

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

The Goodhue County Planning Advisory Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair S. Michels in the Goodhue County Justice Center located at 454 West Sixth Street in Red Wing, Minnesota.

Present: Tom Webster Bernie Overby Suzanne Blue Brandon Schafer
 Mike Patterson Sam Michels Howard Stenerson Mike Wozniak

Absent: S. Michels, D. Rechtzigel

¹*Motioned by B. Overby and seconded by L. Olson to approve the October 15, 2007 agenda with clarification of Hay Creek Campground Zone District Change pulled from agenda by M. Wozniak. Motion carried 7-0.*

²*Motioned by H. Stenerson. and seconded by S. Blue to approve the September 17, 2007 minutes. Motion carried 7-0.*

STAFF UPDATES – M. Wozniak addressed the introduction of Commissioner Brandon Schafer. He also presented an update on the Bayview Drive-Stelter variance/appeal issue, recent decision on variance/ appeal with the County prevailing in decision.

CONFLICT/DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST – chair for tonight....M. Patterson nominated by S. Blue, seconded by T. Webster. Motion carried 7-0.

Summary

Chateau Frontenac Homes is requesting a Preliminary /Final Plat and a Planned Unit Development for their combination of adjoining parcels in Section 2 of Florence Township. Parcels 32.130.0010, 32.130.0090, and 32.130.0280 also known as Blocks A, B, One, Two, Ten, and eleven in the town of Frontenac, formerly known as Westervelt, within Section 2 Florence Township are requested to be re-configured as a modern Planned Unit Development. The purpose of this change is to be allowed the opportunity to re-structure parcels, separate residential lot sites, and convey 0.2 acres of land to the Chateau in trade for 0.2 acres of land conveyed to the public along Lake Pepin. This will allow for open beach access to the public and straighten to refine the property lines of the Chateau Frontenac site.

The proposed Chateau Frontenac Planned Unit Development/Subdivision represents a rationale approach to allow for the preservation of historically significant structures while establishing property boundaries that will allow each home-site to be sold separate and distinctly. In addition the PUD/Plat and plans for renovation of existing structures represents an exemplary approach to preservation and improvement of a historically significant site located within a nationally recognized historic district.

Background: Bill Flies currently own the parcels involved in the PUD request. The purpose of the re-structuring is to configure a development of seven single family dwellings suitable in Section 2 in the historic R-1 Zone District within Old Frontenac, formerly Westervelt, in Florence Township. In order to address some encroachment of existing structures near or across property boundaries the applicant and Florence Township will be trading approximately 0.20 acres of property. The small pieces of property that will be deeded to Florence Township have been identified as Outlots A, B, C and D on the PUD/Plat.

The proposed PUD/Plat will establish 7 residential home sites, Lot 1 of Block 4, is utilized for the drain field of the shared on-site sewer system that serves all of the home sites.

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

The existing entrance road between parcels 32.130.0280 and 32.130.0090 would continue to be utilized as access to the overall PUD properties. Parcel 32.130.0010 is partially affected by the floodway impact zone. The proposed plan is consistent with the Goodhue County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Detailed description of the proposed Chateau Frontenac PUD/Plat has been included in the Chateau Frontenac Site Plat Description submitted as part of the application.

Shoreland Planned Unit Development requirements: Provisions for PUD's within the Shoreland Area are established under Article 30 (formerly Article 17 of the Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance. Section 13 of the Shoreland Regulations establishes detailed application requirements, development standards and performance standards. The Chateau Frontenac Site Plat Description submitted as part of the application and the Chateau Frontenac Homes Association - Covenants & Restriction along with the Chateau Frontenac Homes Shoreland PUD drawing explain and identify how the PUD plan conforms to the requirements established in Section 13.

Preliminary Plat/Final Plat Requirements: In order to streamline the review of Chateau Frontenac Homes it has been submitted as a Preliminary and Final Plat in addition to a Shoreland Planned Unit Development Plan. Because subdivision of property is involved the proposed subdivision plan is subject to requirements established in the Goodhue County Subdivision Controls Ordinance. Because the proposed subdivision represents a re-platting of property, because no new public roads are proposed and because existing structures and water/wastewater systems are substantially in place LUM Staff have permitted some streamlining of preliminary plat submittal requirements.

It should be noted that the proposed Chateau Frontenac Homes Shoreland PUD is located within Historic Old Frontenac a locally designated "Historic District" in addition to being designated on the National Register of Historic Places. The Florence Township Heritage Preservation Commission administers a design review process to consider impacts related to subdivision, development and building construction on the Historic District and individual properties of historic significance. Documentation has been included with this staff report of approval of the proposed plan by a unanimous vote of the Florence Township HPC.

Findings of Fact

- The proposed Chateau Frontenac Homes Shoreland PUD is consistent with the Goodhue County Comprehensive Plan; and
- Chateau Frontenac meets standards and requirements set forth in the Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance including Article 30 (Shoreland Regulations), Section 13 (Shoreland PUD requirements); and
- The application submitted by Chateau Frontenac Homes / Bill Flies meets submittal requirements as expressed in the Goodhue County Subdivision Ordinance and interpreted by the Goodhue County Zoning Administrator; and
- Florence Township has considered the proposed Chateau Frontenac Homes Shoreland PUD and Preliminary/Final Plat and has raised no objections.
- That the Florence Township Heritage Preservation Commission has reviewed and approved the proposed Chateau Frontenac Homes Shoreland PUD and Preliminary/Final Plat.

