to A/R Agricultural-Residential in 1994.

Present: Josh Holthaus; representative for Thomas Holthaus

- A. Riley displayed the location map, zoning, land use maps and subdivision proposal. The item was continued by the Planning Commission for a site inspection. The property was rezoned to A/R in 1994 and minutes were provided for that action. The applicant's request is for a subdivision of the property, as presented on the proposal. At the last meeting the applicant was asked to show drainage easements. Those easements have been delineated on the presented subdivision plan. Since this is not a platted development and there is no homeowner association, it is not clear who will maintain or be responsible for drainage items. Borrell - spoke with the applicant and after their conversation he feels that the applicant recognizes it is in everyone's best interest to understand the drainage concerns and documents at the time of sale will included language related to drainage. To go through a legal avenue at this time will be costly and time consuming when it can be addressed at the time of sale on the deed. Riley – as long as it is understood that limits and conditions will be properly recorded on the deed at time of sale. Borrell – agrees and feels that the applicant has a good understanding of what needs to be addressed.
- B. Felger opened the hearing to the public and asked the applicant if he had anything to add. J. Holthaus – had no comment.
- C. Bravinder - comments from Wright County Soil & Water Conservation District (SWCD) appear to be addressed in the suggested motion. He wants to make sure the property owners know what needs to be done to maintain the drainage tiles and keep them open, as that seems to be a concern of SWCD. Borrell – does not believe there are tiles. SWCD didn't know so they just stated that if there are drain tiles they wanted to make sure the upkeep is addressed, so that there are not future drainage problems. SWCD might be pushing their legal authority; but, he appreciates SWCD bringing the tiles into conversation so that draining issues and conflicts can be prevented. Bravinder – recognizes SCWD might not have legal authority, he simply wanted to make sure that the SCWD recommendation was addressed. Riley – records indicate there are no tiles on the property, there are drainage ditches that are protected by easement. There are small wetlands that are addressed by State law and included in the conditions.
- D. Borrell motioned to approve the conditional use permit for the seven-lot subdivision with the following conditions: 1) the easements for drainage areas are recorded on deeds when lots are sold; 2) the drainage areas are not disturbed or diminished, and non-drainage

related improvements cannot be made within these easement areas; 3) per Feedlot regulations each parcel will be allowed $\frac{1}{2}$ animal unit per acre. Also, each lot will not be allowed to reach 10 animal units and any building that houses animals will need to be 100 feet from property lines and 300 feet from the lake; 4) structures must be 200 feet from the lake; 5) proper access permits as needed from the Township will be properly obtained; and 6) wetlands exist within the subdivision and cannot be filled or altered without approval from the Soil and Water Conservation District. Seconded by Bravinder.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **DINGMAN CUSTOM HOMES** – Cont. from 12/13/18

LOCATION: 8514 County Road 13 SE – Part of Gov't Lots 1 & 2, Section 15; also Part of Gov't Lot 1, lying south of County Road 13, Section 16, all in Township 118, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Cedar Lake -Franklin Twp.) Tax #208-200-153200 & -164100 Owner: Freedom Creek, Inc.

Petitions to rezone approximately 22.5 acres from AG General Agricultural and S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands to R-2a Suburban Residential and S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.051 & 155.057 of Chapter 155, & Chapter 156, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Present: Dale Dingman & Linda Splittstoezer

- A. Riley displayed the location map, zoning, land use plan and the concept plan. The Commission had continued the rezoning request for a site inspection. The property is currently zoned AG, on Cedar Lake and in the land use plan as AG. The Planning Commission needs to determine if the parcel is “especially suited for residential development” and provide a recommendation to the County Board regarding the rezoning request.
- B. Splittstoezer – stated for several months she has worked with Riley to make sure this project meets the County Ordinance standards. The County Highway Department requested that the new township road will need to be south of the current property access. Franklin Township is willing to take over the road and is in favor of the development. Because there is a small window of opportunity to build in Minnesota they are looking for the Boards approval tonight so that they can start with road work. Riley – addressed the Planning Commission, the rezoning request is what is being discussed tonight, without rezoning there is not a subdivision.
- C. Felger – asked for clarification regarding the request from the Highway Department. Riley – the original idea was for the new road to be located at the current home access. Because of visibility and safety concerns the Highway Department requested that the new road be moved farther south with a left turn lane added to the County road. Felger asked if there is a public access on this lake. Dingman – no there is no public lake access.
- D. Felger – opened the hearing for public comment. Hearing no response, returned to the Commission.
- E. Borrell – commented that the Ordinance allows land like this to be rezoned, if deemed as ideally suited. There are two recent requests the Commission has approved rezoning on a Natural Environment Lake; noting Ember and Washington Lake where there was no question that the land was ideally suited. One concern of a Town Board member as well as the Commission’s Chair, is what happens when houses are built in rural areas and complaints are heard regarding expansion of existing feedlots. He could support this if the County added to the Ordinance language that would require a buyer to sign a document

