

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: February 25, 2021

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met February 25, 2021 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Ken Felger, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. with members present in person: Dan Bravinder & Mike Kaczmarek, in attendance remotely were Felger, Corey Tanner. Mol, arrived in person at 1:10 and assumed the Chair. Absent were Jan Thompson and Pat Mahlberg. Sean Riley represented the Planning & Zoning Office; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, providing legal counsel remotely. Riley reminded the Commission there is a Site Inspection scheduled for March 2, if there are additional properties they want to visit.

MINUTES – February 4, 2021 meeting

On a motion by Bravinder, seconded by Tanner, a unanimous vote passed to approve the minutes for the February 4, 2021 meeting as printed.

1. **JOE P. BOLLANT** – Cont. from 2/4/21

LOCATION: 220 80TH Street NW –Part of SE ¼ of SE ¼, Section 24, Township 121, Range 26, Wright County, (Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #210-100-244400 & 210-100-244301

Petitions to rezone approximately 3 acres out of east side of 210-100-244301 from R-2a Suburban-Residential to AG General Agriculture and a Conditional Use Permit for a subdivision to expand existing residential lot (210-100-244400) that is zoned AG General Agriculture for septic area as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.029, 155.047 & 155.048 Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances and Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Joe Bollant, on WebEx

- A. Riley summarized the previous hearing and action to recommend rezoning a portion of the land back to AG in order to expand the existing “lot of record”. The County Board action to approve was received. The Commission is considering the subdivision which requires a Conditional Use.
- B. Bollant explained his goal is to include the area that contains the new sewer system in the lot. The County allowed placement of the sewer with an easement on the adjacent land. The easement will be lifted once the 1.2 acres is attached.
- C. Felger opened the hearing for public comment, no one in attendance and he returned to the Commission. Felger noted the information in the Staff Report indicates the survey work shows a slight difference in the land area to be added. He asked if it is not a substantive difference? Riley noted the site plan provided them originally was slightly different, but the parcels meet the lot standards. The zoning map will reflect the area described on the survey.
- D. Bravinder moved to approve a conditional use permit for a subdivision in accord with the survey submitted and prepared by Meyer Rohlin Land Services with the revised date of 2/24/2021; File No. 21117 because it meets all minimum requirements for both districts and the Town Board approves. Tanner seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mol arrived and assumed the Chair.

2. **JUSTON D. DOOLEY** – Cont. from 1/14/21

LOCATION: 731 County Road 30 SE – Part of E ½ of NE ¼, Section 18, Township 118, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Franklin Twp.) Tax #208-200-181101

Owner: Dooley Farm LLC

Petitions to amend the existing Conditional Use Permit to allow for the expansion and addition of a “tasting room” in a new building for the winery under Commercial Agriculture Tourism to allow for indoor gatherings and to expand the limit of 10 large public events a year for up to 350 guests to 20 large public events a year as regulated in Section 155.003(B)(119), 155.003(B)(25), 155.029, 155.048 & 155.109 of Chapter 155 Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Juston Dooley

- A. Riley summarized the hearing was continued for a site inspection. The existing winery operation wants an amendment to expand the Commercial Outdoor recreation and also asking for Commercial Ag Tourism. The new building for public use and area for additional parking was shown on a site plan displayed. Discussion and concern centered on expanding events, status of the existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and the outdoor music. The type of language the Board has used, limits what that is. Discussion should address any concerns the Commission might have.
- B. Dooley, Riley mentioned concerns on the existing status of the CUP. He asked, is there something the Board wants to change before considering the new request. Riley – they have 10 large events, and the request is 20 events; there is a condition on the music that it will not be a nuisance for neighboring properties; and a request for music and the question is whether the level of events is to be low level similar to when the CUP was originally approved. The clarification needed is music small in the evening, with a guitar, amplification etc? They need clarification on the extent. Dooley – apologized for not being at the site inspection, however, his wife was able to show them around. Expanding for an additional ten events and the purpose of the building is to have some indoor events. The events would be year around and the reason for expanding the number would allow them to have winter events. He is open to discussion on those indoor events. The number is high at 375 people for the current 10 events. Riley that is correct and hours for those are 11 a.m. 10 p.m. with music ceasing at 9 p.m. and only on Friday and Saturday. The indoor building might alleviate some of the concerns about the music, or they could require a certain number take place indoors rather than outdoors. The Commission could address those kinds of conditions. Dooley – had asked a few of the neighbors who are within close proximity to write in about their experiences of events last year. Mol confirmed the Commission received copies of those letters. Dooley – understands and respects the one neighbor who has concerns about expanding events and is willing to talk about what the additional events might look like. Summarized the hours are acceptable, the winery closes at 10. Completely open to discussion for the additional ten events and offered a cap of up to 200 people. Although the property can handle the large crowds, agrees the 375 is a large crowd; but events such as an art festival they are planning for this coming summer could draw that many. There would not be much noise at that event, a lot of traffic; but lines of tents in the 7-10 acres of field and potentially a lot of people onsite. He is not suggesting having rock band concerts out here. They cannot be successful with distraught neighbors.
- C. Mol opened the hearing for public comment. No one responded.

