

Present: Howard Stenerson    Ron Allen            Randy Juliar    Bernie Overby  
          Steven McNamara    Suzanne Blue    Sarah Pettit    Lisa Hanni  
          Mike Wozniak

Absent: Sam Michels        Mike Patterson

### **WORKSHOP—MEETING PROTOCOL**

L. Hanni introduced Michael Wozniak as the new County Planner and Zoning Administrator.

Michael Wozniak stated that he has a bachelor's degree in Landscape Architecture and a Master's Degree in Regional Planning. He also gave a summary of his past work experiences. He stated that he has quite a bit of experience in preparing Comprehensive Plans and administering them and in writing and enforcing Zoning Ordinances. He went on to explain the strategic planning meetings that he was a part of when he was here at the County earlier in his career.

Each Planning Commissioner went through and introduced themselves. L. Hanni stated that Ron Allen is our new Commissioner representative.

L. Hanni stated that she would like to do some reminding of the general rules and by-laws. Everyone gets this every year as a reminder, especially with a new chair and for each of the members. L. Hanni read through the general guidelines and the motion basics of the Planning Advisory Commission.

L. Hanni spoke about the by-laws of the Planning Advisory Commission. She stated that the by-laws have not been updated in a long time. There was a question of the BOA representative. Another question was raised that the people that are supporting an issue are supposed to come up first, and the people against it are supposed to come up second. She suggested that at the beginning of the next meeting they can make changes if people would like. She went on to talk about the conflict of interest portion of the by-laws.

L. Hanni stated that she did want to go through a few of the handouts that were placed in front of each person: the 2006 PAC member chart—please review that and make sure that it is right. She stated that Carie does the PAC, and Kristi does the BOA.

L. Hanni stated that one of the other issues is the draft ordinance of the Regulated Animals Ordinance. She stated that it was the PAC that brought this interim ordinance forward. She stated that they looked at other Ordinance copies. She stated that what they concluded was to prohibit the animals exactly as it is in the State Statute. The regulated animals were animals that were potentially hazardous to the Public. She stated that they are not going to attach this as part of the Zoning Ordinance: then we can license the animals—it is not tied to the land. The regulated animals would get a license from the County Board, which will be a two-year license. After two years, you can just administratively go in and update the license. However, if your animals would change,

you would have to go back to the County Board. She stated that we did not want to have to bring everyone back every two years to the County Board.

B. Overby asked if bears and these animals are completely prohibited? What happens if someone has one already in place?

L. Hanni stated that we dealt with that in a portion of the ordinance—under Exemptions. She stated that we have two examples already in the County, and this would not be applied to them.

R. Allen asked about if they pass on?

L. Hanni stated that she would have to go back and look at the exact wording of the Conditional Use Permit.

R. Allen asked what kind of animals?

B. Overby stated that in the example he knows of, the man has two bears, monkeys, wolves, pretty good mix of animals. He sells them all over the world. He stated that it is south of Kenyon.

H. Stenerson asked when the moratorium expires?

L. Hanni stated that she thought it was in June. She stated that you are the body that put the moratorium on. If you have any comments or concerns, please come to staff as soon as possible. It will be a public hearing at the County Board, as a stand-alone Ordinance.

H. Stenerson asked about the moratorium?

L. Hanni stated that I am giving this to you right now. Part of this is that we thought it should be a stand-alone Ordinance.

M. Wozniak stated that it just requires Board action.

S. Blue asked if this will be an enforcement issue? One of the weaknesses that we had before were related to enforcement, so is that being addressed?

L. Hanni stated that yes, it has been addressed.

S. Blue stated that the concern she has are the containment items, which are often related to land.

L. Hanni stated that we do ask for a lot of information, including liability insurance, how animals are kept, etc.

S. Blue asked if the safety concerns are addressed by other agencies?

L. Hanni stated yes. She thought it was going to the Board in February. She asked if there were any other items? She went on to state that you don't get a raise with your mileage—it did go back down, so you'll notice that in your paychecks.

S. McNamara asked about the Kennel issue with the Stoltenberg's?

L. Hanni stated that Retreats and Kennels went through to the County Board. She also stated that the Stoltenberg's withdrew their kennel application.

S. Pettit asked about the discussion on the meetings at the end of the minutes at the last meeting.

L. Hanni stated that Mike, Jeff (in the Surveyor's Department), and herself are hoping to be able to get some more communication items available for during the meetings. Most people get the notice that just states the property on a piece of paper and are not sure where the property is exactly located. We were looking at placing a screen in this room to display site plans, drawings, etc.

The Goodhue County Planning Advisory Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chair Sarah Pettit in the Goodhue County Justice Center located at 454 West Sixth Street in Red Wing, Minnesota.

Present: Howard Stenerson    Bernie Overby    Steve McNamara    Ron Allen (non-voting)  
          Suzanne Blue            Sarah Pettit        Randy Juliar        Mike Wozniak      Lisa Hanni

Absent: Mike Patterson        Sam Michels

**APPROVE JANUARY 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, AGENDA** –

H. Stenerson talk about the vice chair position. He also discussed that they maybe overlooked stable issued in the feedlot ordinance.

L. Hanni stated that the Stoltenberg Kennel issue should be placed before the Orchard Rangers Saddle Club on the agenda.

*<sup>i[1]</sup>Motioned by H. Stenerson and seconded by R. Juliar to approve the January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006 agenda, as amended. Motion carried 6:0.*

**APPROVE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2005, MEETING** –

*<sup>ii[2]</sup>Motioned by S. Blue and seconded by S. McNamara to approve the November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005 minutes. Motion carried 6:0.*

**STAFF UPDATES** – L. Hanni stated that they were addressed earlier.

**CONFLICT/DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST** – None to be discussed.

L. Hanni explained that Pamela and Jacob Stoltenberg’s item was tabled at the last meeting. In the meantime, they withdrew their request. She just asked that the Commission accept their withdrawal. Withdrawal was accepted.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—ORCHARD RANGERS SADDLE CLUB—**

Orchard Rangers Saddle Club is requesting a conditional use permit to operate a campground in Section 24 of Featherstone Township. Section 24 of Featherstone Township is zoned A-2, Agriculture District, which allows campgrounds as a conditional use permit.

Orchard Rangers Saddle Club is a private saddle club requesting a conditional use permit for a campground. The Club has been utilizing the property for weekend camping and trail riding in the past. The club has evolved from utilizing a riding area in Lakeville to trail riding in the Featherstone and Hay Creek areas. (Please review the attached application materials submitted by the applicants, in which Article 8, Section 7 is addressed).