which states they are aware what moving into an agricultural setting means. He referred to a friend in California that was required to sign a statement of understanding when she moved into an Ag area. Mahlberg – the Ordinances already details what is and is not allowed in the Ag areas and the problem still exists with people moving out into farming areas thinking they are going to have peace and quiet. Borrell proposed a workshop to create a provision that could be added to the Ordinance to address this concern. Mahlberg – what about the next future buyers, would they be giving up the right to petition the government for redress? Wouldn't this just be an acknowledgement of the rules? Borrell – the Staff and Commission understands these situations, but the lay person does not. He asked if Staff could come up with a document for buyers to sign. Kryzer – responded, no. This would not be a job for the County as this is an issue between private owners. Dingman stated that language could be added into the covenants. Riley explained although covenants are nice to put property owners on notice, the County does not enforce private covenant rules. His office will address legitimate complaints; but normal farm operation activity is exempt from nuisance standards. Kryzer –the California situation Borrell is referencing was probably to avoid a private suit for nuisance with the document possibly coming from the private seller and not the County. Riley - the argument is that areas which are largely agriculture, in the Land Use Plan to stay agriculture, shouldn't have pockets of different uses introduced; because conflicts arise. Borrell – complaints and issues are not always farm related but could be noise such as a discharge of a firearm. Riley – discharging of a firearm is not a zoning issue. Kryzer –there are State regulations that address distance to a building when discharging a firearm. The County does not regulate discharging of a firearm. Borrell – is trying to find a way to prevent a problem that seems to keep coming up.

- F. Bravinder – looking for direction on how a developer's agreement would work. Kryzer – if the County would enter into a developer's agreement it would be related to the development of the road. Riley – other infrastructure might be involved, such as drainage ditches and ponds. Bravinder – the Township response mentioned the development agreement. Kryzer stated that the development agreement is only there to make sure the road is built to Township specifications. The agreement has nothing to do with rezoning; but the subdivision portion of the request. Bravinder mentioned that in the past requests on marginal lakes had lakeshore, in this proposal it does not appear that all lots have lakeshore. Riley – the proposal was displayed to show how the lots are orientated with the lakeshore and the ordinary highwater mark. The standard is not that the lots touch the shoreline of a lake; but if this parcel is “especially suited for residential development” if it is not in the Land Use Plan. Similarities between past requests and this request need to be decided by the Commissioners. The common thread is not if the lots touch the shoreline, that is a given, it needs to be determined if the parcel is “especially suited for residential development” or not.
- G. Felger – the standard is not necessarily the quality of the lakeshore. When the Ordinance says “especially suited for residential development” what does that speak to? Does it speak to the quality of the lake or accessibility to lakeshore as part of the criteria? Riley – there is not a clear definition and interpretation can vary. The Commission determined that the parcels on Ember and Washington Lake were favorable to the standard of “especially

suitied for residential development”. Felger – the items that tipped him in favor of those two requests was that there was already lakeshore development, lake quality and the access to the lake. Ember has lakeshore where you can walk right down to the lake, there is existing development around the lake, although the parcel they were looking at included agricultural land, it was not surrounded by Ag land. In this case he doesn’t see the similarities that he saw with the other two lakes. Admittedly, it was not a unanimous decision on those two lakes because of issues relative to the Ordinance; and, if the property is properly suited in an AG district. He doesn’t see that this request compares with the past two decisions.