Staff Recommendations:

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

Land Use Management Staff recommends that the Planning Advisory Commission recommends approval of the Chateau Frontenac Homes Shoreland PUD subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Subject to the Chateau Frontenac Homes Shoreland PUD/Plat drawing as submitted by the Applicant on October 11, 2007 and supporting descriptive information included with the Chateau Frontenac Homes application for Planned Unit Development and Preliminary/Final Plat dated August 20, 2007.**
- 2. Compliance with all standards and requirements included in the Goodhue County Subdivision Controls Ordinance.**
- 3. Recording of the final plat with the County Recorder/Registrar of Deeds.**
- 4. Conformance with Goodhue County Shoreland Management Regulations (Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance – Article 30) including but not limited to Section 13, Subd. 5 (Maintenance and Design Criteria).**
- 5. Recording with the County Recorder/Registrar of Deeds of Chateau Frontenac Homes Association By-Laws; Chateau Frontenac Homes Rules and Restrictions; and Chateau Frontenac Homes Covenants & Restrictions.**
- 6. Submittal of Proof of Ownership: A copy of a current Title Commitment, Title Opinion, or Certificate of title (Torrens Property) that covers the property of the proposed plat prior to signing of the plat by the Chairman of the Goodhue County Board of Commissioners, Goodhue County Surveyor or Goodhue County Recorder.**

Discussion;

B. Overby asked B. Flies about public beach area.

B. Flies explained public lands and conveyance.

B. Overby asked about individual wells.

B. Flies said 2 wells, explained setup to various homes, 110 feet deep, good water.

M. Wozniak said a shared community onsite system was state approved in 1996.

B. Flies said six 1,000 gallon tanks and large drain fields rated for 12 homes are onsite.

H. Stenerson asked if all lots would cover existing older buildings.

B. Flies said no new buildings, century and a half old , 4 removed to make compliance.

C/m. Patterson opened the public hearing.no comments.

H. Stenerson motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by T.Webster. Motion carried 7-0.

H. Stenerson asked about packet information having home owner association concerns and if the county would enforce these and would recording them make the county responsible.

M. Wozniak answered that shoreland regulations set provisions for ongoing maintenance and dictate covenants and county staff is just recognizing that. County can hold association accountable later. Shoreland PUD provisions allow for private property that runs down to waters that may be an issue later, convenents in that case then necessary and orderly.

H. Stenerson stated that covenants may cause county problems later. Be sure not in bad position.

S. Blue asked is this for information only and if passing PUD, simply passing what is on paper for plan.

M. Wozniak said we want to know covenants recorded and intent by association to uphold them.

S. Blue said that does not answer.

M. Wozniak said we will not take on responsibility.

S. Blue asked if it would proceed as is with covenants.

M. Wozniak said shoreland regulations met priority, Chateau association ordinances are their perogative.

H. Stenerson re-stated future concerns for county when association makes choices later.

M. Wozniak stated B. Flies could answer better.

B. Flies stated historic district strict already and in documents with protection clauses.

B. Overby asked about docks.

B. Flies said he discussed day dock for owners with public permit from county.

M. Wozniak said DNR would have to authorize that.

S. Blue asked protected from what.

M. Wozniak stated Mn. protection area, with shoreland special requirements subject to permitting by DNR.

S. Blue asked if they would go beyond.

B. Flies stated no, township property.

H. Stenerson asked if registered historic structures.

B. Flies stated 2 are and would add more later.

M. Wozniak commented on historic registration requirements by Florence heritage Commission, Nat'l Register of Historic places.

S. Blue asked if Historic preservation acted also.

B. Flies yes, before township.

S. Blue asked if they don't have recommendations either.

B. Flies explained their authorization.

³ Motion by H. Stenerson, seconded by S. Blue to approve the Preliminary / Final Plat and PUD for Chateau Frontenac Homes parcels in section 2 Florence Township with 5 conditions and consult with Goodhue County Attorney S. Betcher . Motion carried 7-0.

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

Summary

Verizon Wireless is requesting a conditional use permit for a Telecommunication Facility (250' self support tower along with a 12' x 20' equipment shelter) in the A-2 Agricultural District. Wireless Communication Facilities are regulated under Article 22 (Wireless Communication Facilities) of the Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance. Towers up to a maximum of 400' may be permitted as a conditional use in the A-2 District.

Background

Verizon Wireless has indicated it "desires to improve their level of service in the area of Goodhue County including the area of Florence Township. The Tower proposed to be sited on property leased from Donald W. Bade will enhance their already established network". Verizon has listed the following benefits to the community associated with the proposed Wireless Facility:

- ❑ Improved cellular reception and expanded service area.
- ❑ Probable source of communications at time of natural disaster.
- ❑ Communications link for personal safety and roadside emergencies.
- ❑ Available for expansion into future technology with wireless communications industry & 911 interface capability.
- ❑ Site will be made available for collocation with other wireless carriers.
- ❑ A location for the site that is of minimal visual impact to the community.

Wireless Communication Facilities are subject to compliance with various performance standards set forth in Article 22, Section 7, of the Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance.

The application materials submitted by Verizon Wireless indicate the proposal identifies a 100' x 100' site to be leased from Donald W. Bade, owner of the property. Article 22, Section 7, Subd. 1, states "On a parcel of land that already has a principal use, the facilities shall be considered as an accessory use and a smaller area of land may be leased provided that all requirements of Article 22 can be met." The principal use of the Bade Property is Agriculture and the Verizon Wireless Facility would qualify as an accessory use of the subject property.

Setback requirements from property lines for towers are set forth in Article 22, Section 7, Subd. 2, Paragraph A., as follows:

"Generally, tower structures shall be set back from the nearest property line a distance equal to the height of the tower. This setback may be reduced to one-half the height of the tower if the applicant submits a report stamped by a professional engineer registered in the State of Minnesota that certifies that the tower is designed and engineered to collapse upon failure within the distance from the tower to the property line." The Bluff Land Regulations (Article 12) in the Zoning Ordinance include a

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

provision that no towers may be located within ¼ mile of a bluff impact zone. The proposed Verizon tower would be located approximately two hundred feet from a bluff impact zone (see enclosed site map identifying bluff impact zone). However, the proposed site is located near a ravine that is comprised of un-buildable property. Across the ravine more bluff top property of similar elevation would be visible. The proposed tower would be situated approximately 1700 feet back from the top of the bluff that rises up from T.H. 61. The applicant will be required to apply for a variance the ¼ mile setback from the bluff impact zone, however, the Board of Adjustment approved such a variance for a Wireless Communication Tower in Vasa Township under similar circumstances. LUM Staff does not believe that the proposed location of the Verizon Tower is inconsistent with the intent of the Bluff Land Regulations.