- D. Tanner – asked about traffic control for events that attract a lot of people. He would want assurance that emergency vehicle access is not restricted. Dooley - there are two entrances, in an emergency they could access the winery through his residential driveway. Has not had discussions with emergency services. Tanner was impressed with the property when he visited the site.
- E. Kaczmarek – there were different conversations with the applicant and then with his wife at the site. He wanted to review what they were told. The three biggest concerns are traffic, parking, and noise. There is an apple orchard nearby. There are a lot of curves on the road, but in his 20 years on patrol in this area, the accidents he responded to did not have anything to do with people coming and going to either operation. At the last meeting Dooley mentioned a full-size stage and concert atmosphere for bands, but then his wife mentioned that was scaled back. Dooley stated he misspoke; he meant there was a band that had set up a temporary one. They have no plans for a permanent stage. Asking for expansion of events and additional space. Kaczmarek – a suggested clause is to revisit this in a year and because of the neighbor’s concern, he felt that might be appropriate, noting this use had a history. Dooley agreed and wants to address any concerns so they can be successful. Mol -often times the review is by the Town Board and if there are no concerns, then it does not have to come back to the Commission. Kaczmarek is agreeable with that. Bravinder stated as a business owner, he has concerns about an applicant putting a lot of money into an “Interim Permit”. He would support a Town Board review. Dooley stated he wants to be a good neighbor and hopes to make this a family destination.
- F. Mol - felt there should be no outdoor music other than during the day because the weddings with music outdoors tend to get out of hand. Dooley asked if they are restricting outdoor music? Mol – he was referring to the amplified music that is turned up on property of this size, so it carries. Dooley hoping to have some outdoor events with acoustic music because summers are short, but the majority of dances and music would be held indoors. Mol agreed it would contain the music better if it is indoors. The complaints come from neighbors who are trying to enjoy their property and have to listen to the music going on every weekend. Kaczmarek – advised adhering to the music cutoff time to avoid attention to it.
- G. Kaczmarek moved to amend the existing Conditional Use Permit with review by the Town Board in one year to allow for the expansion of a “tasting room” in a new building for the winery under Commercial Agriculture Tourism to allow for indoor gatherings in accord with the narrative and plans held on file and to expand the limit to 20 large public events a year (which are any event with 100 people or more) with the following conditions: 1) All required permits must be acquired before the expansion can take place for the new building and septic; 2) Parking area is expanded before the implementation of the expanded number of events and expanded tasting room can occur; 3) Food for the expanded building events will be catered in; and 4) Any expansion or change in conditions would require a new Conditional Use Permit. Tanner seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **BUFFALO LAKE, LLC, represented by Michael M. Erpelding** – Cont. from 1/14/21

LOCATION: Part of Gov't Lots 4, 5 & 6 Section 1, Township 119, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Deer & Buffalo Lakes – Marysville Twp.) Tax #211-000-012400 & - 013100

Petitions to rezone from AG General Agriculture & S-2 Residential-Recreational Shorelands to A/R Agricultural-Residential and S-2 and a Rural Planned Unit Development District. Also requests a Conditional Use Permit for a platted 12-lot residential subdivision as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.029, 155.047, 155.057 & 155.059, Chapter 155 Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Paul Otto on WebEx

- A. Riley summarized the previous hearing and action approving the zoning to A/R and a Planned Unit Development District. The hearing on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the subdivision was continued a few times to allow the applicant to work on the road details and complete the survey work for the preliminary plat. The preliminary plat was displayed. The information required was received and the Commission is to consider whether they will accept the plan or want modifications and attach conditions to it.
- B. Otto explained the Town Board has been working on details for the road specs and he expects final action soon. They are willing to build it to their specifications. The plan shows the current road plans. There will be some delay before they come back with a final plat as they work through those matters. Have designed residential lots out of the wetlands and there are no wetland impacts, all the wetlands are in the outlots. All the lots have access to the Outlots. Much like what was before the Commission last time, other than minor adjustments to back lines to keep the wetlands out of the residential lots. A couple of outbuildings will be removed. Asked for clarification on the building permits and when they could be issued. Looking for the Board's feelings on that. They are comfortable with the rest of what is in the Staff Report.
- C. Mol – as a member of the Board of Adjustment, noting these will likely be high-end homes, questioned if there is enough room on these lots for storage buildings of about 2,000 sq. ft.? Otto felt there is. But noted if the home is built in the wrong spot, it could limit what they could build. He advises his clients to think about whether they want an outbuilding or a pool in the future and plan accordingly. He noted these lots have at least two acres and should accommodate this if they do it right. Only two lots that might be limited: Lot 1, Block 1, coming off the highway has some steep slopes, as well as Lot 5, also has some limits, noting the feedlot setback limits those two lots. Mol – he wants to avoid anyone coming in for variances.
- D. Riley – the suggested motion states the building sites will closely match the site plan/survey, or if they change substantially it might require a land alteration or a CUP. He further explained, the lots on the west side of the road have slopes to the west and if an owner wants to flip-flop the house/sewer locations requiring land alterations, he will likely find that a substantial change from what is before them. East of the road, a change from north to south side of the lot for house placement might be acceptable. Primarily a change in elevation for house sites vs what is shown on the plan is the concern. Mol if they would move toward the flood plain, he would not want to see variances to do that. Riley – flood plain regulations must be adhered to. They would discourage that as well as fill. He noted as Administrator, he has some discretion to allow some

movement, but it will be reviewed under these conditions. Mol - would agree they have a document that has the flood plain identified and has the locations laid out.

- E. Kaczmarek - in looking at where the house and sewers are located, could that be moved based on the experts that do the work. Riley stated the initial work has been done, they have located two sewer sites for each lot. Later a full sewer design will be required based on the number of bedrooms etc. This discussion is more about a buyer wanting a completely different house location. There are different impacts and concerns if a change in location requires land alterations, going down slopes and building driveways, structures, or cause drainage concerns.
- F. Felger – along those concerns, he asked Otto about the suggested house placement and is it determined by flood plain, lot elevations, etc. He asked if there might be another location on the lot that meets the same criteria. Riley –one of those criteria would be elevation. For instance, using Lot 2, Block 3, for example and they might want to switch house from southeast to the northeast corner and at the similar elevation/setback, that might be acceptable; however, if in order to change that location it requires much fill or an elevation change, he might find it does not meet the criteria. Otto agrees, looking at the County Ordinance, moving more than a certain amount of material requires a land alteration, may not matter in most home construction, but it would in these PUD developments. Agreed it is good to have some latitude, but they want to avoid making the lot into what someone wants it to be, should look at the lot as to where it makes sense. Felger stated he is not suggesting they should be able to cut in or bring in a lot of fill, he is suggesting they allow some latitude without requiring them to get a variance, but not restrict the house to a specific box on the plan. Riley – good to have the discussion, not so much the placement of the box, but changes in elevation, proximity to road and property lines and impacts on the development. He noted a PUD has been allowed smaller lots with a higher density. They would not be having this discussion or detail on ten-acre A/R lots. This type of development could be impacted down the road by what one owner might do. This is a unified development that has house locations similar to road elevations. Felger felt a buyer who wants a different configuration taking into consideration the setbacks, elevation should be allowed that. Riley if it does not meet the original approval it might have to go through a process, minor changes as described by Felger that meets the criteria would not.
- G. Kaczmarek – in response to written comments, he questioned access to the Deer Lake channel. Would there be access through Outlot A to get to the water of the channel. Riley noted the Outlot does touch Armitage Avenue. Otto pointed a small bay and channel they own land on both sides of the channel all the way along Outlot A on the west side. Kaczmarek – also anything in the Plan that would require any adjustments for the owner to the east who has a feedlot permit now. Riley - pointed out the location and a delineated line on the preliminary plat that requires houses be at least 500' from the feedlot operation. That owner would not have to make any changes because of this plat. Kaczmarek – that owner is asking whether there are any restrictions spreading manure on the land adjacent. Tracy Janikula – Feedlot Administrator online – stated there is a setback of 100' from a well to spread manure. The smell is something those new owners will have to deal with. Kaczmarek – the Town Board has written they still have to complete the road agreement; they have different stipulations to take it over. They want a two-year warranty after last house is built and a frost season. Questioned legally if they are far enough along to act. Riley – the plan shows the minimum County standards are met; Township indicates they are willing to take this over as a public road. Always concerns if there are different things a Township wants. He noted the Town Board can ask for a warranty. A developer's agreement must be received prior to the County Board accepting the final plat. Kryzer - Marysville Township on August 20, stated they