All of the trailers and campers are self-contained. The applicants do not wish to install a well or septic system. The Club grounds also contain satellites, which are vendor-maintained. Each member supplies his/her own water in self-contained campers and has his/her own drinking water supply. All members are required to take their garbage, waste, and trash with them when they leave the Club grounds. Electricity is existing and has been approved by the State Inspector, according to the applicants.

On the busiest weekends, the applicants estimated that they have 30-35 horses on the campground. The average weekend has approximately 12-15 horses. Each campsite contains tie-up locations for the horses. Members are responsible for collecting the manure and placing it in the designated haul-out pit. A neighbor farmer then transfers the manure for use on his fields. Steve Schmidt, the County Feedlot Officer, has reviewed the request, been in contact with the applicants, and is okay with this situation.

The proposed campground area is located within the shoreland and floodplain districts. According to Bill Huber, DNR Area Hydrologist, “Campsites should meet the 100-ft. structural setback from the top of the bank of Hay Creek. According to the plan you sent, campsites B14, B15, and B16 are located in the shore impact zone (within 50-ft. of the top of the bank), and campsite B13 is located within 100-ft. of the creek bank. These campsites should be eliminated or moved to meet the setback requirements.” (Please see the attached letter.)

“Campsites B1 through B18 are located in the floodway. No fill or other obstruction is allowed in the floodway, unless it can be shown that the obstruction does not raise flood elevations.”

Because all of the campsites are located in the floodplain, staff and Bill Huber have recommended that the applicants prepare an Emergency Evacuation Plan, according to Article 18, Section 9, Subd. 3.D.2. (Please see the attached letter).

Environmental Health is aware of the request.

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

Based upon the following findings of fact, according to Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance, Article 25, Section 5:

*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. **The Hay Creek campground is very close in proximity to the proposed campground. The public utilizes the state trails and will continue to be able to utilize the state trails, just as the Orchard Rangers Saddle Club members do.***

*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 establishment of the weekend-only campground will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property. In fact, the DNR has been working with the Orchard Rangers Saddle Club on a land exchange between the two groups to re-route the state trail, and the Club as agreed to the land exchange.***

*Subd. 3. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. **Electricity is already provided for the campers. The access road off of Hay Creek trail is existing, and it allows members to access the entire property with vehicles. The drainage is natural. Satellites have been provided by the Club, and the campers are all self-contained.***

*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. **There are designated parking pads used for the campers and trailers. Members travel in their campers, so there is not a need for off-street parking.***

*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***

**Saddle Club is a private club that has a several year waiting list, which greatly limits the amount of campers and horses that will be on-site at one time, which in turn limits the noise. There are no plans for street lighting that could possibly disturb the neighboring properties. Each member is responsible for disposing of garbage and waste, which limits possible odors.**

Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit request to operate a campground in an A-2, Agriculture District, with the following conditions:

- 1) Campsites B13, B14, B15, and B16 shall be eliminated or moved to meet the setback requirement of 100 ft. from the top of the bank of Hay Creek;**
- 2) No fill or other obstruction is allowed on campsites B1 through B18 because of their location in the floodway (unless it can be shown that the obstruction does not raise flood elevations);**
- 3) An Evacuation Plan must be submitted and approved by the Emergency Management Department; and**
- 4) The campground shall be approved by the Environmental Health Department.**

#### *PAC DISCUSSION*

Eldon Fossum and Mark Majerus, both with the Orchard Rangers Saddle Club, were present. Mr. Fossum stated that they have used this piece of property going into the 19<sup>th</sup> season this summer. When the property was purchased, they went through the channels of Featherstone Township, got the blessing from Featherstone, and at that point, they weren't aware that there was anything else necessary. They did not know until they got the notice last summer.

L. Hanni went through the findings of fact listed in the staff report. L. Hanni went through the staff recommendation and the conditions placed on the recommendation. She stated that with that there was a letter from Jason Petersen, Environmental Health Director. She went through and read the letter. With Jason's comments arriving today, she stated that they are still covered with the last condition that they get the approval from the Environmental Health Department. She stated that they do not foresee tabling this because they still need to get approval.

R. Juliar stated that he went out there with Carie Fuhrman. He stated that it looked neat and straightforward. They explained where they traded the DNR for the property. They were made aware of those four campsites along the Creek, which are too close to the creek. Otherwise, it was pretty straight forward.

S. McNamara stated that he spoke to the maintenance person with Featherstone Township, and they don't have a problem.

S. Pettit stated that their site is always immaculately clean. It is always very neat when she has seen it.

*C/S. Pettit opened the public hearing.*

Stan Gordon, Hay Creek Trail, stated that he agrees that the campground looks very nice, and it's always quiet. His concern was that he really didn't know what was going to happen here. He has always had a concern with the horses and the creek. He stated that he doesn't know what they own across the creek. He stated that he knows that the creek gets torn up from the horses.

*With no further comment, H. Stenerson made a motion to close the public hearing and seconded by R. Juliar. Motion carried 6:0.*

Mr. Fossum stated that they have been in contact with Emergency Management. They are in the process of filling out the Evacuation Plan.

Discussion regarding the septic system ensued.

H. Stenerson asked where they go if a tornado comes?

Mr. Majerus said same place that George's go.

H. Stenerson asked if there is a site manager on site?

Mr. Majerus stated that there is no management.

H. Stenerson stated that he had the same concerns before he even saw the letter from Jason. He asked if they are watering the horses in the creek?

Mr. Majerus replied that they water them from their own portable water and from the creek.

H. Stenerson asked if he has ever talked with George about sharing their dumping station?

Mr. Fossum stated that these units are all self-contained. He stated that they really have no need for a dumping site. A lot of people dump directly into their own septic tanks at home or they utilize dumping stations along the road.

Mr. Majerus stated that there are two sites that he can think of right off the top of his head.

R. Juliar stated that when we they were out there they found out that it is membership-only. They require their members so many hours to work. They are running a really member-orientated establishment. He stated that he was impressed with how they run it. It is actually self-policed. They even have a waiting list.

Mr. Fossum stated that their gate is locked at all times.

B. Overby asked about the public trails.

S. McNamara asked about this dumping station? Is that different from a public campground or a private campground?

L. Hanni replied that Mr. Petersen will have to answer that. She went on to state that they also include their club ground rules. It does not quite fit in with the mold of things,

so maybe a variance would be appropriate. She stated that they would like to see them move ahead with the C.U.P. and get approved from Mr. Petersen.