Verizon Wireless has indicated to Land Use Management Staff that there are not existing opportunities for co-location that will satisfy technical requirements to enhance wireless service in this general area. Staff will ask the applicant to clarify this position at the Planning Advisory Commission Meeting on October 15. Verizon has stated in its application that the proposed Wireless Communication Tower will be made available for co-location with other wireless carriers.

Included with the applicant's submittal is a letter signed by Stephen Yeo, P.E., and a State of Minnesota licensed Professional Engineer. Mr. Yeo's letter states that in the unlikely event of failure the proposed tower is designed to collapse within a radius of 50% of the height from the base. The proposed Tower setbacks to the north, east and south property boundaries will substantially exceed the height of the tower. The setback from the west property boundary would be approximately 120', which exceeds 50% of the height from the base of the tower.

Site work necessary to construct the proposed Wireless Communication Facility includes grading to create a new driveway off of 320th Avenue Way and leveling the site area for the tower and equipment building which is being located on a sloped portion of the site. The access drive will be approximately 300 feet in length. Appropriate erosion and sediment control measures have been incorporated into the plans and specifications for the project. The property abuts the road right-of-way, but, does not meet the requirement of having at least 100 feet of width on a public road that applies for all "permitted" or "conditionally permitted uses in the A-2 Zone District. The applicant would be required to obtain a variance to this requirement from the Goodhue County Board of Appeals and Adjustment. LUM Staff views the available access for the property as appropriate for a land use that requires only periodic maintenance generating a limited number of vehicle trips.

Verizon Wireless has indicated to Land Use Management Staff that there are not existing opportunities for co-location that will satisfy technical requirements to enhance wireless service in this general area. Staff will ask the applicant to clarify this position at the Planning Advisory Commission Meeting on October 15, 2007. Verizon has stated in its application that the proposed Wireless Communication Tower will be made available for co-location with other wireless carriers.

Florence Township has signed the Zoning Application Summary Form, indicating their approval of the request.

Findings of Fact

No conditional use shall be recommended by the County Planning Commission unless said Commission shall find:

- Subd. 1. That the conditional use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, not substantially diminish and impair property values within the immediate vicinity. **Section 8 is zoned A-2 Agricultural District. Wireless Communication Towers up to 400' may be permitted as a conditional use in the A-2 District.**
- Subd. 2. That the establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for uses predominant to the area. **The section is zoned Agricultural. There are no foreseeable adverse effects on the accessory use of a small part (100' x 100' leased area) for location of the proposed Wireless Communication Facility. The proposed facility conforms to required setbacks from property lines.**
- Subd. 3. Those adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. The proposed Wireless Communication Facility site will be accessed by the existing farm access road. **See attached site map.**
- Subd. 4. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide sufficient off-street parking and loading space to serve the proposed use. **According to the site plan adequate parking and loading space will be available.**
- Subd. 5. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to prevent or control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise and vibration, so that none of these will constitute a nuisance, and to control lighted signs and other lights in such a manner that no disturbance to neighboring properties will result. **The proposed tower will be subject to lighting requirements established by the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) and Federal Communications Agency (FCC).**

Staff Recommendation/Resolution

The proposed location of the Wireless Communication Facility on the Bade Property appears to be sited in a manner that offers a positive balance between visual impacts on the surrounding area with the benefits of improved Verizon Wireless Services for the area with additional opportunities for co-location by other providers. Staff recommends that the Planning Advisory Commission recommend approve the Verizon Wireless Communication Facility to be sited on the Donald W. Bade property subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Conformance with plans and specification included with Verizon's Conditional Use Permit Application dated September 13, 2007.**
- 2) Obtaining Building Permit approvals from Florence Township and Goodhue County prior to construction.**

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

- 3) Compliance with all Wireless Communication Facilities Regulations included in Article 17 (Wireless Communication Regulations) of the Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance.**
- 4) Subject to approval of variances by the Goodhue County Board of Appeals and Adjustment to the ¼ mile setback from bluff impact zone requirement and the requirement of having 100 feet of frontage on a public road.**
- 5) Offering Goodhue County priority opportunity to co-locate public safety related wireless communication antennas and associated equipment on the wireless communication facility.**

Discussion:

B. Overby asked how many companies are currently operating towers.

C. Walter answered 9 in USA.

B. Overby asked why not more co-located.

C. Walter answered it is getting more complicated, 9 licensed, gov't auctioning off more day to day, whole system going wireless. Township points addressed and this is the right spot realistically between Red Wing and Lake City. Verizon bought Qwest existing facilities, 2 sites cannot be too close together, broadband internet in future off these towers. Township agreed to make this to accommodate future co-locators on it. Each takes 20 ft of space on 250 ft tower from top down. 7 carriers total. This is perfect spot.

B. Overby said you are thinking about this.

C. Walter answered yes.

M. Wozniak stated multiple users on tower require each a ground bldg on leased area. Asked is that something for further property consideration or on lease set up.

C. Walter said us and 6 others would have no room, Verizon has largest facility with generator and discussed with county for emergency system with accommodations. County has 12X30 building, T-mobile has smaller cabins that can fit too. Midwest has 12x20 building that would not fit, would need to lease more space.

M. Wozniak stated that this is the intent for these to work together.

C. Walter said enough room for Verizon and county with land space for first couple at least.

M. Patterson stated concerns in county of tower volume, asked staff of county towers map.

M. Wozniak stated that maps may exist and would provide in future.

M. Patterson stated that would be better for him to judge necessity or validity of towers and whats out there.

B. Overby had statement about competition, asked C. Walter could you allow competitor co-location.

C. Walter said absolutely yes, standard contracts for others nation wide and vise versa.

M. Wozniak stated that since 2000 regulation language stated basics of co-location and accomidation concerns. Not easy to police, need them to work with each other.

M. Patterson asked if easier to co-locate.

C. Walter stated values in different scenarios, intent to save and use whatever they can. more money up front to build new tower.

C/S. Patterson opened the public hearing.

David Buck, Goodhue township, stated individual opinion, has 2 towers in Goodhue township stated co-location issue in past and value concern. Question is there any reason to co-locate if they can afford it in 3 years to pay off on their own or will you limit volume of towers. Glad this subject brought up, don't need whole county covered with towers. Other cities force co-location.

