

Draft

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
December 13, 2010 MEETING MINUTES

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

Present: Len Feuling Dan Rechtzigel Tom Webster L. Olson
 H. Stenerson Michael Wozniak J. Volz B. Overby

Absent: B. Schafer, R. Bauer

¹*Motioned by J. Volz and seconded by D. Rechtzigel to approve the December 13, 2010 agenda. Motion carried 7-0.*

²*Motioned by B. Overby and seconded by L. Feuling to approve the November 15, 2010 minutes. Motion carried 7-0.*

STAFF UPDATES: MW SAID B. SCHAFFER RE-APPOINTED.

CONFLICT/DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST:NONE

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

SUMMARY:

Neal Stenlund is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit, CUP, to use and operate an agricultural grass strip airfield for an aircraft landing field and associated facilities on parcel 25.024.0600 in an A-1 (Agricultural Protection) Zone District. The purpose of this Conditional Use Permit is to properly register the use and become in compliance after more than 25 years with Goodhue County Zoning Regulations.

Background

Neal Stenlund has submitted a CUP application to gain compliance for an existing agricultural airfield with a hanger on farm property located in Belle Creek Township.

The site is located on parcel number 25.024.0600, in the SW ¼ of Section 24. Besides the onsite farmhouse there are four other dwelling situated within a half mile of the subject property. The parcel is currently in agricultural use and has an unoccupied dwelling and several accessory buildings. One structure is used as a Hanger to house Mr. Stenlund’s aircraft. The farmstead is owned in a family trust and the applicant does not currently reside at the location. Extensive clean-up of the property has occurred since the last aerial photos of the county were conducted. The applicant has now requested and has one grass airstrip in use as per the site drawing and attached photographs.

The applicant has written in the application that no conflicts exist with nearby landowners, and feels many of

Draft

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
December 13, 2010 MEETING MINUTES**

the questions on the application are Not Applicable to his land use request. The applicant provided a typed statement to explain the scope of the land use request. Additionally, the applicant has also submitted an FAA field registration document from this year. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure all FAA criteria measures have been met, if necessary.

Belle Creek Township has indicated that it will support the request and has not stated any additional provisions.

Findings of Fact

For at least 25-30 years aircraft take off and landings have taken place on the property. No known safety concerns or injuries onsite. The applicant is concerned about future land use issues such as wind energy development in the surrounding area of his property. The property is 2 miles of the City of Goodhue and the City will be notified.

Staff Recommendation/Resolution

Based on the above stated findings of fact, staff recommends to the Planning Advisory Commission to recommend approval of the conditional use permit for Neal A. Stenlund be located and operated in an A-1 Zone on parcel number 25.024.0600 with the following conditions:

- 1) **Neal A. Stenlund may locate and operate a agricultural airfield for aircraft landing field with associated facilities on parcel ID#25.024.0600 as per the specific site addressed on the site map; and**
- 2) **Any public health and safety matters must be addressed with Goodhue County Environmental Health Department prior to public use; and**
- 3) **Any new structures proposed on the property shall be subject to conformance with Minnesota State Building Code as interpreted by the Goodhue County Building Official; and**
- 4) **No additional building construction onsite, public aircraft traffic, or public use shall take place prior to issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.**
- 5) **All State (MN. Statute 8800) and Federal FAA criteria to operate a grass airfield for other than personal use must be met.**

DISCUSSION:

M. Wozniak gave staff report for the Stenlund CUP. He noted location, background of use before ordinance development, key points of conditions, and findings of fact.

J. Volz asked why this is here, what happens if we do nothing.

M. Wozniak said yes, he would able to operate legal non-conforming. From County perspective it puts him on the map as recorded as CUP.

H. Stenerson said if switch to CUP we could shut it down later if problems.

M. Wozniak said interpretation, if causing safety issue it could as legal non-conforming use, some more leverage, property owner a little benefit from County of being fully legal.