would accept the road if built to their specs, they are still negotiating that. He does not see it as a hindrance to act on the preliminary plat. Details are down to the amount of bituminous and base details. Otto responded that is right. Kryzer - they are not going to get building permits underneath the subdivision ordinance until this is arrived at and need to enter into a developer's agreement. Riley - Otto had a question on building permits and a scenario where the Township finds the road at an acceptable level for issuing driveway permits and the issuance of permits. The staging would be as follows: developer's agreement, final plat improvements to a level they can issue building permits and then final acceptance of the road.

- H. Bravinder – explained in Cokato Township what has worked well is once the plat has been approved, they have worked with the developer and once their requirements are met, they will take that road over with whatever the warranty is. Noted the developers don't want to own the road. Kryzer - the developer's agreements finalize it. Riley the concern is homes may not be completed for 12-15 years, and there is a concern in the meantime whether the Township can do their maintenance in the time between. Bravinder – in his Township they had that concern and wanted to be sure the road could handle any future equipment coming in. Feels agreements could be different, but the criteria do not have to be when the last house was built. Kryzer – concurred the Town Board is the main driver of the agreement and County would just sign off.
- I. Felger – questioned the language in B., of the Staff Report about Outlet that touches the county road is too steep to access and what is that referring to? Riley explained the town road would come off the County Road, with a lot that bounds the county road but would only have a driveway off the town road. Felger noted a misspelling then, it should read Outlot. Is the outlot private or owners along Armitage could gain access to the trails on the Outlot. Riley – it is private and spelled out in the Homeowner's Association and anyone other than someone in the plat would be trespassing as they would be now.
- J. Otto would like clarification on the building permits. As long as the Township could tell the County when permits could be released, if that is the case, he is okay. But asked if Lot 1, Block 4 could get a permit right away. Riley as far as access off the existing Township road that is correct, but there are some buildings that must be removed also. Otto asked if Antelope Avenue would not have to be built to township standards to pull a permit on that lot. Riley – no, but the final plat must be signed, must have the Developer's Agreement, the Township approval of a driveway permit off Armitage Avenue with buildings removed. Kryzer - understands Otto's question is because the draft motion is all inclusive, suggested the Commission could add that a permit for that lot could be taken out before the road is built. Riley clarified that if the plat is filed and is meeting all the other conditions, he would agree.
- K. Kaczmarek moved to approve a conditional use permit for a 12-lot platted subdivision called Lake Estates, as the Commission finds the terms of Chapter 155 Section 155.059 of the zoning ordinance are met, that the plan preserves significant natural areas including wetlands, steep slopes, wildlife habitat, and floodplain, and provides for a better design than a standard subdivision by utilizing the common open space of Outlot A. Therefore the preliminary plat of Lake Estates is approved in accord with the record of these hearings and the plans, terms and specifications submitted by the applicant and completed by Otto Associates dated 2/18/2021 Project #19-0547 and is subject to the following conditions: 1) Prior to recording the final plat checklist must be completed including but not limited to the following: a) Park dedication is paid along with the other fees noted on the plat checklist; b) Title opinion and developer's agreement are submitted and accepted by the County Attorney; c) Documents establishing the homeowner's association and

covenants shall be submitted to the County Attorney for review, and include provisions for the maintenance of common open areas if needed; d) The letter of credit or other acceptable financial surety is established for the Township road and the right turn lane required from the County Highway Department. This will need to be included in the required developer's agreement and approved by the County Attorney's office noting that prior to any building permit the Township will have approved the road as a public road and County Highway Dept. will have approved the access off of County Road 108; unless Township provides confirmation that the road has been completed to the extent that they will approve of Township road access for a building permit to be issued. Driveway approaches onto Township road must be approved by the Township. No driveway access will be allowed off of County Road 108 and no direct access off of CSAH 12 will be allowed; Lot 1, Block 4 can have a building permit independent of the completion of the road build for Antelope Avenue, subject to the Township approving a driveway access permit off of Armitage Avenue; 2) The Commission notes that there are wetland areas and drainage areas throughout the plat and that these areas are subject to regulations and control and cannot be altered without the proper permits through SWCD; 3) The lowest floor of all structures must be at or above elevation 922.7 (RFPE); 4) Outlot A shall be common open space in accord with Section 155.059(I) of the Wright County Code of Ordinances, for the purpose of preserving the natural areas and no further development shall be permitted on Outlot A; 5) To preserve the integrity of a unified development, to protect the drainage and sewage treatment facilities and due to required floodplain elevations for this plat, homes shall be generally located as shown on the approved preliminary plat although minor changes may be allowed if all building requirements are met. Any building or development proposed for any lot must include plans to show the preservation of proper surface drainage and both a primary and secondary sewage treatment site. The Zoning Administrator may require that any significant change of the building location or land alteration on lots shall require review by the Planning Commission as an amendment to this Planned Unit Development approval; 6) Existing buildings on Lot 1, Block 4 must be removed and all structures and refuse properly disposed before any new development takes place on those lots; 7) The lots shall be regulated by the standards for R-2 zoning; and 8) Livestock are allowed as regulated by Section 152 of the Wright County Code of Ordinances. A feedlot setback of 500 feet to a new home affects the dwelling placement on lots: Lot 1, Block 1; Lot 5, Block 2 and Lot 5, Block 3. Those individual lot surveys must show the setback being met at the time of dwelling permit application. Bravinder seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **CURTIS WEIERS** – New Item