- H. Borrell – the way the Ordinance reads the parcel does not have to be on a lake, we could have a parcel anywhere that is ideally suited for residential development. Kryzer – the land use plan reads “shoreland especially suited for residential development”. Mahlberg – read the specific language. Borrell – it could go either way but the way it reads it is more likely shoreland. Mahlberg – would not necessarily characterize as more likely or not, they are just different standards and comes down to interpretation. His initial reaction is that this lake looks like a lot of lakes in agricultural areas; with a significant amount of a floating bog between shoreland and open water. Bodies of water like this exist all over the County. He does not see these types of lakes as being “especially suited for residential development”. At the site visit he did note that the lots would be on a vista, not a bluff, that would provide nice views for the building sites. Is a nice view enough to convert this area into residential development and approve rezoning? He would like to hear thoughts on why this lake would especially suited for residential development.
- I. Felger – asked Kryzer to give the legal interpretation of the term riparian. Kryzer - a lot that abuts a public water body. Mahlberg – this is a riparian lot, that isn’t the question, the question is if a shoreland is “especially suited for residential development”. There is not a lot of guidance in the Land Use Plan for what would be considered “especially suited for residential development”.
- J. Borrell – the positive side is that this lot is in Franklin Township, an area of fast growth. Residential development is especially prevalent north of Farmington Avenue. Asked how close this property is to City limits? Riley – the location is near a Transition Area and the City of Delano. Franklin Township is fast growing and that is why areas east of the river were recently added into their Land Use Plan. Sometimes in the areas on the border of growth and near cities is where you see the most conflict with residential lots moving into agriculture areas. Borrell – The Town Board approved, with one member of the Township engaged in agriculture expressed concerns; but may concede with the document suggested. The Town Board is pro-development, they want to see the tax base in the Township expanded. Borrell feels it is appropriate because the infra-structure is there, the Delano schools have a good reputation and proximity to the metro area. Washington Lake is fairly close to the City of Buffalo with Ember Lake being out a distance; but still was a beautiful spot with scenery. This lake would have sizeable lots, nice views overlooking undeveloped areas. He could go either way, but does see a benefit. Mahlberg – noted Township Supervisor McMullen, states it is the Township’s mission to leave the planning and zoning in the hands of the County; but if approved, they would accept the road. Another

Supervisor states he is opposed to the request. Sometimes the Township Board response is crystal clear, this one is not. Mahlberg asked Borrell about his comment that rezoning shoreland in Franklin Township is more suitable than other Townships. How is this lake different than similar lakes in the County? Borrell – this location has beautiful views, Township is inviting growth, wants the tax base and is in near the metro. If the location was Stockholm or Woodland, he does not think he would lean the same way. Mahlberg – trying to determine what this argument means for other riparian lots on a lake that looks like this, in an agricultural area throughout the County. Borrell – the difference with this location, versus Ember and Washington, is the beautiful views. If this location was in Stockholm or Woodland Township, he doesn't think he would be leaning towards approval. Felger – questioned Borrell how Townships can be treated differently. Borrell – in this situation his interpretation of especially suited is that this location is in a Township that is inviting growth, wants expansion and near the metro. On Ember and Washington was using a totally different interpretation. Mahlberg – with Ember the Board interpreted that it is a nice recreational lake, where people could use speed boats and had development around the lakeshore. Borrell – there can be a difference of interpretation on what is especially suited and that is why there is a seven-member board.

- K. Dingman – people buy lakeshore for different reasons. Buyers purchase lakeshore for the view and not necessarily access or use. The City is quickly developing with 250 lots coming on Darrow. Splettstoesser – this lot is one parcel west of the City limits with very little agricultural land around the property, with active agriculture across County Road 13. She lives in a neighborhood on Rice Lake which is a similar lake to Cedar. People move to the lake because they like the views, wildlife and they want the privacy. This property offers ideal walk-out home sites with wonderful views of Cedar Lake. Borrell – the Little Rock Lake development had a similar shoreline and is not an ideal lake for boating. Instead of lake access; the woods and maple trees were part of the reasoning for rezoning approval. Some buyers want an active lake with others preferring more of the wildlife viewing property. Mahlberg – the AG district already allows for that. There are ag parcels in the County that abut bodies of water that look like this lake.

- L. Bravinder stated that he is hesitant in saying this is a better view than another location, that is all in the “eye of the beholder”. He will not try to judge the request based solely on the view. This location fits the same that Little Rock and Ember Lakes did because it is a Natural Environment lake. In that regard, he views these all the same because they abut a Natural Environment lake. Felt that Little Rock Lake was a great place to develop, with bigger lots being over 10 acres. He asked the zoning district used on Little Rock Lake. Riley – Little Rock Lake was A/R S/2 with the same provision being used. The rezoning request here is smaller because 10 acre lots will not fit. Felger reminded the Board that the approval on Little Rock Lake was not unanimous. Bravinder – not willing to judge if one location has a better view or one is better because it has a more defined shoreline. He goes back to the riparian definition and this request meets that description. Mahlberg – what he is hearing Bravinder say, is that if the lots are riparian, have a buildable site, they have approved rezoning other NE lakes and that meets the requirements for him. His understanding of the lake hierarchy is that the NE lake is at the bottom of what is thought of as a developable lake, with GD lakes at the top of the list. The conclusion would be that