S. Pettit stated that the trails are already being utilized by riders. They go down to the state ground and park. The only thing that differentiates them is the fact that they are staying overnight. She stated that a variance is that they are bring one-days more of stuff than what she would bring down when she rides.

S. Blue spoke regarding variances—then it is harder to place conditions on it. We might want to simply address it with conditions.

L. Hanni stated that she would not know what conditions to place on it. She stated that getting Environmental Health's approval solves the problem.

S. Blue stated that a variance would go to the Board of Adjustment, and the BOA has trouble putting on conditions. Is it better to be addressed with conditions, or with adoption of a variance?

L. Hanni stated that the variance would be the way because it would be a variance to the rule. You can address each specific ordinance. If they decide to do what Mr. Petersen says, then they don't need a variance.

H. Stenerson stated that it is private, they do have holding tanks. To him, it does make sense to have something in the contract. Even if arrangements can be made with a nearby campground, that might help the situation. He stated that he is concerned to have some way to address water, even if it's brought in with a portable tank, so there is some water for them at the facility. He stated that he is bothered by approving a campground without seeing the Emergency Management Plan. He stated that he is wondering if we approve something without storm shelters. He brought up the issue of the notification of flash flooding. He wondered if there was a way to have the protocol for that. He wondered how they can have an emergency management plan without a contact. He wondered if they can address these issues now. Would it make sense to set a list of things that they need to address?

L. Hanni asked them where they are at with Emergency Management?

Mr. Fossum stated that Mr. Fried (Emergency Management) informed him that they would be well within the area that we would be covered within the Hay Creek sirens.

L. Hanni stated that with the Emergency Plan, we can put some input on it, but really it is the Emergency Management Department's responsibility. She stated that as staff, do you want us to not consider an application complete unless there is an Emergency Management Plan? Just a little direction would be helpful.

H. Stenerson stated that he's not sure he would even understand every aspect of an Emergency Management Plan. Is it okay or safe? Campers are not the safest thing in the world to have when a storm comes on. He stated that he is uncomfortable recommending approval to the Board without addressing at least some of this?

S. Pettit stated that there are many people who come in to ride on the trails—what do we do with them?

R. Juliar asked H. Stenerson asked about the dumping station possibility? He stated that if they have to drive, even just down the road, is there really a different to continue down to their house?

B. Overby stated that his brother has one of these fifth-wheels—a lot of these places have holding tanks, take it back, and dump it at their site. It works very well—no leakage and no problems. He did not understand why that was not acceptable. Is it a requirement or a suggestion that he does that?

L. Hanni stated that part of it, especially since it is private, it is like what Howard said, maybe if they make an agreement, they might not need a variance. She stated that people have disposed of it on the road. So, maybe Howard's suggestion could be added as a condition that they have a nearby location to dump the waste.

S. Pettit stated that they could have a covenant with someone that they have to bring the waste back and take care of it at a specific location. The Farmington Fairgrounds is an example of a location to dump the waste.

H. Stenerson asked about consistency? When we have approved other campgrounds, the septic are a part of it. Just because we use the word "private" doesn't mean they don't have to do it.

S. Pettit stated that if they went down to Zumbro Bottoms—there is no dumping station there either.

R. Juliar stated that there is a difference with the campgrounds that we approve—do most of them have self-contained units?

Mr. Thoreson (Shades of Sherwood campground owner) said that most of them are self-contained.

H. Stenerson stated that if they are not self-contained, they are probably a tent.

S. Pettit stated that they have been in existence for 19 years. We do not look at residence, but it hasn't become an issue, and it hasn't been an issue.

M. Wozniak stated that these are issues that are Environmental Health issues. These are issues that are going to have to be resolved with Environmental Health.

C. Fuhrman stated that to answer Bernie's question from awhile ago, these are not just suggestions from Jason, these are based on Ordinances and State Statute. In his statement, he had to state that he did not agree with their proposal because he couldn't—he has to be consistent with enforcing. Environmental Health does not differentiate between a public and a private campground.

S. Blue stated that number four in staff recommendation that the approval would be based on approval by Environmental Health, and also refer to an Evacuation Plan. She stated that it seems that a conditional use permit would be better because conditions would be placed on it.

***Motion by S. Blue to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners for the conditional use permit to operate a campground in an A-2, Agriculture District, with the following conditions: (1) Campsites B13, B14, B15, and B16 shall be eliminated or moved to meet the setback requirement of 100 ft. from the top of the bank***

*of Hay Creek; (2) No fill or other obstruction is allowed on campsites B1 through B18 because of their location in the floodway (unless it can be shown that the obstruction does not raise flood elevations); (3) An Evacuation Plan must be submitted and approved by the Emergency Management Department; and (4) The campground shall be approved by the Environmental Health Department as written more fully by staff. Motion failed due to lack of a second.*

R. Juliar stated that he would like to get some clearer things on Howard's concerns as far as the storm shelter and the other things he had mentioned. He stated that he agrees with Suzanne, but he just needs a clearer view from Howard to see if we should incorporate those into this.

H. Stenerson stated that under number three, to add some form of statement that would basically give the Emergency Management Department the right to decide if a storm shelter and on-site manager are necessary or required. He stated that he hates to make a recommendation without addressing those two issues. If somebody could make the determination, he would be comfortable with it that this is safe without addressing those two.

L. Hanni asked if would something like "An Evacuation Plan must be submitted and approved by the Emergency Management Department, specifically addressing shelter and on-site manager issues" to give them a little direction.

R. Juliar stated that he is comfortable with giving it to Emergency Management. He stated that he is confident that they know what they are doing and if we bring that up, and then Environmental Health will do what they need to do.

S. Blue stated that she is pretty familiar with the Hay Creek Campground that is adjacent to this. If the Emergency siren goes off, you could try to run to your car, or the saloon, or something like that, but it's not realistic. As far as flooding—she stated that she thought that there is high ground adjacent to most of these areas. In terms of a storm shelter, when you're talking about hundreds of acres of trails, the chances of being near a shelter in time might be valuable, might not.