LOCATION: 7371 US Hwy. 12 SW – Part of NW ¼ of NE ¼, south of US Hwy. 12, Section 2, Township 118, Range 27, Wright County, MN. (Victor Twp.) Tax #219-000-021200
Owner: Wren

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a consignment auction lot with sales primarily on-line and include an auto dealers license to sell autos through auction sales. Also request a Conditional Use Permit to replace or improve an existing building and allow trailer sales as regulated in Section 155.029 & 155.055 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances. Property is zoned I-1 General Industry.

Present: Curtis Weirs & Carrie both of Wright Way Auction Services

- A. Riley reviewed the property location on State Highway 12 zoned I-1 and Transition in the Land Use Plan. Request is to build a new building to run a new business. Practical concerns are MN Department of Transportation (MN DOT) requirements to build turn lanes to their standards. A new building cannot be built on the footprint of the existing building because it does not meet the highway setback. The Ordinance requires fencing, landscaping, or screening along the east property line to shield the adjacent residential lot.
- B. Weirs explained initially they thought they would remodel the existing structure, however, talking with a contractor, decided to build a new pole building with an office and moving it back to meet the setback. The business is on-line auctions, however, in the future would want the option of live auctions and that is where the turn lanes would come in. They are still negotiating that with the current owner.
- C. Hearing was opened to the public, no response and Mol opened questions up to the Commission,
- D. Weirs stated this operation will be like the auction sales north of Buffalo on Highway 25.
- E. Mol stated most of the Commission have been out to the property a few times. Bravinder – stated he is very familiar with the property, thinks this is a good use. The original use had a lot of traffic in and out of the property. The sight lines are good. Kaczmarek concurred the history was the former site of the T & O junkyard. He questioned what would be installed to meet the requirement for the screening from the residential site. Weirs stated this is the first he heard of this. They had planned a 6' rail fence and need to secure the site, questioned if he needs a different plan. Riley stated more than a split rail. A combination with landscaping is an option. Weirs asked if a 6' privacy fence qualifies? Riley stated the elevation and layout must be part of the consideration. Kaczmarek confirmed they are just addressing the east line. Riley – yes, west side has an existing fence.
- F. Felger moved to approve a Conditional Use Permit for an auction sales lot to include an auto dealers license to sell autos through auction sales and on-site trailer sales in accord with the site plan submitted. This would also include replacement of the existing building for office and storage space with the following conditions: 1) Before the business can commence the turn lane will need to be completed and approved through MN Department of Transportation; 2) Building and septic permits will need to be obtained for the proposed new building and the building will need to meet all setbacks. The old building will need to be removed; 3) Screening, a 6' privacy

fence, will need to be placed along the east side of the property and will need to be constructed before commencement of operation; and 4) Live auctions are limited to a maximum of 100 people on site at any given time; and 5) Any changes in use or expansions would require a new conditional use permit. Tanner seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Bravinder questioned the applicant if he is aware the requirement for turn lanes means they must be constructed and approved by MN DOT before the business commences? Weirs - I heard that but is not what he wanted. Bravinder – this is based on traffic counts; from what he knows from his business on the State Highway. He questioned if this is only needed when they go to live auctions? Weirs – prefers that, money would be escrowed for the improvement when it is needed. Riley did not want to lift the condition without MN DOT input. Discussion on MN DOT requirements must be met before business begins. Weirs – stated his discussion with MN DOT was they are satisfied knowing the money is there and it would get done. Riley he cannot say what MN DOT will accept, and whether money escrowed is enough. Weirs prefers to work with them directly. Felger suggested the motion could be amended to read “subject to all MN DOT requirements being met”, Mol confirmed that the applicant is to work directly with MN DOT before starting. Felger noted it could become onerous, especially if they require a left turn lane. Does not want to put the applicant in a position he would not be able to succeed. Felt this might be arbitrary; there used to be a trailer sales business, no turn lane required; and before that the T & O business. Agreed to amend his motion and it will be up to the applicant to decide.

Felger amended his motion Condition #1, to read “Subject to meeting all MN DOT requirements”
Tanner amended his second.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **ROSS L. DANIELSON** – New Item

LOCATION: 3138 Bolton Avenue SW – NE ¼ of NW ¼, except tract desc. in Bk. 280-444, Section 23, Township 119, Range 26, Wright County. (Marysville Twp.)Tax #211-000-232101/231200

Petitions to rezone five acres from AG General Agriculture to R-2a Suburban-Residential and a Conditional Use Permit for an unplatted two-lot subdivision (one new 5-acre residential building lot). The existing house to remain zoned AG and split off on 2.5 acres with the remaining acreage to be attached to adjacent land owned by the applicant as regulated in Section 155.028, 155.029, 155.048 & 155.051 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances & Wright County Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Ross Danielson & Jonathan Danielson