John Honneke, after August meeting concern that volume is too high. Look at grid work so they have to share towers and encourage look at placement before there is a problem later.

B. Overby re-stated competition concern with advantages held and not shared, with towers up all over.

M. Wozniak stated that more attention focused on it at the county board and they will administer preference to co-locate more. Regulations already state priority to prove you cannot already co-locate.

M. Patterson asked again about maps.

M. Wozniak stated maps could be made in future.

S. Blue asked if staff could come back to PAC with map review.

M. Wozniak asked if this would be separate from action this evening or to table this issue.

S. Blue stated past requests due to complications, suggest take 30 days with perspective.

C. Walter described existing towers on hand held plat map and where other towers are and theres. With drawing on chalkboard.

S. Blue stated 2 on other side of lake Pepin.

C. Walter stated cannot license in Wi. Stated too close to other sites and explained proposed site with coverage area.

S. Blue asked how many of those sites have multiple carriers.

C. Walter said none.

S. Blue asked how many co-located in County.

C. Walter stated many, none on Highway 61.

M. Wozniak stated co-location request is administrative if height not added.

S. Blue stated that's happening often enough.

M. Wozniak stated frustration can be avoided situations with new towers being build and understand logic of why coverage doesn't span over all, makes sense. Frustration is towers met need before, not now.

S. Blue stated planning function to design grid.

M. Wozniak addressed that, past experiences as consultant-South Dakota telecommunications master plan scenario, point of mention is its easier said than done. Set areas off limits ok and co-location concern but technologies changing and vary on landscapes with challenges as public policy matter.

S. Blue asked if we proceed application by application.

M. Wozniak said maybe not but better study and provide more information to guide decisions and board. Cannot dictate where the best spots are but be better prepared to ask why it would not work, show us. Explain network and gaps.

C. Walter stated map info would help in area for careers.

M. Wozniak stated we could establish general guiding policies as best thoughts. Key thing in South Dakota was location of restriction zones/areas.

H. Stenerson had thoughts as ideal tower to establish co-locations on central corridor that has been lacking in past as difficult corridor because of terrain. Impose condition of co-user lease before building permit process. Talk the talk by company, may need to be pushed by commission. County co-location interest also, with second carrier for permit.

B. Overby stated they agree co-located is best, with future info added. With fairness, can we hold this situation unlike others in past.

T. Webster asked what drives desire for this tower.

C. Walter said this is a capacity site. Old tower is overloaded.

T. Webster asked is this a supply and demand situation with more to come. Enjoy services for all uses. Hate to see too restrictive on towers to force companies to do anything unless. Hearing more humming of descent of public which needs to be listened to. Verizon has been progressive for needs, if high spot deemed not a nuisance allow to go up.

M. Patterson asked if 1500 a month to rent times 7 theoretically.

C. Walter said never seen situation with 7 carriers on it. This may be, cannot have servers in Wi to cover this area.

M. Wozniak said 7 would be a lot.

H. Stenerson mentioned township concerns and use concerns, and establish standards at some point.

M. Patterson agreed with T. Webster not to govt to produce grid or go down that path. Like to see overall pattern or map in basics as standard for making informed decisions with lay of the land.

B. Overby said that's important to see where they are and to know.

M. Patterson asked if any other public comments. none.

T. W. motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by B. Overby. Motion carried 7-0.

C. Walter stated it is false comment about 3 yr payoff, its 14 years.

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

**Motion by T.W., seconded by L.Olson to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Verizon Wireless .
Motion carried 6-1.**

S. Blue had commented about co-location and need for staff to make maps.

C. Walter said he does not know, would provide technical help, cannot beef up to his knowledge on current towers.

S. Blue said government has role.

M. Wozniak stated good regulations just how rigorous review by staff.

B. Overby asked should companies show why in each area its needed.

M. Wozniak stated that as info is provided work together for best result and impacts.

S. Blue stated population growing with cell phones, asked how much is needed.

C. Walter said its more than just cell phones, wireless issues.

S. Blue stated as it crowds such as in Pheonix it is too crowded going back to wiring,

M. Wozniak stated it's a situational issue.

C. Walter stated he would help in future.

Summary

Hay Creek Valley Campground is requesting a Conditional Use Permit for their proposed campground expansion by up to 50 new sites on adjoining parcels in Section 19 of Hay Creek Township contingent upon parcels 34.019.0900, 34.019.0901, 34.019.3100 and 34.019.4000 within Section 19 Hay Creek Township being re-zoned as Commercial Recreational. The purpose of this Conditional Use Permit is to allow the opportunity to expand campground sites and operations in the future.

Background Hay Creek Valley Campground currently own the four parcels involved in the Zoning District Change request. The purpose of the Conditional Use Permit is to configure a property suitable for a potential expansion of up to 50 new camp sites in Section 19 in the B-2 Zone District (proposed C R Zoned District) within Hay Creek Township. The Change of Zone will require separate actions by the PAC and County Board. The Change of Zone is not being considered concurrently with the CUP because a boundary survey is required as part of the change of zone application and it has not yet been submitted by the applicant. Because any expansion would be creating multiple new camping sites, new access roads on the property may be proposed in any future expansion plan. It is the intent of the applicant to proceed with the expansion on a gradual basis. A site drawing (submitted on an aerial photo) has been provided by the applicant to illustrate the location of the first 9-10 sites that will be added.

The existing driveway on parcels 34.019.4000 would continue to be utilized as access to the overall Campground property. Parcel 34.019.4000 is partially affected by the floodway impact zone. The proposed plan for developed of up to 50 new campsites would be located outside of this area on higher elevation and is consistent with the Goodhue County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

LUM Staff are trying to accommodate a timetable for approval requested by the Applicant, even though not all of the submittal requirements for a campground CUP have been met. The applicant is trying to gain reasonable confidence that the County will approve the proposed campground expansion in order to be able to make commitments to campers that some additional campsites will be available for next season. Additional

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

information regarding the proposed campground expansion will be presented to the PAC at the October 15, PAC Meeting.