H. Stenerson asked Stenlund if anything to add.

Neal Stenlund, add findings as Stanton airport has mile and a half protection, has a couple nearby towers now, wants notification if anything happens.

M. Wozniak said the County does not have clear zone standards for airports, recognize state of Minnesota requirements. IF PAC or Cty board wanted to create standards, might want to look at zoning ordinance.

B. Overby asked about state and FAA distance.

K. Moriarty added to M. Wozniak explanation.

M. Wozniak explained public vs non-public uses, state standard.

N. Stenlund handed out copies of statute, clear zone. Explained.

H. Stenerson asked if any questions.

L. Feuling asked if strip all the way up to County 9.

N. Stenlund answered yes.

J. Volz asked N. Stenlund what about mile and a half setback.

N. Stenlund said he used State and Stanton language, trying to protect himself to a mile and a half, his plane comes in at 800 ft, have to be careful.

H. Stenerson asked N. Stenlund is strip 250 feet wide.

N. Stenlund said no , just a model, mine is 50 feet wide.

N. Stenlund answered 250 would be the number he is asking for protection.

H. Stenerson asked how much clear zone is on his property.

N. Stenlund said none south at end of property, but north is 800 ft away.

M. Wozniak said for discussion purposes, think about other land use issues of reciprocal setbacks spelled out in the ordinance, but usually not in a CUP, have to have solid basis for restricting neighboring properties.

B. Overby said is he asking to be notified.

M. Wozniak said N. Stenlund could explain clear zone vs. notification.

N. Stenlund would like mile and a half clear zone.

B. Overby said we don't have that in the ordinance, so would need an ordinance change and a public hearing.

M. Wozniak said considered an airstrip there whether or not CUP approved for safety. Does PAC feel standard needs memorialized in ordinance.

H. Stenerson re-stated if it is private then it doesn't need a CUP, but if he decides to charge fees later, FAA rules apply.

M. Wozniak said state language pertaining to public use not included because CUP not proposed as public facility.

B. Overby said so PAC should be done talking about it, no clear zone in Ordinance.

M. Wozniak said whether approved or not he is there to consider for safety concerns.

N. Stenlund said FAA has approved it and gave him an ID number on FAA flight charts. They have no problems with it.

D. Rehtzigel said FAA will apply rules of their own.

M. Wozniak added and state DOT will.

C/B. Stenerson opened the discussion to public comments.

Dennis Gadiant, north landowner half mile, commented about the number from FAA , said they have no setback for this kind of facility, if you give him this CUP it doesn't change that.

M. Wozniak said recognizing his facility, not applying any new setbacks. Noted it has been there 3 decades.

D. Gadiant said it is a hobby, to restrict neighbors in any way is wrong, issue should not be acted upon until wind issue settled first, requested table.

Rochelle Nygaard, this is a wind issue, is up to county to write ordinance in your county, what about others, he will lose that site if he cannot fly.

Ann Buck, Goodhue Twp., N. Stenlunds fathers land abuts, her sons property closest to airstrip, we see no problem, fed approved and recognized. Earlier on, checked with lawyers, part of Sept. 3rd letter (she read) safety

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
December 13, 2010 MEETING MINUTES

concerns. N. Stenlund knows what he will need to have as a clear zone. Asked N. Stenlund whom he talked to. she read and interpreted other legal language. He needs safe landing area, been there 40 years abide by it.

B. Overby asked about FAA.

Ann Buck answered.

M. Wozniak made distinction of private vs. public airstrip.

Ann Buck said son has no objection either.

Dennis Gadiant, again, it's a county issue, but Ann Buck is to the NE, son on West, maybe he can change his runway angle, then County 9 is out of the equation.

H. Stenerson asked are you south.

D. Gadiant said north, and with power line in between, hobby to restrict is ridiculous, county should not get involved.

Steve Groth, talked to attorney, just wants it to be official.

Male, looked into it, Norman and Murray county have 5 mile setback, also have horizontal setback, also any higher towers or any impaired visibility. Assuming 120 mph takeoff.