any proposal to rezone an AG zoned parcel that abuts a NE lake is to be considered “especially suited for development”. Bravinder – if the topography is there, with a high buildable area that is not flood prone, he would be okay with the request. Mahlberg – questioned how a topographical distinction is different than the comment of beauty is in the “eye of the beholder”. Bravinder - there are some NE lakes in the County that are flat and prone to flooding; therefore, they are not buildable lots or desirable for development. Mahlberg – clarified it is Bravinder’s opinion that if the location is a buildable riparian lot on a NE lake. Bravinder – confirms that is close to his interpretation. Mahlberg – asked if he has the same opinion as Borrell that the Township is a factor? Bravinder - no, does not agree with that statement. Borrell clarified that he is not saying he would not consider rezoning in other areas of the County. With this request, the Township and location is adding weight and credence to his decision.

- M. Riley stated that if the standard was that the location is a riparian lot on a lake, then all lakes could be in the Land Use Plan. That simple of a standard would be reflected in the Plan and if a lot is buildable, the township accepted the road than the request would likely happen. Rice Lake was in the Plan. The standard is not simply, it abuts a lake.
- N. Mahlberg – Bravinder’s position includes that the lot must be buildable, which includes not being in a flood prone area. Mahlberg did not feel they can cast a wide net across all NE lakes. Riley – buildable is not the only determination for rezoning. For rezoning the Commission is not reviewing soils, building and septic code and road standards. It is a given you cannot build in a flood plain or wetland. The Commission can consider anything, but seem to be going back to whether it touches the lake and if that is the only standard, then what lake is not especially suited? Mahlberg – that is part of the problem he is having differentiating. Should the buildable component even be used as part of the consideration? Riley – the Commission can consider what they choose but conversation keeps gravitating back to if the lot is riparian. If the standard is the lot touches the lake, is not muck, not flood prone and is not on a bluff than what lake would not be especially suited? There would probably be 10% of the lakes scratched from the list and the other 90% added to the Land Use Plan. Mahlberg – the language regarding “especially suited for residential development” would be eliminated from the Plan. Riley - interpretation is completely up to the Commission; but if the interpretation comes down to buildability on the lake, in theory the Land Use Plan can be revised to include all lakes that are buildable. Borrell feels there can be different reasons for what makes a lot especially suited. As Bravinder mentioned, there are many things that add to the decision as to what makes a location “especially suited”. The site inspection allowed the Commissioners to see the vistas, access to the County road and he could see that these lots could be very marketable. Felger – “marketability” is not a concern of the Commission. Borrell agreed that is not the only item, but if a lot is not especially suited they might not sell. Certain buyers will look for a location to view wildlife and the fact there cannot be motor boats would be appealing.
- O. Bravinder – according to SWCD comments, the wetland identified in the delineation indicated that if the proposed plan is followed there should be no impact to the wetlands. The County Highway Department provided their requirements and the applicant agrees to meet those conditions. When making decisions he looks at the reports from other

departments as well as their opinion and recommendations. Mahlberg – the applicant is planning to meet the required standards that does not necessarily mean the departments are in favor of the proposal. Riley – the proposed plan must meet a set of standards, that is a given. The Commission must first decide the rezoning under the definition and determine “especially suited”, not the other departments.