- A. Riley reviewed the property location in Marysville Township. The zoning map shows AG and the designation for future A/R in the Land Use Plan. The request is to rezone five acres to R-2a for a new building lot. The second lot is an existing home that would be the “entitlement” division and the balance of the AG land to be attached to commonly owned contiguous land to meet frontage.
- B. R. Danielson – reviewed the original farmstead that was split off years ago in the northwest corner and his parents built a new home on the property in 1995 and built pole barns. They also own land to the north and east. Want to split off the house and a pole barn closest to the home on 2.5 acres and second part is rezoning for the five-acre lot. Have had soil tests to show there are a primary and secondary sewer sites. He pointed out existing homes that were split off prior to Ordinances, but there are other four and five acre lots in the area. A few other small lots were pointed out. The natural boundaries are hard to work with, they are using the woods to the south, a pond that would be used as a natural barrier. The lot meets the requirements for an R-2a lot. Trying to set the land up for the highest and best use by using the low land, existing boundaries and preserve the agricultural land. Noted two parcels only touch at corners and adding the agricultural portion will give them proper access to get between the two existing parcels and avoid crossing the Carlson property. No additional expenditures for the Township for roads, the power lines are there. Feels this is consistent with the neighborhood, does not diminish the values of the neighborhood and follows natural barriers. He pointed out the policy of the Plan and felt they are using the least valuable ag land by the subdivision. The end result would be an AG split with 2.5 acres with his mother’s home and a five-acre residential lot.
- C. Mol asked if anyone from the public is on-line, Riley responded no.
- D. Riley broke down the request. The land is zoned AG, the existing home could be split off administratively as an AG division, leaving the rest restricted. The applicant is tying the two requests together. First a decision on rezoning a portion of the property to R-2a and if approved, a subdivision to split off five acres, leaving the “entitlement” split of the existing homestead on 2.5 acres, tying the rest of the land back into contiguous land. The Land Use Plan is A/R and Commission recently rezoned 10 acres that was never developed from A/R back to AG so they could have more flexibility under ag. standards. Danielson is right there are smaller lots in the area; however, they were “lots of record” and are pre-Ordinance not by rezoning. The Land Use language was provided the Commission to interpret. The comments received about buildability and the wetland issues were in the Staff Report, but noted the driveway, sewer or existing house do not have wetland issues. It is access to the back part of the property that has the issues.

- E. Mol – stated his concern is going against the Land Use Plan to R-2a, is that this is a rural community and people want larger sheds, hobbies they expect on these larger properties. They see a lot of requests before the Board of Adjustment wanting larger sheds and this property would have a limit on size. People want more options when they get out in the country and they will want bigger sheds. Does not want to create a situation where there are problems down the road, even if it stays in the family. R. Danielson - he has reviewed those limits with Riley. Noted there is a shed, 30' x 40' going with the existing dwelling and is not at the maximum for outbuildings. There are two other buildings on the 5 acres with an option to add on or could replace one that is a three-sided hay shed. Mol - going against the Land Use Plan sets a precedent in an Ag/Residential area and how do they handle requests from the neighbors. R. Danielson his understanding is that they are meeting all the conditions of the A/R except the size, but they are preserving the ag land and using natural boundaries and consistent with everything along the road.
- F. Riley –reviewed the limits on outbuildings. An R-2a zoned five-acre lot could have up to 4,000 sq. ft.; the 2.5-acre AG lot could have a total buildings of 3200 sq. ft. They cannot allow a division that does not meet performance standards. The decision is the rezoning and interpreting the land use plan language and what they feel they can do for a rezoning request.
- G. Barry Heikkinen - Silver Creek Township member– added to what Mol was saying is that allowing this proposal based on existing lots pre-ordinance, would make it hard to turn anyone else down.
- H. Bravinder –questioned the Township’s approval, with the statement the 22 acres cannot have further splits, can they do that? Kryzer – not at the rezoning stage. Riley - what the Township is stating is already the case; only way to create another lot is to rezone whether it is 5 or 10 acres. The remainder of the AG land would not be entitled to any building sites. There are several lots of record that are similar in size to the R-2a standards but created decades ago. The Land Use Plan has language under certain circumstances they can go down to R-2a, it is to be infill to existing R-2a, unless it is riparian. Bravinder – looking into the future, he does not see how they could restrict the 22 acres from ever being rezoned or divided. Riley that is correct, in the future and it is rezoned, things can change. R. Danielson – at this time the 22 acres would be deed restricted and added to the 88 acres they own. Riley correct, it would be the same as if they were just splitting off the existing house, someone can come back and request rezoning. Mol – just as the applicant came in and asked the A/R zone to be put back to AG and now asking that they consider R-2a. They are considering an R-2a zone which is not in the Plan. This is in the Plan for A/R and although there are no guarantees, the applicant could have asked to lay the 80+ acres into ten-acre lots. The Commission must consider properties across the County that border these types of existing lots. There is some latitude, they must find it is unique. R. Danielson - through the A/R there are certain conditions that would allow them to go from A/R to R-2a, saving ag land, impractical situations that would prevent access to the rest. Years ago, it was a ten-acre lot, and his brother was going to build in the back. But to get back there it was impractical, so the ten acres was not deeded or developed. The proposal is to put the ag land back into the farm. The wetlands make it impractical to develop in back. The consistency of the area, although it is pre-ordinance, and the reason he brings up the existing property lines and the lines that come off of Bolton would keep the new line consistent, matching up the previous division his parents made. He felt it meets all the requirements except the for the size.
- I. Bravinder moved to continue the petition to March 18, 2021 for a site inspection. The Commission could look at the wetlands referred to. Tanner seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **VALLEY PAVING, INC.** – New Item

LOCATION: SE ¼, except tract desc. in doc #1396893, Section 21 & W ½ of W ½ of SW ¼, Section 22, all in Township 121, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Monticello Twp.)
Tax #213-100-214100, 213-100-214200 & 213-100-223200 Property owner: Holthaus
Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.048 & 155.100, Chapter 155 of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances for a phased sand and gravel mining operation to include washing, screening, crushing, stockpiling. Operations include the recycling of asphalt and concrete materials. Placement of a temporary asphalt plant is proposed for the 2021 road construction season.