N. Stenlund about 80 mph.

Male, said D. Gadiant would lose bldg site anyway with towers.

David Burfiend, mile and a quarter east, said he has right to pursue hobby, he is in 1.25 mile proposed setback. His family signed a wind lease, so entitled to our rights also.

Paul Reese, Goodhue Twp, looking over ordinance, 4-2 subdiv 1, read, cannot deny him what he already has. Not their property rights wind dev property rights, not worried, not here.

Craig Nord, 50 plus year neighbor, no problems. Questions regarding setback to him to do his thing vs. ours. PAC consider.

Erin Logan, comment about hobby, irrelevant, had airstrip for how many years.

N. Stenlund 35 years.

E. Logan continued, going thru formal process, to better help county level decisions.

Donald Nord, Goodhue Twp, about a mile away, if not broke, don't fix it. If adding a policy it is opening can of worms.

Kyle Simmons, Geronimo Wind Energy, Met Tower east of N. Stenlund, only thought about 1.5 miles, didn't see in Zoning Code, no reference, if default FAA, there is no reference to 1.5 miles there.

Ann Buck, add no regs, called many people, Bethany report, 3 miles, but N. Stenlund was not at that length for that report, talking with lawyers, he came up with 1.5, we don't have set regulation. Being generous.

With no further public comment it was motioned by L. Feuling and seconded by L. Olson to close the public comments. Motioned carried 7-0.

B. Overby asked chair coming in as private, not public.

M. Wozniak said state of MN. sets standard, not PAC here tonight.

L. Olson asked how many flights per year.

N. Stenlund said 40.

L. Olson asked so about one per wk.

N. Stenlund said it is closed now to April, grass not paved, not plowed in winter. Another part of reason for mile and a half setback is half a mile of backwash air from wind turbines.

H. Stenerson said he interprets handout as triangle by FAA, at 5,000 ft at 20 to 1 approach only 250 tall.

N. Stenlund said something without any turbulence. Blades have turbulence problems.

H. Stenerson said our ordinance doesn't address a clear zone, his concern is if clear zone is needed, use stays the same. If changes to commercial, then add language to cond. 1 as private strip.

B. Overby said a year ago no restrictions written on that CUP in Cherry Grove, not a issue with this CUP, just get on with it.

H. Stenerson agreed, but other was commercial. Future landowner could use it if not identified as private.

N. Stenlund said he also allowed others to land there, but no charges or nothing like that.

H. Stenerson said we are talking if it becomes a business venture.

B. Overby asked chair what to add as private language.

H. Stenerson spelled out language...add private to agricultural.

M. Wozniak said discussing it now because N. Stenlund asked for clear zone, but noted lack of standard for that. Distinction here.

D. Rehtzigel said placing condition on applicant.

M. Wozniak said other reciprocal standards in ord. he noted ordinance language. PAC decides if private or public.

D. Rehtzigel said if for own use we treat it differently. If he changes to commercial, he comes back. Add word private.

H. Stenerson said condition 4 is N/A.

M. Wozniak explained conditions.

H. Stenerson said he gets it.

J. Volz asked chair if clarifying, if private , not clear if we need number 2 as condition.

M. Wozniak explained why number 2. Precautionary standard.

H. Stenerson said it would kick in if commercial.

J. Volz said we don't need conditions 2,3, 4, and 5. She doesn't understand 5.

M. Wozniak explained relative to if he goes public.

J. Volz thinks no need for 2,3,4 or 5.

L. Olson asked if insert personal or private before agricultural airstrip wording.

J. Volz offered personal for private use.

B. Overby said private a better word, offers more.

H. Stenerson said don't tag with new restrictions. Note FAA for future.

D. Rehtzigel said change number 5.

M. Wozniak said personal use is an important distinction. Limits it.

H. Stenerson said maybe private language.

M. Wozniak said state is applicable first.

L. Olson asked what does PAC call it, or not.

L. Feuling asked if personal in front of agricultural.

B. Overby said put in personal and eliminate 3,4, 5.

³Motion by B. Overby , seconded by L. Olson , to APPROVE the Conditional Use Permit with adding the

word Personal in front of agricultural for Neal A. Stenlund. Motion paused...