Findings of Fact

- The proposed Hay Creek Valley Campground Conditional Use Permit that proposes development of up to 50 new camp sites is consistent with the Goodhue County Comprehensive Plan; and
- Hay Creek Valley Campground exceeds the minimum lot area requirement of 2 acres and includes over the 100 feet of width from the road right-of-way back to the proposed expansion location that are requirements of the A-2 Zone District; and
- The proposed Hay Creek Valley Campground expansion will comply with and interpreted by the Goodhue County Zoning Administrator; and
- Hay Creek Township has considered the proposed plat and has raised not objections.

Staff Recommendations:

Land Use Management Staff recommends that the Planning Advisory Commission recommends approval to the Goodhue County Board of Commissioners of the Hay Creek Valley Campground Conditional Use Permit subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Compliance with Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance Article 16 (formerly Article 8, Section 7, Subd. 5 (Performance Standards for Campgrounds)).**
- 2. Approval of Change of Zone of the entire Hay Creek Campground property from the A-2 Agriculture Zone District to the CR Commercial Recreation Zone District prior to use of any of the 50 new campsites.**
- 3. Subject to conformance with licensing requirements as determined by the Goodhue County Environmental Health Department.**

Discussion:

Pat O. described situation.

B. Overby asked about township form.

M. Wozniak stated in office.

Pat. O. stated un-used ball field on high ground.

M. Wozniak said high ground.

B. Overby asked what area to west.

S. Blue asked about memo of public negative sentiment-burning manure.

Pat O. said they do burn manure weekly by local farmer, can be issue at times, with straw or hay and hard to get rid of.

S. Blue asked if usable on fields.

Pat O. said hall or burn bulk and its hard to get rid of it. It is in separate area but can cause issue depending on winds.

S. Blue asked if burn trash too.

Pat O. No, hired service for trash now.

B. Schafer asked what is level of traffic on weekly basis for horses.

Pat used to be more depends big weekends booked, probably 20 sites usable for horse sites. Father against horse expansion, separate area, less than 10 yrs ago, 25 sites specifically horse related, 40 on big weekends.

B. S. asked if feedlot permits

Pat no,not required yet.

C/S. Patterson opened public comments; none for or against.

Bruce Quarterman, Kenyon, manure issue impossible to deal with, Jim Dressen hired, rain so much you can't burn it, members asked to take it home , but can't , issue, new sites not concern. DNR required 75 ft setbacks from his creek, need to eliminate campsites on his CUP, why can theses have along creek. Work to be good neighbors, why do they agree to regulations and not Pat. Past issue wanted to bring up, but good campground. No argument against addition.

With no(further) comment it was moved by H.Stenerson and seconded by B. Overby to close the public hearing. Motion carried 7-0.

B. Overby asked hypothetically next step is still re-zoned.

M. Wozniak said that is correct in conditions. Stated plans and desires of applicant.

B. Overby asked would this PAC be involved in change of zone.

M. Wozniak stated yes with county board.

M. Patterson had DNR setback of 75 ft question.

M. Wozniak said campground pre-dates current zoning and shoreland regulations with 75 ft setback. Legal non-conforming use when expanded cannot be made more non-conforming so we try to bring more into rational use. Cannot answer financial impacts of change. Intent of staff to re-zone property and looked at expansion as making it less nonconforming with less stress on flood prone areas. Typically administered with flexibility but DNR can force issue site by site.

M/ Patterson said maps shows 30-40 in flood area.

Pat said DNR has done a lot of work in last 15 years.

M. Wozniak said shades of Sherwood and Hidden Valley in Welch have same valid issues. Maybe future policy matter to decide right way to admin.

M. Patterson said this is right way in this instance.

M. Wozniak stated it is not being ignored, just not made more non-conforming,
Pat stated he understands they cannot expand along creek area.
M. Wozniak stated Welch wild and scenic situation as example as turned back for re-vision.
H. Stenerson asked is shoreland issue zone change would DNR need contacted.
M. Wozniak stated DNR supportive of that and we have to notify them. They can object.
H. Stenerson asked if any objections.
M. Wzonakia said no objections.
H. Stenerson asked if horses cause problem.
Pat said DNR made new trail.

⁴Motion by H. Stenerson and seconded by B. Overby to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the Haycreek Valley Campground. Motion carried 7-0.

B. Schafer asked is hwy 58 corridor issue addressed.
Pat said known but 2 old building including town hall would maybe shift plans.
M. Patterson asked if feedlot officer needs contacted for manure management issues.
M. Wozniak said we can make that happen if appropriate.
H. Stenerson said not definable as feedlot, manure issue for disposal is important for advice.
B. S, stated should be advisory capacity.
T. Webster asked if other gentlemans situation is same or different.
M. Wozniak stated he could not remember if DNR.
Quarterman, said county told him to move sites.
M. Wozniak said maybe because of environmental health issues.
H. Stenerson said maybe it was a issue of never proper licensed before, but grandfathered.
Quarterman said they were told they needed up to date to get permits as new facility.
M. Woznaik and B. Overby re-stated comment.

⁵Motion by H. Stenerson and seconded by B. Overby to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the Haycreek Valley Campground. Motion carried 7-0.

S. Blue requested letter be written to address horse and horse trail concerns.

Discussion of Highway 19 Corridor Zoning (Cannon Falls Township east of City of Cannon Falls)

In Mr. Smiley's letter he indicates that the Township was unable to approve Mr. Lindell's request because spot zoning would not benefit the interests of the neighbor or the Recently Cannon Fall Township took action to deny a request from Mr. Roy Lindell, an owner of property in located in Section 17, of Cannon Falls Township to change the zoning of his 16.42 acre property from A-3 to R-1. Mr. Lindell had previously discussed with

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

LUM Staff his interest in subdividing his property to develop one additional building site for a dwelling. The current A-3 zoning requires a minimum 35 acres parcel size for a dwelling site. Mr. Lindell's current property which includes his residence is a legal non-conforming parcel. LUM Staff had informed Mr. Lindell that his only realistic possibility for getting another building site approved would be to pursue a change of zone to the R-1 Zone District. Staff also informed Mr. Lindell that there are numerous smaller home sites and other parcel of land on both the north and south sides of Hwy. 19 in both Sections 17 and 16. He was also informed that there are numerous parcel of land in relatively close proximity to his property that are zoned R-1.

township as a whole. However, he further noted that the Township Board felt that some consideration should be given to whether a number parcels within Section 16 and 17 including Mr. Lindell's might warrant consideration for a change of zone to the R-1 District. The Township has asked the Goodhue County Planning Advisory Commission to discuss this issue and to provide feedback to the Township.