Present: In person: John Wokasch & Joe Holthaus, Remotely, Nick Bonow, with Carlson-McCain

- A. Riley reviewed the zoning and land use plan that show it is AG. The property is familiar to the Commission when they viewed it for past solar and mining operations. The request is to reopen the mine reclaimed for additional gravel mining and operations. Plans were provided.
- B. J. Wokasch – stated they want to reopen the existing pit because there is quite a bit of resource left. They would start in the southwest quadrant and work to the west to the 30’ setback and work the perimeter and then go down to the floor.
- C. Riley asked if anyone from the public has comments. There were written submissions. Hearing no response, discussion returned to the Commission.
- D. Mol noted there seems to be some question about the haul road to be used. There may be a possibility of going out to State Highway 25. Wokasch explained there is an easement through the Wm. Holthaus property, and they are still working through that and at this time have not reached an agreement. Seems to be the safest route with the turn lanes in and out. Mol – this is next to the solar request that is on hold. Riley - it is all one property for zoning purposes, this parcel and the one to the west have frontage on the county road.
- E. Bravinder because they have been to the property a couple times, he is very familiar and has no issues with the request. Mol – the Township did not give final approval and are asking for a site inspection but agrees they have been out here multiple times. Familiar with how the property lies. Riley – the Township wanted more time and wanted to make a site inspection and one with the County. What might be different here is considering the haul road, bypass and turn lanes on the State Highway. The property owner to the east and the Sportsmen’s Club response on the access because they also use it. He noted there may be several factors that might not have been addressed. Mol the haul road is there, four are already using it, but what is the agreement? Wokasch they have an existing easement, runs with the land and it states that it is for mining, solar and farming activities. Riley – the Township is not ready for a recommendation; they are unlikely to make a motion without a site inspection. Since the Commission is driving by for another site inspection, it would give them an opportunity to look at this access. Not saying they can solve a private landowner, or existing easement agreement or previous CUP’s, but seeing it might be beneficial from the point of truck traffic control.
- F. Bravinder moved to continue the hearing to March 18, 2021 for a site inspection. Kaczmarek seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mol called for a Chairman's break and reconvened at 3:10 p.m.

7. **HOFFMAN CONSTRUCTION** – New Item

LOCATION: 13667 Meridian Avenue N – Part of SE ¼ of NE ¼ & NE ¼ of SE ¼, Section 25, Township 122, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Silver Creek Twp.) Property owner: Schmitz Tax #216-100-251401

Petitions for a land alteration as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.048 & 155.101 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to haul clean fill, estimated amount is 50,000 cu. yds., to construct a berm on the south and west edge of the property. Material is being hauled from the I-94 road project to this site.

Present in person: Tom Dobberthein, & Jarid Flemming with Hoffman Construction

- A. Riley explained this applicant has several sites where fill is going. This and the following items on the agenda address each site separately. This location was viewed, and zoning map to show the property is zoned AG General Agriculture and in the Land Use Plan for “Rural-Residential”. The air photo shows an existing house and outbuilding. The property adjacent is currently under consideration for a gravel pit and a site inspection is scheduled there the following week. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to bring excess material from the I-94 road project to this property and build a series of berms. A cross-section showing this along with landscape plans were provided. An Excel power line must be located along with their easement. If approved, a condition was suggested requiring they meet all easement requirements.
- B. Dobberthein stated they have the bid to remove excess material off the right-of-way for I-94 road project between Monticello and Clearwater. They looked for nearby properties that could benefit from this fill and a noise berm and negotiated with several property owners. One of the contingencies was to get all permits, including from Excel. He explained Excel has given them the parameters and must be approved by their engineer once the Conditional Use Permit is approved. Conditions are that fill can be in their easement, but 25' from the poles and not exceed 15-20' in height.
- C. Riley informed the Chair that Barry Heikkinen, Township Supervisor online may want to address the Board. The office received information the Town Board approved. Riley asked for the record who the applicant has agreements with. Dobberthein stated they have an agreement with MN Department of Transportation (MN DOT) and a contract with each property owner. Riley informed the Commission the office has received the signatures of each property owner for each agenda item.
- D. Mol questioned putting large piles of material along the freeway, once MN DOT does it what stops others from doing the same for sound barriers. Why excess material is not brought back to the gravel pit? This would be beneficial for the reclamation. Dobberthein stated it is cost prohibitive. The heavy equipment, off-road trucks, excavators are on the job site and the material moves across the right-of-way. Mol felt with the number of pits that could use this material, it is lost in large berms to be built along the freeway. The Commission often hears complaints from neighbors about pits left with big holes. Dobberthein agreed if it were cost effective and they have done some, but it has a huge hauling cost compared to the sites that are close by.

- E. Kaczmarek – cost was mentioned a few times, is there money changing hands between them and the property owners along the road. Dobberthein no – explained they try to find a place that could benefit, placement and landscaping would include seeding down. Dobberthein - Noise berms are a cost-effective way to control noise along the freeways rather than fences. Mol – this is the countryside where people travelling down the freeway don't want to see berms, not in a city or housing developments. Dobberthein this corridor requires noise control, there are berms, fences, and walls within the MN DOT right of way being built for that. Kaczmarek – fill must be clean, properly landscaped and seeded as soon as possible. Dobberthein stated they fall under the MN DOT, SWIFT program, requires a permit and once that is approved, they must go to the MN PCA and get the erosion control permit. This is responsibility of their sub-contractor. April 1 is the start date, and all sites are to be completed by November 1. Kaczmarek an idea of the time frame for the hauling? Dobberthein his part of the job will likely be finished mid-September. Kaczmarek – noted the Town Board approves.
- F. Barry Heikkinen - the Township approval was not unanimous – the applicant also mentioned cost in hauling the material. He noted some of the residents suggested dumping the material along the old railroad bed as that would provide a buffer from the proposed gravel pit across the road. He questioned moving the material, he does not see the cost effectiveness for one property owner. Kaczmarek – that is a business decision on the part of the applicant. It is speculation to suggest a location for the fill for screening of a mining application and that permit will get approved. He asked Riley about arrangements for some of the area pits where there is an exchange of materials to bring back material. Riley - that is beyond his scope, not aware of those agreements. The County has reclamation standards, plans and conditions, but don't have plans to take out and bring in. Mol – the pending gravel pit and others say they are going to replace what they take out, but most times it is not written into the reclamation and on the record. Riley – he would say the opposite, they have a reclamation plan, and they don't usually fill it all back in. Usually, plans address the side slopes, bring back soils to put back into farming. The pending application has said they would bring material back in; but that is a long way down the road. Mol – did not recall if they have written into a permit that they have to fill it back in. Riley - agreed that would not be practical. He mentioned the Falde pit where it could be matched up if these projects were closer.
- G. Heikkinen - they have another location where a permit was given to Hoffman Const. on the east bound side, they have one location already approved. Asked if there is room to bring material there to avoid these big berms all along the freeway. Dobberthein that site is much smaller and is the Coudron property. He did not think they could be tied to the next-door pit. Would they not have to build their own berm around the mine? Mol - concurred and have that condition on pits.
- H. Mol asked for further comments, hearing no response asked how they want to proceed.
- I. Kaczmarek - moved to approve a land alteration request according to the plans and description provided by the applicant, with the following conditions: 1) Applicant must obtain valid permission to do grading and work within the power line easement; 2) Hauling across CSAH 75 must be done with appropriate safety precautions including flagging or signage, per Wright County Highway requirements; 3) Hours of operation to be as noted in the narrative with a majority of the work to be done between 6am and 8pm. Nighttime work should be kept to a minimum; 4) All fill must be clean usable fill free of any contaminates; and 5) The site should be permanently landscaped, and turf established as soon as possible. Bravinder seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Bravinder questioned if there is night-time hauling included? Riley some limited here, on some of the following locations the applicant does include nighttime hours.