J. Volz asked why 2,3,4, and 5.

B. Overby said as default no harm.

H. Stenerson asked about language.

B. Overby said he can go either way.

D. Rehtzigel said confusing. Don't need 3,4, 5. Keep it simple.

B. Overby, 2nd by L. Olson for Motion to be Withdrawn.

D. Rehtzigel Motion to Approve, J. Volz 2nd, add word personal before agricultural, drop 2,3,4,5 for Neal A. Stenlund CUP with findings of fact and staff recommendation. Motion Carried 7-0.

PAC Discussion:

Summary

The Goodhue County Board of Adjustment directed staff at their October 25, 2010 regular monthly meeting to research A-3 zones regarding density standards.

Background

The A-3 zone is the Urban Fringe District. What sets this zone apart from the other "A" zones is that it is not regarded as agricultural in nature. This is inconsistent with our County goals and policies to support and preserve agriculture.

Three major things divide the A-3 zones from the other "A" zones:

1. Feedlots are restricted in the A-3 zone
2. Minimum lot size is 35 acres
3. The only density standard is the lot size of 35 acres (essentially 18 per section)

The top 5 variance requests for Goodhue County from 1998-2008 were:

1. Accessory Structure size
2. 100' Property line setback

Draft

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
December 13, 2010 MEETING MINUTES**

3. ¼, ¼ density
4. Create parcel less than 35 acres
5. Build on a parcel less than 35 acres

The first two have been addressed by ordinance changes. During that 10 year period more variances have been granted to A-3 lot size than to the ¼, ¼ density. The difficulty the Board of Adjustments is facing with the A-3 lot size variance requests is that the majority of them are majorly based on economic hardships and these hardships cannot be the sole basis for a variance.

Staff researched the A-3 districts to see if an alternative lot size and density would be possible. Eleven sections that are currently A-3 would be considered full if we decided to go to a density similar to A-2 (one dwelling per ¼, ¼ 12 per section). However if we had a morphed density one per ¼, ¼ 16 per section only seven sections would be considered full.

Staff also feels that certain areas could revert back to A-1. This change of zone would be consistent with the surrounding areas, and the most restrictive in terms of density. The sections to consider this would be around the City of Wanamingo, the City of Goodhue and part of the area around Zumbrota.

Staff Recommendation/Resolution

Staff suggests at this time to amend Article 22 Section 5 as suggested below;

SECTION 5. GENERAL DISTRICT REGULATIONS

Any lot in the A-3, Urban Fringe District on which any permitted or conditionally permitted use is erected shall meet the following minimum standards:

Subd. 1. Lot Area.

- A. There shall be a minimum lot size of ~~thirty five (35)~~ **two (2)** acres per principal building or use when not served by a public or centralized sewage collection and treatment system.
- B. Lot area shall meet the requirements in Article 23, Section 5, Subd. 1.B if served by a municipal sewage treatment system.

Subd. 2. Density Requirements.

- A. **Sixteen (16) single family dwellings per section unless additional dwellings are permitted by Sections 2 and 3 of this Article.**
- B. **Any dwellings allowed by Subd. A. above shall be limited to one per 1/4, 1/4 section, except as allowed by Sections 2 and 3 of this Article.**

Furthermore, staff recommends to change the zone of section 30 of Minneola Township and section 25 of Wanamingo Township, section 21 and 28 of Goodhue Township, that part of section 19 and 20 of Zumbrota Township, and that part of section 2 of Roscoe Township to change from A-3 district to A-1.

Staff does not wish to place a parcel of record provision into the ordinance changes. This may have to get looked into further whether or not there would be any takings issues with the sections that are full. Approximately 17 parcels would lose building site opportunities.