R. Juliar stated that if the Emergency Management deemed it necessary.

B. Overby stated that we are to assume that all conditions apply whether it is public or private.

L. Hanni stated yes. She asked if you would be comfortable with the wording stated before. They can address it.

<sup>3</sup> *Moved by S. Blue and seconded by R. Juliar to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners for the request for a conditional use permit to operate a campground in an A-2, Agriculture District with the following conditions: (1) Campsites B13, B14, B15, and B16 shall be eliminated or moved to meet the setback requirement of 100 ft. from the top of the bank of Hay Creek; (2) No fill or other obstruction is allowed on campsites B1 through B18 because of their location in the floodway (unless it can be shown that the obstruction does not raise flood elevations); (3) An Evacuation Plan must be submitted and approved by the Emergency Management Department, specifically addressing shelter and on-site manager issues; and (4) The campground shall be approved by the Environmental Health Department.*

S. McNamara asked about the holding tank issue.

L. Hanni answered that it might be something like Howard suggested, possibly utilizing the neighbor's facilities—we would have to talk to Jason about that.

S. Blue asked if this were to pass, and it turns out they need a huge shelter and so forth, and they decide that they don't want to do this, then they would forward this for a variance.

S. Pettit asked if they can get a variance from Environmental Health.

L. Hanni stated that is what Jason was suggesting.

M. Wozniak stated that it would go to the Environmental Health Board and the Board of Adjustment.

H. Stenerson asked staff on number four.

L. Hanni stated that they still fall under Jason's rules.

R. Juliar stated that they still do have the option for a workable variance?

L. Hanni stated yes.

***Motion carried 6:0***

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**— T-Mobile is requesting a conditional use permit to erect a new wireless communication tower and facility on the Robert and Marian Beissel property located in Section 18 of Vasa Township. Section 18 is zoned A-2, Agriculture District, which requires a conditional use permit for a new communications tower.

Steve Carlson of Carlson & Harrington, Inc., a commercial real estate service company, is representing T-Mobile USA, Inc. T-Mobile is requesting to construct a communications facility, include wi S.Sreless antennae and lightning protection, at 30595 County 58 Boulevard, Cannon Falls.

The proposed communication facility will consist of a 195 ft. above-grade self support tower and a related equipment platform, located within a 70 ft. by 70 ft. fenced compound. Directional panel antennas will be attached to the top of the tower, and a 4 ft. lightning rod will extend above the tower for electrical protection (for a total height of 199 ft. above-grade). (Please review the attached application materials provided by the applicant according to Article 22 of the Zoning Ordinance.)

The proposed site contains a single family dwelling and farm. The property owners, Robert and Marian Beissel, have signed a lease agreement. The proposed tower location

is approximately 325 ft. from the property owner's dwelling, over 1,000 ft. from the nearest neighboring dwelling, approximately 550 ft. from County 58 Boulevard, and approximately 490 ft. from State Highway 19.

The Township has signed the Zoning Application Summary Form, indicating their approval of the requested conditional use permit.

It should be noted that a conditional use permit was recently approved by the PAC on November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2004, and by the County Board on December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004 for a Nextel communications tower and shelter in the SW ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 15 in Vasa Township. This tower was designed to be structurally capable of holding at least two (2) additional sets of antennas.

The applicants have addressed and met the General Requirements, Prohibitions, District Requirements, and Performance Standards stated in Article 22, Wireless Communication Facilities, of the Zoning Ordinance.

Therefore, staff recommends approval of the requested conditional use permit based upon the completed application and the following findings of fact, according to Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance, Article 25, Section 5:

*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. **No lighting is planned that would impede enjoyment of other property (typically, towers under 200 ft. do not require lighting for airspace safety); the proposed tower setback to any property line exceeds 400 ft.; an 8-ft. high chain link fence and locking gate is proposed to protect against unauthorized access; and signs will be mounted on the compound to warn of the danger from the electrical equipment; therefore, the proposed tower will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property or substantially diminish and impair property values.***

*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. **Communication towers are permitted as a conditional use permit in an A-2 zoning district and will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property.***

*Subd. 3. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. **T-Mobile will be providing the appropriate utility equipment and locked facilities for the tower. They are also proposing to provide a class-five gravel access drive to the tower compound.***

*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. **The tower location provides sufficient off-street parking and loading space. T-Mobile is proposing to provide a class-five gravel access drive to the tower compound, along with adequate parking and turn-around for vehicles.***

*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. **No lighting is planned that might create a nuisance. The location selected best screens the tower compound from any public right-of-way or nearby residence. The compound is located approximately 550 ft. from County 58 Boulevard behind existing buildings and approximately 490 ft. from State Highway 19. The nearest neighboring residence is over 1,000 ft. southeast of the tower location and is screened by an existing building and existing vegetation. The tower location is approximately 325 ft. from the property owner's dwelling.***

Steve Carlson stated that this was the only tower in the area besides in Cannon Falls. He stated that the existing sites in Goodhue County are on the map that he submitted. T-Mobile is trying to provide better coverage for all of Goodhue County. This is the proposal to help alleviate those concerns. We do need to go through all of the federal requirements, so we go through the state historic preservation process, FFA approval, etc.

R. Juliar stated that Carie and I were out there—it is pretty straight forward. There was nothing that jumped out at us.

H. Stenerson asked about how many more towers they need along the Highway 19 Corridor?

Mr. Carlson stated that the number of sites can be misleading—the number of towers in Red Wing is due to density of population. He stated that each site can only process a certain number of phone calls at one time. They do have planned probably one more site between this site and Red Wing.

H. Stenerson asked about the tower two sections away from them. They were assured that there would be room for more sites on that tower when it was approved. Can you go on that site?

Mr. Carlson stated that he understands that Nextel has a building permit in. There is nothing built yet though. That site is too far east to fill the gap from Cannon Falls. If we went 2.5 miles east from this site—there are lots of hills and a river creek—it is too difficult to provide seamless coverage. In terms of leasing from other carriers—Sprint,

Nextel, and T-Mobile have a mass lease agreement throughout the County. It is not a leasing issue—it is strictly so we can meet the needs of the customers in this area. He stated that he does not know why they have not started building yet. It would not meet the coverage needs that we have.

R. Juliar stated that it is a shame. He stated that there was a lot of conversation with the tower 2 miles away—the community worked with that tower company. He stated that 2.5 miles can make a difference. He stated that you lose contact at a certain amount of places.

Mr. Carlson stated that he spoke with the Engineering Department about it—they have looked at that location, and they said that there was no way that we could avoid a coverage gap on Highway 19.

R. Juliar asked how they test that?

Mr. Carlson stated that they use topographical software.

R. Juliar asked staff about the permit issue with the tower that was already approved.

C. Fuhrman stated that their building permit was issued in July, and before Kristi left, she sent them a letter stating that they needed to start work on the construction, but we have not heard anything back from the company.