- P. Bravinder – when the Townships created the Land Use Plan, maybe they didn’t necessarily foresee exactly how the County would grow and develop or how fast areas would grow. Mahlberg – the comment about the Township not thinking far enough in advance or foreseeing how growth would occur doesn’t seem accurate. When looking at the Plan it appears that the Townships did look at the future, they could foresee the development coming and they were going to control where the development occurred. They wanted to keep residential development out of the agricultural areas as they realized agricultural areas, in all the quadrants, are very important. Borrell – his argument is that the County and Board has changed. He feels when the Plan was created it matched exactly what the County Board wanted, he is not sure the current Board would think the same way. In the predominately dominate agriculture Townships there are little pockets of development using the “1 per 40” rule and does not see the resistance. Feels Chairman Mol would agree with the old Boards way of thinking. Understands that new residents move into the country and make it more difficult for the people farming and referred to the problems that Hennepin County is seeing. He would like to see an understanding with new residents moving into the rural area that they accept what comes with the location.
- Q. Splittstoezer – feels this property is especially suited more so than any other property that she could think of; the beautiful views, perfect walk-out sites, one parcel away from the city limits and limited agriculture area. Believes this parcel has all the criteria to meet especially suited and if this property does not fit, what would. Mahlberg – something that looks like Rock or Ember lake. Splittstoezer - she lives on Rice Lake, which is similar, because she wants to see the wildlife and not hear jet skis. Borrell – noted they do not want people moving out and complaining about the ag activities or an expansion of a feedlot. Bravinder asked what is going on with the parcel to the east? Splittstoezer – the owner is building a house. Riley – asked if the parcel to the east has horses? Splittstoezer – it is not being farmed, it is just a residential lot with a house being built.
- R. Riley – reviewed the surrounding area that is zoned AG and did not do an inventory of what all the existing ag. uses are. Noted the neighboring Church that is a Conditional Use Permit in the AG district and that the Town Board felt that was taking up too much farmland.
- S. Felger – if there is an action to rezone, would a neighboring farmers rights be restricted or infringed upon if they wanted a feedlot? Riley – Feedlot Officer, Tracy Janikula, would be the one to address this question. Janikula did indicate the proposed house locations should not be a problem for the existing operations; but she could not speak to the future or new feedlots near existing homes. Kryzer – there is a 500’ setback for future agricultural buildings and activity to any new house.

- T. Borrell moved to recommend to the County Board rezoning approximately 22.5 acres from AG General Agricultural and S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands to R-2a Suburban Residential and S-2 as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.051 & 155.057 of Chapter 155, & Chapter 156, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances. Planning Commission feels it meets the definition of “especially suited for residential development”. D. Thompson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Malhberg explained he has come to the opinion that “especially suited to residential” is a property that stands out above others to make it “especially suited”. He feels this lake looks too much like a lot of other lakes in the County. People can create beautiful lots with wonderful wildlife viewing in so many other locations in the Counties Ag districts. This location does not stand out enough to meet the “especially suited” standard.

Borrell appreciates that thought and noted that other members might see other aspects in their interpretation as reasoning. Everyone has their own threshold.

D. Thompson – does not see a lot of recreational uses on the lake and that influences his decision. There does not seem to be any access to the lake, no docks or snowmobile trails and did not think there would be any activities on the lake. Unlikely, people will be recreating on the lake and his reason for seconding the motion.

Mahlberg – felt that in the winter people would be driving through the marsh with four-wheelers so they could fish.

VOTE: CARRIED

IN FAVOR: Borrell, D. Thompson and Bravinder

NAY: Felger & Mahlberg

3. **LARRY S. STUBBS** – New Item

LOCATION: XXX 28th Street SE – Lot 2, Block 1, Whispering Winds Industrial Park Second Addition, according to plat of record, Section 14, Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, (Rockford Twp.) Owner: LS Enterprises, LLC Tax #215-063-001020

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a general contracting and house moving business to include construction of a building to house equipment and offices for the business as regulated in Section 155.029 & 155.055 Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances. Property is zoned I-1 General Industry.

Present: Larry Stubbs

- A. Riley reviewed the property location. The lot is located in the Rockford Township Whispering Winds Industrial Park and zoned Industrial. The Planning Commission recently subdivided this parcel off of a larger parcel, to the west, which is where the house moving business is currently operating. The request is to move the house moving business from the larger parcel to the smaller parcel. The site plan was displayed, showing the proposed building and parking. The application has indicated that he does not have plans to build the building right away, so the Planning Commission needs to determine if the six-month building start date can be waived, indefinitely extended or given a time frame.
- B. Stubbs stated that as of now, the plan is to start the new building construction this summer.
- C. Felger – history was that this smaller lot was split from larger piece. Stubbs – confirmed that the parcel was originally 6 acres, which is where he was running his business. It was split into a 4 and 2 acre lots. Buyers will purchase the 4 acres and his plan is to use the 2 acres and continue his business.
- D. Bravinder motion to approve a conditional use permit for a house moving business with the following conditions: 1) access permit is obtained from Township, if needed; 2) improvements are made according to site plan and narrative submitted; and 3) six-month start requirement on construction of building is waived. Seconded my Mahlberg.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Riley
Planning & Zoning Administrator

SR:sld/tp

cc: Planning Commission
County Board of Commissioners
Kryzer
Applicant/owners
Twp. Clerks