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
December 13, 2010 MEETING MINUTES

Discussion:

MW explained item for discussion. 8:11 pm start. Introduced G. Griffin also (seated). He noted packet examples. Asked PAC how they would handle CUP/IUP's. Explained issue with GGG.

HS gave example of this for feedback from PAC.

TW said last meeting said included twp and cities, not ready for that yet. Concerned developer prior to inclusion of them, be clear on who's flying the plane. Not ready to listen until cities and twp's. How would they respond.

HS not plan, but some feedback.

MW about interpreting ord.

BO said goals, not private developer, don't know if appropriate. Not making decisions, talk to see where ti went.

MW said he consulted with HS prior about GGG. If PAC not comfortable, up to you. We have same ord asd Olmsted, interpreted different, up to you.

JV like to hear what he has to say. Let's hear him.

HS suggest he hear GGG, no intention to change ord. Have listened to dev in past, like 3-4 yrs ago. Up to PAC.

Bo said if we only listen, and we have done it in the past, that's fine.

LF if no dec lets see.

TW said note my concern.

GGG, chair said exactly, talk about how I interpret your existing ord, look at urban fringe to proect it so city can grow someday, R-1 different stays in twp. He reads Sec 1, 3rd para, joint city /twp/ cty process. In our case, the twp and city and Mike dialogue more than a yr. Reviewed by city eng for sewer, infra in and signed by city eng, for later. Drains N to S, real easy transfer from centralized system to municipal later. City does not want to annex now, but gave him standards. Want to avoid development, that 20 yrs from now city says is in the way. He reads Ord as in para 2, stay in ag land unless centralized sewage treatment system. Complexity comes with lot area as Mike said 35 acres, but next sentence says if you go to city they would have to annex. Looking at section 5a half acre lots not down to 6,000 sq ft. , follow larger criteria as city wants as he anticipates it moving forward. Mike and I talk numerous times.

MW explained matter of interpretation.

GGG almost exactly like Olmsted cty, happy marriage between city and twp.

HS, feedback, PAC turned everybody down after comp plan, wants them in city limits. Property nesar turkey farm. Question is why wont cf annex you.

GGG couple reasons, biggest they don't want to force anything on anyone. Not pushing.

MW this property complicated. CF twp and Stanton Twp.

GGG said a lot of benefits, if in city puts turkey farm in hard position. Seems to fit better this way, on Cannon river, has soils for system.

MW said it would be subject to platting.

BO asked how many acres.

GGG said 160.

BO asked is 35 acres critical issue.

GGG says he doesn't think anything needs to change, he reads language differently. His intent to put in system as is. Both sides supporting. Wants clarification on sec 5 subdiv 1, para a,b. on how many acres if not 35.

MW explained para a,b what does centralized mean.

GGG continued his interpretation.

MW said in recent years have not been proposal in A-3 zone, we did Frontenac Heritage acres in R-1.

GGG needs direction on how many acres as written. Thinks 20,000 sq ft.

JV asked why not a re-zone.

GGG looks at it differently, a lot of times R-1 would stay R-1 forever, whereas in A-3 have big parcels or agreement with city.

MW for PAC to consider, how to administer. Concern of staff, what if someone else comes in and doesn't want 35 acres, and only wants 2-3 homes. Could they do it too.

BO asked if he could re-zone to R-1.

MW said yes, he could. Also feedlot setbacks language hold-over that sets standards as stricter setback.

GGG, said 1/2 mile if over 300 animal units, if go to R-1 no houses on it.

MW PAC may want to talk another day.

GGG thinks A-3 right zone, work with all parties, here for clarification of acreage or size.

MW explained wastewater treatment permit, staff unclear so far, trying to sort out.

GGG said he is taking the high ground with 20,000 sq ft.

LO asked if group well.

GGG group well.

DR asked who maintains central sewage.

GGG I would then association until defined all sold usually. 20 landowners responsible.

DR what if it fails later.