R. Allen asked about piggy-backing?

Mr. Carlson stated that in hilly terrain, it is very difficult to keep coverage.

S. McNamara asked about the black dots? The rest of the county—are they that thick with towers?

Mr. Carlson stated that you have to keep in mind that those are not all towers—they are probably co-locating on some towers. For example, the site in Cannon Falls is owned by Nextel, and they are on that one with them. Sometimes there is a fear that everyone needs their own tower, which isn't true because there is a lot of co-locating.

S. Pettit stated that she will assume that the Nextel tower in Cannon Falls and the other one in Vasa, are they bridging that gap?

Mr. Carlson stated that you have to keep in mind that they operate at different technologies. Nextel is at a lower frequency than T-Mobile.

R. Juliar asked if there is any way of communicating with them? Is there any possibility at all that they could come to your tower?

Mr. Carlson stated that part of it may be how quickly their permit dies.

B. Overby asked if the main reason was because some of the customers have come to them, or has the company determined that they are not getting that coverage?

L. Hanni stated that we are not getting coverage.

Mr. Carlson stated that it comes down to customer complaints, and companies know when calls are being dropped.

S. Pettit asked if there a way in the packet to get information on all of the towers in the County?

L. Hanni stated that she thought that staff could get that information from Emergency Management. She stated that the FCC only puts up on their website what was updated that year.

### *PAC DISCUSSION*

*C/S. Pettit opened the public hearing.*

No public comment was taken.

*Moved by R. Juliar and seconded by S. Blue to close the public hearing. Motion carried 6:0.*

H. Stenerson stated that it appears to him that the ideal situation is to have a series of about three towers spread between Cannon Falls and the Red Wing area?

Mr. Carlson stated yes.

H. Stenerson asked if the Nextel tower has their permit yet?

C. Fuhrman stated that they received their building permit in July.

H. Stenerson stated that it would make sense with me to have Nextel come onto T-Mobile's tower. Would it not make sense for Sprint and T-Mobile to discuss if the Sprint can join with T-Mobile?

B. Overby asked if there is a problem? Is there objection from the public? Have we heard anything like that? If we need that for coverage and if there aren't complaints, let's go ahead and let them put them up.

L. Hanni stated that they did have complaints because it was in the historic district.

H. Stenerson stated that they did have quite a bit of objections—where it was sited was a tolerable compromise.

S. Blue stated that they are stuck on just the one point of how many towers, and Lisa has information.

S. Blue stated that she suggests they table it and see the map of all of the towers in the County.

L. Hanni stated that she can find the information that we have, and it won't have the individual tower companies' coverage areas though.

R. Juliar stated that it seems a shame that there is a possibility to just have one tower in that area—we should just give an effort.

H. Stenerson asked about approaching Sprint to join them on the same tower?

Mr. Carlson stated that quite honestly, it is unrealistic. Every carrier has budget constraints, their own network, own build plan, and different technologies. It would be ideal to say let's get all the carriers together, but the problem is that we have no control over if Sprint and Nextel build. We cannot make them do anything, and they cannot make us do anything.

H. Stenerson stated that what if we asked staff to approach Sprint about co-locating with T-Mobile. What if we approached you (Mr. Carlson), would you be willing to not build your tower and co-locate?

Mr. Carlson stated that there have been cases that a CUP was issued and for some reason, wasn't going to be built, to go and take that CUP from another carrier. He stated that he can't think of a time where he has seen that happen. He stated that in this case, they don't know what Sprint/Nextel was going to do, and even if they had built it, this tower would not work for us. This is how we survive—to provide the best possible coverage to our customers.

*<sup>4</sup>Moved by H. Stenerson and seconded by B. Overby to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners for the conditional use permit to erect a new wireless communication tower and facility in an A-2, Agriculture District, based on staff recommendations. Motion carried 6:0.*

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—MARK THORESON C/O SHADES OF SHERWOOD**—Mark Thoreson, c/o Shades of Sherwood, is requesting a conditional use permit to operate a public stable in an A-1, Agricultural Protection Zone, and an A-2, Agriculture District. A-1 and A-2 zoning districts allow public stables as a conditional use permit.

The applicant is proposing to offer horse rides to the public on the existing campground. Mr. Thoreson, campground owner, will be providing his horses for the public stable. The horses will be kept on the campground and across Sherwood Trail, at his brother's property.

A site visit was conducted on May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2005 by representatives from Land Use Management, Environmental Health, and the Humane Society. The site visit was conducted in response to two complaints received by the Humane Society regarding

possible sick horses in questionable conditions at the Shades of Sherwood campground. The need for a conditional use permit to operate a public stable was discussed at the site visit and in a follow-up letter. The applicants had decided in June of 2005 not to apply for a conditional use permit to operate a public stable. The applicants have now changed their mind and requested a conditional use permit.

Bill Huber, DNR Area Hydrologist, has reviewed the request and does not see any concerns with the proposed public stable. Steve Schmidt, the County Feedlot Officer, has reviewed the request and has requested more information from the applicant before signing off on the permit application. Jason Petersen, Environmental Health Director, is aware of the request.

Therefore, based upon the following findings of fact, according to Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance, Article 25, Section 5:

- 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. **The public stable is not foreseen to be injurious to the other property in the immediate vicinity or diminish and impair property values within the immediate vicinity, as long as the horses are kept on the property.***
- 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 public stable is not foreseen to impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property, as long as the horses are kept on the property.***
- Subd. 3. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. **The campground contains existing trails throughout the property.***
- 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. **Sufficient parking is provided at the campground, and sufficient loading space is available to load and unload the horses.***
- 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. **Adequate measures should be taken to dispose of the manure.***

Staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit request with the following conditions:

- 1) **Receive approval from the Goodhue County Environmental Health Department;**
- 2) **Receive approval from the Goodhue County Feedlot Officer; and**
- 3) **Allow periodic inspections by the Land Use Management Department.**

#### *PAC DISCUSSION*

Mr. Thoreson introduced his proposal. He stated that he did meet with Steve Schmidt, who is here tonight.

R. Juliar stated that he was lost without having a site map.

H. Stenerson asked if they were keeping the horses at the campground all summer long?

Mr. Thoreson stated that in the past, they have moved the horses in and out. The horses will be kept there in the summer time. There is a building directly across the road—there is a field and a pasture on the property directly across the road. They will be kept across the road. He stated that they will have a corral; otherwise they will be kept across the road. The pasture is approximately 11 acres. The plan is for a dozen horses. That whole area behind is a pasture on the north side. The maximum number of horses will probably be 20. The horses will be kept in Winona County on his farm in the off-season.