LUM Staff will present at the October 15, PAC Meeting the pro's and con's of changing the zoning of parcels in Section 16 and Section 17, along Hwy. 19. In addition, staff will present background on how a change of zone might conform or conflict with Goals and Policies of the Goodhue County Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion:

H. Stenerson asked where property was located on the map.

B. Overby gave examples of past situations.

M. Patterson stated concern about regions in county that are similar to this.

R. Lidell stated he originally wanted one house, then plat, variance issues. R-1 right across on south side of 19 and farther out. His north side of property abuts city limits, only ants one more house.

M. Wozniak stated process has gotten broader than original ideas.

H.S. stated twp needs giudance to make it R-1 or apply for annexation as personal solution. Look at A-4 zone concern. Opinion annexation as simple solution.

M. Wozniak stated all or nothing.

M. Patterson stated keep A-3 or revise.

S. Blue stated we should support application or broader application to cannon Falls,

R. Lidell stated 14 months of dealing with twp. Called mayor, etc. he did not have problem.

S. Blue asked is this adjacent to CF, fits time to support time to annexation.

M. Wozniak stated we would not object.

S. Blue stated this is what falls in comp plan.

H. Stenerson re-stated comp plan as annex simple solution to migrate growth to city. Discourage rural growth.

M. Wozniak wanted sense of commissions opinion from county and if R-1 change is possible.

B. Overby stated give twp direction, they told you what to do?

M. Woznaik they denied Lidells request

R. Lidell stated they did not want to spot zone.

B. Overby stated give Lidell advise or reccommendation for twp. From county PAC.

M. Wozniak stated we need to clarify this for him.

Lidell asked is cry open to re-zone property to R-1 with restriction of just one house.

H. Stenerson wanted plat and design as development and to join city.

Lidell said at last township meeting , township sated county said no spot zoning.

M. Wozniak stated that was misinformation.

Lidell said they didn't want to deal with it.

S. Blue stated what PAC and BOA do.

M. Wozniak stated some cities require city services first to annex.

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

S. Blue said that's what happened in Lake city.

H. Stenerson said also not to speak for twp board, based on type of property next door neighbors will want one by one. Twp. Speaking between the lines.

L. Olson stated annexation voted down on other side of Cannon falls.

S. Blue asked if this would fit with city's complain in future.

M. Wozniak stated 1st time issue , no motivation to re-zone on their part. On Lidell case he abuts city limits, he ought to ask about annexing if that's what he is hearing.

M. Patterson asked how many requests per month thru staff in issue of A-3 .

M. Wozniak said they should start documenting.

M. Patterson said there is demand for new housing.

B. Overby agreed.

M. Wozniak said it is because eof value.

B. Overby stated small famr areas not farmable, not saleable because of full zoned sections.

L.Olson stated that could be best use of land.

M. Wozniak said Liddell had area like that.

R. Lidell said CER of 5 and half bluff area, not changing flavor of neighborhood.

M. Patterson said that could open it up to 35 houses.

M. Wozniak said he wished for other answer or option.

B. Overby said logical request, lack of option.

M. Patterson said it s building over time.

B. Overby agreed.

H. Stenerson gave Welch example to fit rural intermediate lot size, maybe by overlay.

M. Wozniak said with work you can find spots that will work in townships for that need. Be clear of where and to what extend.

S. Blue said and not by application by application. Say to City annex us or give specs on how this section may develop with plan.

M. Wozniak said new3 zoned districts or overlays can allow for higher volume if agreement by folks with work.

S. Blue said long range plan for lands adjacent to Cannon Falls would become Cannon Falls and that's why it became A-3 and Cty PAC then responsible.

M. Wozniak said Lidell should ask city if annex interest, PAC preference. City may want other requirements.

H. Stenerson said talk to planning dept. and coordinate with long range planning.

R. Lidell asked if they want to annex it.

H. Stenerson said if they want subdivision with block lines.

Liddel said they don't want utilities out there, with no wells and septics in city limits.

S. Blue said people don't want to change over as in Lake City issue.

B. Overby asked if hardship.

M. Wozniak said he is not sure, concerned over Lidells situation. Regulations don't accommodate it currently.

S. Blue said variance.

M. Patterson said good lead to next subject and re-look at housing densities with setback changes and dwelling lot sizes.

M. Wozniak stated 5 year comp plan changes soon.

B. Overby said some will not change.

S. Blue suggested staff write letter to city of Cannon falls to address this corridor with long-range goals.

M. Wozniak said we may need to find answer for R. Lidell.

B. Overby said ask for formal solution.

B. Schafer said variance already in ordinance, government not in position to keep all happy.

- S. Blue said time to engage city.
H. Stenerson said twp is right whole corridor needs appropriate answer as square block of R-1 or something .
No short term solution for Liddell.
R. Liddel said contact city and ask them.
M. Wozniak said their annex choice.
S. Blue said we can write e a letter to the city to address this issue in multiple sections.

With no(further) comment it was moved by S. Blue to write letter from staff to City of Cannon Falls and not seconded. Motioned by M. Patterson to close the public hearing. Motion carried 7-0.

Discussion of Side and Rear yard setback requirements for the A-1, A-2 and A-3 Zone Districts

The Goodhue County Board of Appeals and Adjustment has asked the Planning Advisory Commission to consider whether any changes to the 100' side and rear yard setback requirement should be made based on a steady flow of requests for variance as well as knowledge that many property owners are simply not even trying to build because of the current standards.