GGG they are responsible. Used to working with Olmsted county, no bad borings here. Fabulous soil structure, sandy loams. The landowners responsible.

HS sees another issue. This is public or centralized is not yet defined. Is PAC comfortable with this identification. Florence example a nightmare. Be clear on what type of centralized system we would approve, as what we qualify.

GGG, loose things in your Ordinance. No talk of acres, no talk of systems. 2 people doesn't help city yrs later, but sewer mains done to city standards is a different thing.

BO asked if something like this takes place, whose ordinance takes over.

MW comments development would have to conform with Stanton zoning requirements, County standards, system subject to wastewater approval from County. If fails, city gets involved as enforcement.

BO asked about tree plantings.

GGG, different from Frontenac. Association land separate from lots.

MW not here to answer tonight, what does ord allow for this.

GGG what do you want for acreage.

JV said GGG stretching language. Not intent to permit a bunch of suburbs right next to cities, taking that as easy for the city to take over, not quite accurate. Intent is to preserve from development, so when city wants it it can. Thinks that means municipal.

HS tend to agree with JV. He sees the word public, centralized, if city or twp run convinced, but private doesn't make it centralized, stretching, a lot to convince him.

LO said CF not rolling in here quick. Reads it as GGG because OR in language.

GGG re-stated read.

DR said it doesn't say who oversees, maintains, by default system held to standard as equal to public system. Something needs to be done with that language.

BO asked about county private sewage standards.

MW explained.

BO asked what about this.

MW re-stated Frontenac Heriatge Acres, Welch.

BO us or state oversifht.

MW said depends on volume of flow.

GGG answered if under 10,000 galons a day then county, more stringent, which he exdpects.

LO asked isn't this similar ot what we did with campgrounds.

MW said correct.

MW said we aired on conservative side, wastewater permit at county. Asking PAC if correct interpretation.

JV said what is purpose of A-3.

GGG said the city has one or 2 miles has right to influence if they want.

MW said our view is different, if twp do not use planning and zoning, so we have obligation to inform them.

BO brings up another thought that 1,080 open lots already in the cities. Lesser tax using city things, another opnion later.

GGG reminded cooperation in his issue.

MW explained scope of issue, not handling now, explained Olmsted county situations.

BO asked MW if all parties agree, could it be done now, or do we change something.

MW said that's what we have to sort out here. We took conservative tact here, prior to a plat review.

HS said that becomes key, still would need a plat.

GGG needs lot size info.

HS said we need public hearing, need more information.

GGG who interprets ord, who do I go to.

MW said staff felt appropriate, but would PAC like to schedule for subsequent meeting. Staff wants PAC input to weigh in on this.

BO at last meeting 2 BOA members spoke, talk about reducing lot sizes, will we talk tonight. We need to move along.

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
December 13, 2010 MEETING MINUTES

MW said sidetracked on this issue, it came to us. Language subject to interpretation asking pAC to weigh in.

HS not comfortable with a number, weaknesses in ord, in process of discussion, brings to a head. May not come up with a number, or case by case. If lot block we don't want 1 acre lots, maybe range in ord.

GGG range is good.

MW chicken before the egg issue. If plat after sewage permit. Want would range be, opportunity for amore creative approach.

BO confusing, could staff write up to clarify this.

MW part of this a policy matter. Negotiations with municipalities better than 2-3 lots on combined system. Up to PAC and County Board. Not a hodge podge.

GGG said he has application in front of county, so what.

MW clarified staff said cant do this, but language could be interpreted differently.

JV wants explanation of A-3, waiting to hear explanation.

MW explained language from Olmsted interpreted differently, hard for staff, nothing like this in recent years. Trying ot sort it out.

HS, said on here along time, intention with vague language to give PAC power and flexibility.

MW said GGG could appeal to BOA if staff denies him the permit. He could also submit a sub-div plan for PAC. Up to PAC.

HS also wants formal in writing annex from CF.

GGG, yes, formal and NO.

LO if we got this far, his interpretation, this private, see Stanton and CF reps here first.