VOTE: Kaczmarek & Bravinder NAY: Felger, Tanner & Mol
MOTION FAILED

DISCUSSION: Kryzer if they are looking to deny the request, the proper action would be to continue and direct Staff to draft Findings consistent. Mol – we have two members absent and there is an option to continue. Felger stated he voted against the motion because he had heard there were more comments from the Township official on some alternative locations where the fill would go.

- J. Felger moved to continue the petition to March 18, 2021 for more discussion between the applicant, Town Board, and residents. Mol seconded the motion.

VOTE: IN FAVOR: Felger, Mol NAY: Tanner, Kaczmarek, Bravinder
MOTION FAILED

DISCUSSION: Bravinder noted they have a 6/2 vote for the Town Board approval. He understands fully what they are trying to do here. If they start hauling material down the road it will have a major impact. Noted they see these berms along the freeway everywhere. He thinks the applicant has done their homework. Riley – the Township representative speaking, sent a message he wanted clarification on the time frame when the hauling would be done. Riley had heard November or December, but the motion did not spell it out and is why he sent the question. Dobberthein the contract they have for their work is to be completed by November 1. He clarified at Felger's request; the Township Supervisor was asking if the time frame was defined well enough. Felger if there is a definite time frame to this, there may not be a reason continue. He asked if he could go back and change his vote on the first motion. Mol stated a new motion could be made.

- K. Felger moved to approve a land alteration request according to the plans and description provided by the applicant, with the following conditions: 1) Applicant must obtain valid permission to do grading and work within the power line easement; 2) Hauling across CSAH 75 must be done with appropriate safety precautions including flagging or signage, per Wright County Highway requirements; 3) Hours of operation to be as noted in the narrative with a majority of the work to be done between 6am and 8pm. Nighttime work should be kept to a minimum; 4) All fill must be clean usable fill free of any contaminants; and 5) The site should be permanently landscaped, and turf established as soon as possible. Kaczmarek seconded the motion.

VOTE: IN FAVOR: Felger, Kaczmarek, Bravinder; NAY: Tanner, Mol
MOTION PASSED

8. **HOFFMAN CONSTRUCTION** – New Item

LOCATION: XXXX CR 75 – Part NW ¼ of SW ¼ and Part of E ½ of SW ¼ Section 17, Township 122, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Clearwater Twp.) Tax #204-000-173203
Property owner: M-80 LLC

Petitions for a land alteration as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.048 & 155.101 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to haul clean fill, estimated amount is 52,000 cu. yds., to raise the grade of the existing agricultural field and improve drainage. Material is being hauled from the I-94 road project to this site.

Present in person: Tom Dobberthein, & Jarid Flemming with Hoffman Construction

- A. Riley displayed location maps, zoning and land use designates this as AG General Agriculture. Plans show the approximate area of grading, existing conditions, and grades. This location is a continuation of the previous item to bring clean fill to the site and fill in a low spot as shown on the cross-section.
- B. Dobberthein – the fill they are bringing in will fill a low spot in the field. On average, raising it up about 8', strip off the topsoil and replace it. They will seed it with winter wheat or rye.
- C. Mol opened comment to the public, hearing no response returned to the Commission.
- D. Bravinder pointed out the Town Board had approved this location as well as the following properties. Dobberthein stated they described each project with the Clearwater Town Board, and they approved all in one motion.
- E. Kaczmarek asked if the overnight hours were included in the discussion, landowner knows, and neighbors are aware? Dobberthein yes. No residents were at the meeting or expressed concern.
- F. Dobberthein described this segment is from Clearwater to Hasty and operations primarily at night. He described how the material would be moved from the job on the right-of-way here. Mol – just filling in a hole and restoring back to farmland? Dobberthein right, no berm.
- G. Bravinder moved to approve a land alteration request according to the plans and description provided by the applicant, with the following conditions: 1) Hours of operation to be as noted in the narrative with a majority of the work to be done between 8pm and 6am; 2) All fill must be clean usable fill free of any contaminates; and 3) The site should be permanently landscaped, and turf established as soon as possible. Kaczmarek seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **HOFFMAN CONSTRUCTION** – New Item

LOCATION: 16517 Gowan Ave. NW - Part of SE ¼ of NW ¼ & SW ¼ of NE ¼ lying south of I-94, Section 12, Township 122, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Clearwater Twp.)
Tax #204-100-122400 Property owner: Schabel Trust

Petitions for a land alteration as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.048 & 155.101 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to haul clean fill, estimated amount is 30,000 cu. yds., to create a berm along the north edge of the property along I-94 road right of way; 50,000 cu. yards to raise and level the main ag field and 20,000 cu. yds. in the low spot in the ag field on the west end. This fill would bring the existing grade of an old pit back to natural elevation, improve the existing agricultural fields and improve drainage. Material is being hauled from the I-94 road project to this site.