Include in bold type are setback and selected other performance standards from other rural counties with similar characteristics to Goodhue County:

Rice County

509.05 Dimensional Standards

- A. Minimum lot area, residential lot: 35 acres, or a minimum of 1 acre if the site qualifies under §509.03 B.
- B. Minimum lot area, dwelling of record: A parcel containing a dwelling of record may be reduced in size to 1.0 acres. The remainder of the parcel may only be used or developed in accordance with the density standards of §509.03.
- C. Minimum lot area, all other uses: 2.5 acres, or as specified by conditional use permit.
- D. Minimum lot width: 50 feet
- E. Minimum front yard setback: County road, State Highway 100 feet
Township, other road 70 feet and Front property line 70 feet
- F. Minimum side yard setback: 20 feet, with the exception of buildings containing livestock, which shall have a minimum setback of 100 feet.
- G. Minimum rear yard setback:
 - 1. Principal buildings: 70 feet
 - 2. Accessory buildings: 20 feet
 - 3. Livestock buildings: 100 feet

- H. Maximum height: 35 feet. Agricultural structures are exempt from height limitations.
- I. Feedlot setback: The minimum setback for new residences from existing feedlots shall be the same as the requirements established in the Rice County Feedlot Ordinance for setbacks of feedlots from existing residences.

Wabasha County A-1, A-2,

Subd. 2 Yard and Setback Requirements.

Every permitted, conditionally permitted dwelling, or accessory structure shall meet the following yard and/or setback requirements:

- A. All yards and setbacks shall conform to the established setbacks of this Article and other County Ordinances for Wabasha County Roads, Township Roads, Public Easements, Shoreland Areas, Floodplain Areas, Bluffland Areas, Subdivisions and all other items for which setbacks are regulated.
- B. Each lot shall have a minimum width of sixty six (66) feet at an existing public road right-of-way line. However, the County Board may allow a lot that does not abut right of way, provided that the Owner has presented the County with proof it has an easement right to access the road.
- C. Front Yard of all Structures.
 - 1. All setbacks shall conform to Wabasha County Highway Setback Distances, as may be amended from time to time.
 - 2. In the event any building is located on a lot at the intersection of two (2) or more roads or highways, such lot shall have a front yard abutting each such road or highway.
- D. Side and Rear Yard.
 - 1. Side and rear yard setbacks shall be a minimum of fifty (50) feet.
- E. Any building in which the keeping of livestock or fur bearing animals or any kennels (when such keeping results in the accumulation of animal wastes) is carried on shall maintain a separation of two hundred (200) feet from any dwelling on adjacent property.
- F. New feedlots shall not be allowed within 1,000 feet from any existing residence (dwelling) other than the feedlot

operator's, except farmyards that existed prior to the adoption of this ordinance.

- G. In accordance with Minnesota State Statutes Section 394.25, Subd. 3C, Part d, new residences (dwellings) shall not be allowed within 1,000 feet from any existing feedlot, unless the new residence is built to replace an existing residence. A county may grant a variance from this requirement under Minnesota State Statutes Section 394.27, Subd. 7. Subd. 3.

A-3 Zone Wabasha County

D. Side and Rear Yard.

- 1. Side and rear yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 20 feet.

Winona County – Agriculture District

603.5 Performance Standards

(1) HEIGHT REGULATIONS.

- (a) Agricultural structures, permitted principal uses listed under Section 603.2 (15), and properly permitted conditional uses listed in Section 603.4 (9) are exempt from height limitations unless they are located in a special airport zone.
- (b) Structures not enumerated in (a) shall not exceed a height of two and one half (2 ½) stories or thirty-five (35) feet.

(2) FRONT YARD REGULATIONS.

(a) Required Setback Distance:

- From Road Centerline
- Road Class
- 200 feet: Principal Arterial
- 130 feet: Minor Arterial
- 130 feet : Major Collector
- 100 feet : Minor Collector
- 65 feet: All other local roads

- (b) Where a lot is located at the intersection of two or more roads or highways, there shall be a front yard setback on each road or highway side of each corner lot. No accessory buildings shall project beyond the front yard of either road.

(3) SIDE YARD REGULATIONS.

- (a) There shall be a minimum side yard of twenty (20) feet on each side of the building.

(4) REAR YARD REGULATIONS.

- (a) For non-agricultural buildings, there shall be a minimum rear yard of fifty (50) feet.

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

(5) LOT AREA REGULATIONS FOR NON-FARM RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS.

(a) There shall be minimum buildable lot size for non-farm residential uses of one (1) acre.

(b) An increase of the minimum lot size may be required by the County if determined to be necessary by the Planning Director for private sewer systems to function properly.

(6) LOT WIDTH AND DEPTH REGULATIONS.

(a) Every lot or parcel of land of which a one family dwelling is erected shall have a minimum width at the building setback line of one hundred seventy-five (175) feet and a minimum depth of two hundred feet. Revised (200)

Dodge County – Agriculture District

804. Performance Standards

1. Lot Area Requirements

a. lot area required shall be a minimum of three (3) acres, exclusive of road right-of-way;

b. an increase in the minimum lot size shall be required if it is determined that additional area is needed to meet the Dodge County Septic & Wastewater Treatment Ordinance requirements or any other applicable regulations of the County.

2. Lot Width Requirements

a. every lot shall have a minimum lot width of 150 at the building setback line;

3. Height Requirements

a. agricultural structures are exempt from height limitations unless they are located within an airport zone;

b. non-agricultural structures shall not exceed a height of thirty five (35) feet.

4. Front Yard Requirements

a. there shall be a front yard setback of not less than 50 feet from the right of way line;

b. in the instance of a corner lot, there shall be two (2) front yard requirements along the street sides.

5. Side Yard Requirements

a. there shall be a minimum building setback of 25 feet from the side yard property line, with the following exception;

b. for all non-farm residential uses, a minimum building setback of 25 feet shall be maintained from the side yard property line.

c. For all new wells, a minimum of 50' shall be maintained from the side yard property line.

6. Rear Yard Requirements

- a. there shall be a minimum building setback of 50 feet from the rear yard property line, with the following exception;
- b. for all non-farm residential uses, a minimum building setback of 25 feet shall be maintained from the rear yard property line.
- c. For all new wells, a minimum of 50' shall be maintained from the rear yard property line.