B. Overby asked about a feedlot concerns?

Mr. Thoreson stated that Steve can answer that. They would not be kept in a corral situation on a 24-hour basis.

B. Overby asked if the pasture is a registered feedlot?

Steve Schmidt stated that he does not need a feedlot permit—the density of animals within a certain enclosure determined feedlots—at ten animal units or more, we have to look at it from the Zoning Ordinance setbacks.

H. Stenerson stated that he's been struggling, as long as there is not manure accumulation and don't kill grass, and the area is big enough, it wouldn't be a feedlot issue.

S. Pettit asked if there is a rule of how many horses per acre?

S. Schmidt answered no, there is not. He stated that he met with Mark and went over his proposal. He has a general idea of where the corral is going. He told Mark that he needs a site plan and an operational plan. If he maintains it as a pasture, he wouldn't have any issues with this.

Mr. Thoreson stated that the manure would be spread in a pasture situation.

S. Pettit asked about the manure that was acquired in the corral?

Mr. Thoreson stated that we would spread it in the pasture.

R. Juliar asked about the corral?

S. Schmidt stated that the corral is not considered a feedlot. There is an exemption in the State Statute regarding corrals, etc.

S. Pettit asked about kennels—and then what is it with stables?

L. Hanni stated that we do not have any performance standards with public stables. Carie's letter was trying to get the information before the meeting. She stated that she does not know about vaccinations. These six items are things that just came up in discussion that we thought would be helpful.

S. Pettit stated that she would like more clarification on vaccinations and when they are needed.

H. Stenerson stated that one of the motivations for the kennel was the rabies vaccinations with dogs and cats.

S. Blue stated that we're kind of circling these six questions that staff has outlined. The letter was dated about three weeks ago. Maybe Steve can help you identify that site.

Mr. Thoreson stated that he thought that answered the questions with Steve Schmidt.

H. Stenerson stated that maybe the public hearing will help.

*C/S. Pettit opened the public hearing.*

Gary Shelstad, 13960 Sherwood Trail, asked where the pasture is? Mr. Shelstad asked that the pasture is only about 6 or 8 acres that is grass?

Mr. Thoreson stated that there is more on top. The corral is along the road, and the pasture will be up above.

Mr. Shelstad stated that the trail part bothers him.

*Motion by R. Juliar and seconded by S. Blue to close the public comment. Motion carried 6:0.*

R. Juliar questioned about having more time?

Mr. Thoreson stated that if the PAC has questions regarding the sites, can we do something similar with the additional sites? Can you approve it with the conditions that you like?

R. Juliar stated that he's uncomfortable not seeing this. He stated that he's uncomfortable with that. If we can see where the trails are, where the neighbors' properties are, etc.

S. McNamara asked about the Township's signature.

Mr. Thoreson stated that yes, the Township has signed it. The map follows along Sherwood Trail.

H. Stenerson stated that it isn't a feedlot. Really, all we are talking about is it okay to let this campground do pony rides? Where they are going to be ridden, and where the public will meet these issues, just as long as it isn't a feedlot, then it's kind of a non-issue. The issue is that is it appropriate at this campsite to allow pony rides? The real question to me is if they are appropriate, safe trails?

B. Overby asked about approval from the Township?

Mr. Thoreson stated that he explained the situation to them. He stated that he didn't think there was a reason for the Township to come to the meeting because he didn't think there were issues.

L. Hanni stated that part of the concern with what Howard was saying, you might want to add to consider the number of horses, and maybe your comments about having vaccinations included with the conditions.

S. Pettit asked about SWCD?

C. Fuhrman commented that SWCD was aware of the request, and the DNR was aware of the request.

Mr. Thoreson stated that Mr. Petersen (neighboring property owner) has given him permission to ride on his property. They also have existing trails that they will be using on their property.

H. Stenerson asked about allowing people to ride up and down the roads?

Mr. Thoreson stated that no, they will be not be going up and down the roads. The rides are all guided.

S. Schmidt asked Mark in the small pasture next to the road, you referred to some acreage above on the hillside, is that where the lots are for sale?

Mr. Thoreson answered that some of them would be.

S. McNamara asked about their water supply?

Mr. Thoreson stated that they will use water from the well system.

S. Blue stated that she feels like they are trying to develop this application. We should decide if we have enough information, or if we need some more information?

H. Stenerson stated that he is ready to go forward. He asked Steve Schmidt about his opinion?

S. Schmidt stated the only thing would be the barn location. He would have to go through and fill out if indeed it was a feedlot.

B. Overby asked about the Humane Society issue?

Mr. Thoreson stated that the complaints were possibly from some evicted campers.

L. Hanni stated that those issues have been resolved.

R. Juliar stated that if this goes through, it would still be dependant on if this was a feedlot or not?

S. Schmidt stated correct.

S. Blue asked if you still have 355 campsites?

Mr. Thoreson stated that is correct.

H. Stenerson stated that he is looking at the staff recommendations. He stated that he was thinking about limiting the number of horses allowed out there.

S. Pettit asked if the vaccinations are an issue?

Mr. Thoreson requested to have up to 15 horses on there, so he can include his guide horses.

H. Stenerson commented on adding to number four of staff recommendations to include: that animals will have received approved veterinarian vaccinations and to add number five to limit the number of animals to 15.

S. Schmidt stated that he would venture to say that the upper area will stay pasture.

Mr. Thoreson stated that you are typically feeding hay and grain—not just depending on grass.

L. Hanni stated you could use the kennel wording.

***<sup>5</sup>Moved by H. Stenerson and seconded by B. Overby to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners for the conditional use permit request to operate a public stable in an A-1, Agricultural Protection Zone, and an A-2, Agriculture District, with the following conditions: (1) Receive approval from the Goodhue County Environmental Health Department; (2) Receive approval from the Goodhue County Feedlot Officer; (3) Allow periodic inspections by the Land Use Management Department; (4) All animals at the property must have current vaccinations. Records need to be kept on-site, or at an identified veterinarian office, and produced***

*immediately upon request; and (5) Limit the number of horses to 15. Motion carried 6:0.*

A two minute break was taken.

**ORDINANCE AMENDMENT—SUBDIVISION CONTROLS ORDINANCE**— The Subdivision Controls Ordinance has not been updated since 1995. This item was identified as one of the issues to work on throughout 2005 by the Planning Advisory Commission at the January 2005 Workshop.