GGG, thanks for your time.

HS stated intent of A-3 discussion.

MW explained packet again... Rice and Wabasha County.

BO asked why should we hinder if twps like it.

DR want to make sure its formal, nothing different from them, on same page.

BO but if we feel on the same page don't go against it.

DR agreed.

MW thinks comfort level is for all proposals later too.

HS said move on to recommendations from staff report on A-3, what PAC member feedback.

MW explained alternative A. Plus, how handle other CUP's. 35 acres or deed restrictions down to 2 acres.

BO asked if different than the last situation.

MW yes, but if they have 35 acres they can build a home, but can they develop on a smaller lot size.

TW said Bauer asked him to float his idea, food for thought, to consider taking A-3 away and going with A-1, A-2 with those numbers again.

BO said he called him about that also.

MW said it would limit availability but may have smaller homesites on 2 acres but still one per ¼ ¼ if A-2 as limiting factors.

JV question for MW how do either proposal solve splitting question to separate farmstead from farmland.

MW if 2 acre min and ¼ ¼ then someone could split if meeting setbacks from structures on less than 35 then. Not going to help all. Maybe if businesses allowed as CUP's on less than 35 acres.

HS cant figure out why not feedlots in A-3, before offset program, wondering to look at comparison to A-2.

MW said staff could analyze that.

TW said Bauers take was feedlot issue could be dealt with. Lifestock market in Zumbrota hamstrung, issue is a problem. His take was there could be some flexibility that does not exist now.

MW as mentioned staff has determined 17 property owners at one per ¼ ¼ may lose bldg opportunity.

HS what about parcel of record.

MW said challenges with that, understand that.

HS 17 is different scope.

BO if we make A-3 to A-3...wind, mining, look at issues.

DR how many A-2 sections. Intreging to collapse A-3 into A-2 together, maybe more freedoms, address setbacks for issues. Some elements of A-3, some specific restrictions, or ag facility could expand with conditions. A challenge.

MW 35 acres frustaters people currently.

DR mentioned case of max A-2, shed house but no house available. Come up with some conditions, if it makes sense you can do that. Maybe more general freedoms.

BO mentioned 58 sections years ago from A-1 to A-2, they said no in past. What response in public hearing.

LO said he doesn't understand that.

DR said another example in A-1, fell back to tax forfeiture, if there is a way, put a little common sense in.

MW we need tax base. Policy wants that in cities, but we do need more.

HS said 2 steps, who is affected, ask cities and twps too. Then Public hearing not difficult.

BO said Kenyon twp said more tax base.

HS said not all twps have A-3, so it may line them up.

MW said some twp's don't recognize the counties A-3.

DR said look at A-2 vs A-3, big things, way to combine.

MW sure. We can confirm what would be affected.

HS said we could easily handle wind mills and Mines if write standards.

DR said it may specifically more a line standards.

MW said will do side by side comparison.

BO added CUP language combination.

HS go home and think about subdiv one, like tonight-GGG, is this important. We will have to hash out.

BO asked if next step A-2 vs A-3.

MW yes, new report.

DR take out admin functions. Hold off rest for twps and cities.

MW said if you decide to move forward, we could do a info meeting prior to public hearing.

Adjourn:

⁴Moved by BO, seconded by LO, to adjourn the December 13, 2010 Planning Advisory Commission meeting at 21:48 p.m. Motion carried 7 -0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Draft

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
GOODHUE COUNTY, MN
December 13, 2010 MEETING MINUTES**

Kelly Moriarty
Recording Secretary

MOTIONS

¹ APPROVE the December 13, 2010 agenda. Motion carried 7-0.

² APPROVE the November 15, 2010 minutes. Motion carried 7-0.

³ APPROVE the Neal A. Stenlund Conditional Use Permit request. Motion carried 7-0.

⁴ ADJOURN the December 13, 2010 Planning Advisory Commission meeting at 21:48 p.m. Motion carried 7-0.