Present in person: Tom Dobberthein, & Jarid Flemming with Hoffman Construction

- A. Riley reviewed the property location, noted the zoning is AG and in the Land Use Plan as a Transition Area. The site plan of the proximate fill location, berm location was reviewed. The applicant provided a cross-section of the fill placement. There is a condition suggest that they meet all Excel Energy requirements for the power line.
- B. Dobberthein the material will come all the way back to almost the driveway with the noise berm, area between the highway and their house, going under the Excel power line. Excel have asked for 15' high berm on the highway and reduce it under the high line, then extend to the driveway. Also filling a low spot to the west; and an old sand pit they will be filling back in.
- C. Mol the berm is not 20' high? Dobberthein that is right, only 15'. The higher they get, the wider and in order to save the trees in front of his house it will not be as high here.
- D. Mol opened the hearing for public comment, no one online, he returned to the Commission.
- E. Kaczmarek moved to approve a land alteration request according to the plans and description provided by the applicant, with the following conditions: 1) Hours of operation to be as noted in the narrative with a majority of the work to be done between 8pm and 6am; 2) All fill must be clean usable fill free of any contaminates; 3) The site should be permanently landscaped and turf established as soon as possible; and 4) Applicant must obtain valid permission to do grading and work within the power line easement, if applicable. Felger seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. **HOFFMAN CONSTRUCTION** – New Item

LOCATION: 17032 CR 7 NW –Part of S ½ of SE ¼ of SE 1/4, Section 2, Township 122, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Clearwater Twp.) Tax #204-100-024400

Property owner: Anhalt

Petitions for a land alteration as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.048 & 155.101 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to haul clean fill, estimated amount is 35,000 cu. yds., to raise the grade of the existing agricultural field to the east to level it out and improve drainage.

Present in person: Tom Dobberthein, & Jarid Flemming with Hoffman Construction

- A. Riley displayed the location maps to show the farm field and approximate fill location, plans showing the cross-section and deferred to the applicant for the details of the project.
- B. Dobberthein explained this is along the highway right of way, is the smallest site. He described the field where they have a steeper slope and they will fill to improve the slope, make it flatter and less erosion for the owner. They will strip the topsoil, fill, and put the topsoil back and seed it down with winter wheat or rye, if they don't have a winter crop.
- C. Mol confirmed no one was online to comment. Felger asked for confirmation that this has Town Board approval. Riley confirmed it does.
- D. Bravinder moved to approve a land alteration request according to the plans and description provided by the applicant, with the following conditions: 1) Hours of operation to be as noted in the narrative with a majority of the work to be done between 8pm and 6am; 2) All fill must be clean usable fill free of any contaminates; 3) The site should be permanently landscaped and turf established as soon as possible; and 4) Applicant must obtain valid permission to do grading and work within the power line easement, if applicable. Kaczmarek seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. **HOFFMAN CONSTRUCTION** – New Item

LOCATION: XXXX CR 75 NW –Part of SE ¼ of SW ¼ & part of Gov't Lots 1, 2 & 3, Section 1; Part of NE ¼ of NW ¼, north of I-94, Section 12, all in Township 122, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Clearwater Twp.) Tax #204-100-122100 & -013401
Property owner: JJ Ergen & Sons LLC

Petitions for a land alteration as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.048 & 155.101 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to haul in clean fill, estimated amount is 78,000 cu. yds., to raise the grade and level out the existing agricultural field. An existing diversion berm along the east property line will not be altered. Material is being hauled from the I-94 road project to this site.

Present in person: Tom Dobberthein, & Jarid Flemming with Hoffman Construction

- A. Riley summarized the property location, fill location and cross-section to show the fill placement. The property is zoned AG and in the Land Use Plan as a Transition Area.
- B. Dobberthein explained the project is a larger site and filling in a low area in the field. They have also discussed the project with the owner to the north and east who is in favor because he has flooding issues coming off the field. The fill will slow the water down and also help that neighbor out. Filling the low spots to a 2% slope and general improvement. Will strip the topsoil and replace it after the fill is placed.
- C. Felger – asked to view the location maps and questioned the depressed area that currently holds water along the right of way. With the fill to be placed would the water not runoff toward the freeway now. Mol – understands the concern, but the soils are very sandy, and water would drain down. Felger – the material being brought in is sand as well? Dobberthein – yes.
- D. Mol confirmed no one from the public was online to comment and action followed.
- E. Kaczmarek moved to approve a land alteration request according to the plans and description provided by the applicant, with the following conditions: 1) Hours of operation to be as noted in the narrative with a majority of the work to be done between 8pm and 6am; 2) All fill must be clean usable fill free of any contaminates; and 3) The site should be permanently landscaped, and turf established as soon as possible. Tanner seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

DISCUSSION:

Felger questioned if there are any plans to revert to evening meetings to allow for more public participation. Kaczmarek relayed the discussion at the County Board when he brought that up at January's organizational meeting. He had suggested alternating times to allow more public attendance for the County Board meetings. The three Commissioners serving on the Board in the past, were not interested in any evening meetings. Riley explained the Planning Commission usually meets in the evenings, however, when COVID restrictions were established, this Board changed their times to have the ability to hold them virtually and have the IT technology available. He is following the restrictions of the State and County and cannot pull back until he has further direction. Kryzer – that is correct still operating under the Governor's emergency powers and the County's direction. Teams is working well; they are allowing people to participate. They are making it easy for people to show up at their house. Riley – other Counties are not even having applicants in attendance. We do have some Commission members in person and if the applicant prefers to, they can. Felger – is not opposed to Teams; but had thought there was some discussion to offer the public to attend by Teams in the evening. Riley if we go back to evenings, he suggested we wait until we are able to be open door as controlling the size of an unknown crowd can be difficult. Kryzer – have been doing Zoom court since last March and it had improved efficiencies in the Court system. Felt the technology is making it more efficient for them to do so during the day. Bravinder – except for the elderly farmer out in the country. Mol – we are still under the Order and hopefully they can get back to evenings. Evening meetings are easier for the Board members that have full-time jobs, or those with businesses.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Sean Riley
Planning & Zoning Administrator

SR:tp

cc: Planning Commission
Township
Applicants/owners