Staff from Land Use Management, Survey, Public Works, Public Health, and the Attorney's offices have worked through the wording and presented it to the Planning Advisory Commission at workshops prior to every one of the meetings beginning at the July 19, 2005 meeting.

It was determined at the November 21, 2005 PAC meeting that staff would present this as a public hearing at the January 9, 2006 PAC meeting.

The following are notable changes from the current ordinance:

- *Organization*—We organized the Ordinance to look similar to the Zoning Ordinance. The *Intent and Purpose* section, along with the *Scope and Legal Authority* section, were revised to be similar to the Zoning Ordinance. We also broke up some of the larger paragraphs and referenced them by letter or subdivision.
- *Land Subdivision and Combinations*—We clarified and codified the process of subdivisions and combinations. It outlines what needs to be submitted for administrative subdivisions and when property is required to be platted.
- *General Procedures for Platting*—This area outlines specifics of what is required for submittals and the responsibilities of the applicant.
- *Subdivision Design Standards*—The County Engineer reviewed and updated this section to current standards.
- *Financing*—We updated this section to reflect at what point performance bonds or escrows should apply.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed ordinance amendments to the Subdivision Controls Ordinance.

#### *PAC DISCUSSION*

L. Hanni introduced the Subdivision Controls Ordinance. Discussion ensued regarding the two-month time limit on splitting property. L. Hanni suggested putting this in place and see what we get. Right now, we can look at two or six months and see how it goes.

S. Pettit stated that she is comfortable to change the wording on Page 6, Subd. 2.C.

R. Juliar asked about page 2—Why do we have the portion regarding the Covenants in there at all?

L. Hanni stated that she had a note in there to ask Steve (Betcher) about that, and she wasn't sure if she had comment back from him at all.

J. Marshman, Florence Township Board, stated that the Township cannot enforce it, and the one time we needed it, the person did not want to enforce it.

H. Stenerson stated that we have had a number of people trying to come in here trying to make us enforce the Covenants.

L. Hanni stated that if it does become an issue, it is something that we can always add that in as a condition.

We are striking A from Subdivision 2 on page 12.

*C/S. Pettit opened the public hearing.*

Carl Bang, Featherstone Township Supervisor, stated that the type of subdivision that they are concerned about is people selling building sites off of a farm. They are having a problem in some instances where people are creating a lot that does not meet our Ordinance, where they won't have road frontage, adequate setbacks, etc. We would like to see that they meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

L. Hanni stated that we are now requiring to see buildings on the site, to verify setbacks, see the buildings, etc.

Mr. Bang stated that is one of their concerns.

R. Juliar stated that they could sell before that comes in front of us.

L. Hanni stated that splits have to be approved by staff.

M. Wozniak stated that if they have a pre-dating situation, then they could convey it, otherwise if they are trying to split something off, staff reviews the split. He stated that we just dealt with a situation like that.

L. Hanni stated that we know that has happened in the past.

Mr. Bang stated that they had a situation in the past year where the guy had plenty of road frontage, up on a hill, he was able to have another building site, but he is going to sell his driveway and connect that up, so he could sell this other building site.

L. Hanni stated that can happen, and it does happen.

M. Wozniak stated that they can negotiate if a private easement can be in place.

Bill Federbusch, Wacouta Township Supervisor, stated that this is probably a difficult question to ask—is there a mechanism to show what has been changed? He stated that he just got the notice. He stated that he’s wondering what has been enforced and what has not been?

L. Hanni stated that we have the current Subdivision Ordinance. We did not do it word for word. It is a substantial revision. Part of it would be helpful if you told us what kind of concerns you would have.

Mr. Federbusch stated that we have had concerns regarding splits. He stated that he does not want to digress specifically there.

L. Hanni stated that she thinks she knew of one. They did address that if it is a platted property, you have to come back and plat it again. If it was in R-1, and they had a larger lot, then they would just chunk up the parcels.

Mr. Federbusch asked about prior ones?

L. Hanni stated that it will go into effect from the date that it goes into effect.

Mr. Federbusch stated that there was not a clear guideline about what could or could not be done.

R. Juliar stated that is one thing in here that we do have that one copy will go to the Town Board.

Mr. Federbusch stated that we had situation where we did not know until after the fact.

C. Fuhrman stated that the Township does need to sign off on Preliminary Plats, but if it is an administrative split, they do not sign off on the split.

L. Hanni stated that they added that a site plan does need to be submitted with the application.

Mr. Federbusch stated that after the split was done, then trees were also cut down. He stated that he is commending them for putting it in writing.

M. Wozniak stated that we will be using the County’s Natural Resource Inventory to take a look at resources and not just trees.

L. Hanni stated that they had not advertised for the County Board level yet.

Ms. Marshman asked about developments—is this in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan? She stated that people are going to say that we don’t want any development.

R. Juliar stated that there is a misconception on “no development.” He stated that the Comp Plan is getting a bad wrap. It is not “no” to development, it is yes to a “well-thought out” development.

Ms. Marshman stated that we are going to have to tell them how to do it. She stated that in a particular example, their first phase was accepted, and the second was not. She stated that she wants to be able to help them.

M. Wozniak stated that it is important to clarify where development is allowed or isn't. It basically says what the requirements for subdividing land are. It is the zoning that dictates where a certain kind of development can occur.

Ms. Marshman stated that people are going to use this and say “Ah, ha, this is how I apply.”

L. Hanni stated that he can apply now because we do have a Subdivision Ordinance now. She stated that we are re-doing it. She stated that we have to get everything in order, so that when a proposal does come, we have all the information before us.

S. Pettit stated that first he needs to be okayed of whether or not he gets a subdivision. Once he gets a yes, then you apply according to the Subdivision Ordinance.

L. Hanni stated that this is the debate that there are some subdivisions/plats that weren't changing the zoning. It was still A-2 to better his description. If someone is requesting a zoning change and a plat, we will require them to come forward at the same time. Some things happen at the same time.

L. Hanni stated that they do not want to approve Concept Plans, and then five years later, come in and a lot has changed. Staff takes a look at it and says that we might not want to recommend approval.

Ms. Marshman stated that you need to look at the Comp Plan and then the Subdivision Ordinance.

S. Blue stated that the County has many different kind of maps to indicate natural resources, etc. The County can help to provide information, but not indications of whether or not it would pass.