7. Tree and/or Shrub Planting Regulations

- a. deciduous and coniferous trees that reach a mature height of twenty (25') feet or more shall be setback a minimum of twenty five (25') feet from road rights-of-way and all property lines; five
- b. all other trees and shrubs shall be setback a minimum of fifteen (15') feet from road rights-of-way and all property lines. feet

8. Access Drive Regulations

- a. access drives, if providing access to lots not fronting a public road, shall be thirty three (33') feet in width;
- b. access drives, serving two or three residences, shall:
 - i. be sixty six (66') feet in width;
 - ii. provide a twenty four (24') foot driving surface;
 - iii. provide an adequate turnaround area for emergency and public service vehicles; and
 - iv. provide a graveled or better driving surface.
- c. maintenance of access drives shall be the responsibility of the home owner(s) for which the access road is built to serve;
- d. access drives shall not serve more than three residences;
- e. see section 1604 for additional requirements.

General Conclusions:

Review of Agricultural Zone District Standards from Rice County, Wabasha County, Winona County and Dodge County has revealed the following conclusions:

- Generally Side Yard Setback requirements range from 20 to 30 feet; and
- Rear Yard Setbacks for dwelling range from 25 to 50 feet; and
- Side Yard setbacks for accessory building range from 20 to 50 feet (non-livestock) and 100 feet with livestock; and
- Minimum lot widths typically exceed Goodhue County 100 foot width of a public road requirement; and

- It does not appear that these other Counties are expressly concerned about maintaining a significant amount of separation between dwelling.

Staff will offer further insight regarding the pro's and con's of changing current 100 foot side and rear yard setback standard for Goodhue County's Agriculture Districts at the October 15, PAC Meeting.

Discussion:

B. Overby stated big concerns. Dennison example.

M. Patterson stated agreement and concerns.

H. Stenerson said not concerned with side yard setbacks. Lower cost accessory building Rice County example wrong way. Need to leave enough area for front yard setbacks.

B. Overby state BOA stated distances from house to house 100 ft needs to keep as is. Accessory buildings should be 100 ft away.

L. Olson asked 100 ft each side.

B. Overby said yes house to house.

M. Wozniak said if spacing done right then not an issue. If allowing to build 30 ft away form line then other needs 70 ft away to maintain 100 ft.

H. Stenerson said it needs the side yards half distance to equal it out at 50 ft each. Do we want to say accessory building closer to house.

M. Patterson asked would 50 ft be ok.

B. Overby said yes.

M. Wozniak we are high except for livestock setbacks.

B. Overby said 100 ft high.

M. Wozniak said yes high.

H. Stenerson said splits for finances happens, road expansions an issue with front. No probelm with 50 ft side yards back yards.

M. Patterson asked about committee to bring back A-1, A-2, A-3 housing densities.

B. Overby asked if group of people to research density issue.

H. Stenerson said BOA records could answer questions.

M. Wozniak stated what you often see is alternate distances between multiple building.

B. Overby stated example as starter farm, wanted to build road to dryer, etc granted. Additional problem of site sold off and causing own hardship.

H. Stenerson said take median variance as example to come up with safe numbers and people don't have issue with shrinking the number.

M. Wozniak said that county had 30 ft in past.

H. Stenerson stated that caused hardships.

-
- B. Overby said most between 50-100 ft range of old farmsteads $\frac{3}{4}$'s of them with additional building.
- M. Wozniak stated staff wants direction. We could form an ordinance for a former hearing, Kristi has data.
- M. Patterson stated consensus to change.
- H. Stenerson said comfortable with number, committee if change of zone or lot size.
- M. Wozniak said NOV meeting we can look at that.
- B. Overby asked for do you want BOA suggestion.
- M. Wozniak said yes.
- H. Stenerson said just as interested in what BOA didn't approve. Input as to why.
- M. Wozniak said we will find recent findings.
- M. Patterson said more formal in January.
- M. Wozniak said on target to work towards that.
- M. Patterson asked about housing densities.
- H. Stenerson said comp plan not thrilled results. Broad for county.
- S. Blue state A-3 is a problem that needs addressing first.
- R. Liddell state 100 ft hwy frontage restrictions or roadway approval on corridor limits development anyways.
- S. Blue A-3 needs plans or city helps plan.
- M. Wozniak state example on hwy 61 on Wacouta Contacts every week. That area may develop as soon as possible.
- S. Blue said A-3 is different than A-1,2 because it needs coordinated with someone else.
- B. Overby said townships will be a factor in this. Township disapproved A-1 to A-2 shift.
- M. Wozniak said many don't want change or don't come to meetings.
- B. Overby said in 20 years it will change in this area period.
- M. Wozniak said H. Stenerson is right for need for new option in the tool box, we are all or nothing.
- H. Stenerson said S. Blue is right, A-1 is too important to change. A-3 cities will protest, people want to live to see change happen. Let twp made first steps in decisions.
- M. Patterson said we agree so far need for change in densities.
- M. Wozniak said D. Rechtzigel not hear to speak tonight, special committee could have board rep.
- S. Blue said we could have not enough housing in future versus not enough.
- H. Stenerson said 2 years ago no discussion, fast change when people aren't asking for it.
- M. Patterson stated 5 years ago they did not want it.
- H. Stenerson said now look at what makes long range sense and approach the board.
- M. Wozniak said he will speak with Lisa Hanni and get on agenda.

DRAFT

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

Page - 24 -

Moved by H.Stenerson and seconded by L.Olson to adjourn the October 15, 2007 Planning Advisory Commission meeting at 10:44 p.m. Motion carried 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kelly Moriarty

Recording Secretary

DRAFT

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
October 15, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

Page - 25 -

MOTIONS

¹ APPROVE October 15, 2007 agenda.. Motion carried 7-0.

² APPROVE September 17, 2007 minutes. Motion carried 7-0.

³ APPROVE Preliminary and Final Plat and PUD for Chateau Frontenac Homes with conditions stated in staff recommendations.
Motion carried 7-0.

5 APPROVE the Conditonal Use Permit for Verizon Wireless . Motion carried 6-1.

5 APPROVE the Conditonal Use Permit for Haycreek Valley Campground . Motion carried 7-0.