J. Marshman said that we tell them to go to the Planning Commission first before going to the Town Board.

L. Hanni stated that it is a business decision. They need to decide if they want to invest in the information.

*R. Juliar moved and seconded by H. Stenerson to close the public hearing. Motion carried 6:0.*

L. Hanni stated that you can table it, recommend approval with the changes, etc. She stated that we did not know what kind of response we would get, so we did not set the County Board date.

H. Stenerson stated that the 100' issue that we would actually landlock somebody. The other side of the coin is that maybe we are better off making people share the driveways. He stated that he does agree with Ms. Marshman's concept that we are ready to listen to your plan, even though our Comp Plan says if you don't live in the city limits, don't come talk to us.

***6 Moved by H. Stenerson and seconded by R. Juliar to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners for the Ordinance Amendment to the Subdivision Controls Ordinance, with two amendments: (1) p. 6, Subd. 2.C— changing 2 months to 6 months; (2) p. 12, Subd. 2—striking "A".***

L. Hanni commented that the Subdivision Ordinance is more of a mechanics document.

***Motion carried 6:0.***

#### *DISCUSSION*

L. Hanni stated that the PAC needs to decide if the Vice Chair will also be the BOA appointment.

S. Blue nominated Randy Juliar to be the Vice Chair for the PAC.

R. Juliar stated that he would not be able to do both with his time restraints, the PAC and BOA.

S. Pettit asked if anyone else would like to be on the BOA?

H. Stenerson stated that in the past they had discussed using that policy of automatically having the PAC Vice Chair be on the BOA.

R. Juliar stated that he will serve on the BOA.

S. Blue nominated Randy Juliar as the Vice Chair on the Planning Advisory Commission and seconded by S. McNamara.

***7 Motion by B. Overby and seconded by H. Stenerson to close nominations and cast an unanimous ballot to nominate R. Juliar as the Vice Chair on the Planning Advisory Commission. Motion carried 6:0.***

Discussion ensued regarding the serving time, which is April to April, of the Board of Adjustment.

H. Stenerson nominated Randy Juliar to serve on the Board of Adjustment and seconded by S. Blue.

***<sup>8</sup>Motion by B. Overby and seconded by H. Stenerson to close nominations and cast an unanimous ballot to nominate R. Juliar as the Board of Adjustment representative. Motion carried 6:0.***

H. Stenerson discussed the feedlot Ordinance: Do we need to address most cases of public stables?

L. Hanni stated that the difference would be that the Feedlot Ordinance tells you how to handle the manure and animals, whereas the public stable part has some standards for the public stable. We would be looking at what kind of standards are we looking at?

H. Stenerson stated that there are few that don't have some sort of public involvement. He stated that public means that people are coming in.

C. Fuhrman stated that some Counties have Ordinances regarding public and private stables, and they do differentiate between the two.

H. Stenerson went on to state that there are a lot of people that should have a feedlot permit, when they don't.

S. Schmidt, County Feedlot Officer, stated that if we define what a public stable is and then a feedlot ordinance would work—it is the mechanics of how that place should be operated.

L. Hanni stated that we can bring in some definitions and what other Counties have for this one at the next meeting. She stated that we would like to have the Workshop at 7:00pm and prioritize what we would like to look at this coming year.

R. Juliar asked if we could look at the A-3 Zoning District. Were we comfortable with defining A-3 and 35 acres?

L. Hanni brought up issues of growth zones and where areas are being pressured to grow. If it is February or March, we would like to start at 7:00p.m.

R. Juliar asked for the long calendar with the dates on it.

S. Blue brought up the issue of Hay Creek, but do we need to think of some moderating influences to suggest alongside this development? This trail connects to several trails. It is a really active growing and interesting area. It is a long, narrow valley—it is pretty concise.

B. Overby asked if there was quite a bit of distance between.

R. Juliar stated that all of those trails are just one trail.

S. Blue stated that the main trail goes away from the water.

*ADJOURN*

***°Moved by H. Stenerson and seconded by B. Overby to adjourn the January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Planning Advisory Commission meeting at 10: 35 p.m. Motion carried 6:0.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Carie A. Fuhrman  
Zoning Technician, Recording Secretary

## MOTIONS

---

---

<sup>i[1]</sup> APPROVE the January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006 agenda, as amended. Motion carried 6:0.

<sup>2</sup> APPROVE the November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005 minutes. Motion carried 6:0.

<sup>3</sup> Recommend APPROVAL to the County Board of Commissioners for the request for a conditional use permit to operate a campground in an A-2, Agriculture District with the following conditions: (1) Campsites B13, B14, B15, and B16 shall be eliminated or moved to meet the setback requirement of 100 ft. from the top of the bank of Hay Creek; (2) No fill or other obstruction is allowed on campsites B1 through B18 because of their location in the floodway (unless it can be shown that the obstruction does not raise flood elevations); (3) An Evacuation Plan must be submitted and approved by the Emergency Management Department, specifically addressing shelter and on-site manager issues; and (4) The campground shall be approved by the Environmental Health Department. Motion carried 6:0.

<sup>4</sup> Recommend APPROVAL to the County Board of Commissioners for the conditional use permit to erect a new wireless communication tower and facility in an A-2, Agriculture District, based on staff recommendations. Motion carried 6:0.

<sup>5</sup> Recommend APPROVAL to the County Board of Commissioners for the conditional use permit request to operate a public stable in an A-1, Agricultural Protection Zone, and an A-2, Agriculture District, with the following conditions: (1) Receive approval from the Goodhue County Environmental Health Department; (2) Receive approval from the Goodhue County Feedlot Officer; (3) Allow periodic inspections by the Land Use Management Department; (4) All animals at the property must have current vaccinations. Records need to be kept on-site, or at an identified veterinarian office, and produced immediately upon request; and (5) Limit the number of horses to 15. Motion carried 6:0.

<sup>6</sup> Recommend APPROVAL to the County Board of Commissioners for the Ordinance Amendment to the Subdivision Controls Ordinance, with two amendments: (1) p. 6, Subd. 2.C— changing 2 months to 6 months; (2) p. 12, Subd. 2—striking “A”.

<sup>7</sup> Close nominations and cast an unanimous ballot to nominate R. Juliar as the Vice Chair on the Planning Advisory Commission. Motion carried 6:0.

<sup>8</sup> Close nominations and cast an unanimous ballot to nominate R. Juliar as the Board of Adjustment representative. Motion carried 6:0.

<sup>9</sup> ADJOURN the January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Planning Advisory Commission meeting at 10: 35 p.m. Motion carried 6:0.