

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: June 30, 2022

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met June 30, 2022, in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Commission members in attendance: Dan Mol, Ken Felger, Dan Bravinder, Sandy Greninger, Pat Mahlberg, Mark Daleiden, and Jan Thompson. Barry Rhineberger, Planning & Zoning Administrator; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present.

ACTION ON JUNE 9, 2022, MINUTES

On a motion by Bravinder seconded by Greninger, all voted to approve the minutes for the June 9, 2022, meeting as printed.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Rhineberger addressed the Commission and public stating the applicant for agenda item number five (5), PLAZA RINA LLC, has requested a continuation. Therefore, tonight's meeting will not be open for public comment. The Commission will decide if the item will be continued to the August 11th meeting, as requested.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. KAYLA BARTHEL - New

LOCATION: XXXX CR 3 & 37 NW - Approx. 1.5 acres being described as Part of SE ¼ of SW ¼, Section 15, Township 120, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (French Lake Twp.) Tax #209-000-153410 Property Owners: Db Properties MN LLC

Petitions for a conditional use permit for a specific use for a new structure in the B2 zoning district to house an office space for a contracting company, storage space for a contracting company, and a third portion of the building where the use is yet to be determined as regulated in Section 155.27, 155.029, 155.054(B) Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Kayla Barthel

- A. Rhineberger displayed the proposed site plan and proposed building plans. The site is located on the corner of County Road 3 and 37, in French Lake Township. The property was recently rezoned to B-2 General Business and is in the Land Use Plan as Commercial, as is most of the surrounding land. The Board of Adjustment approved a building setback variance for the 7,200 sq. ft. building, at no closer than 75ft. from either County Highway. As part of the approval, the BOA did require a stormwater management plan to address run-off and water concerns related to the amount of impervious surface that will be on the property. The 7,200 sq. ft. building will house 3 business spaces. The first 2 spaces will be used by the applicant for their concrete business. The applicant will be using one of those spaces for an office and the other, for the time being, will be used for cold storage. The 3rd area of the building is planned to house a liquor store, that will be a request brought to the Commission at a later date. The Township did approve of the request.
- B. Barthel – no additional comment.
- C. Mol opened the hearing to the public, no public stepped forward.

- D. Felger questioned if the parking will be adequate for the 3 entities. Barthel – the north side will be a parking lot, roughly 30'. The County Highway Department indicated once, on site an access permit can be granted onto County Road 37. Felger – will the number of spaces be adequate? Barthel – 14 space in front and about 6-8 to the west.
- E. Mol – how much traffic will be coming and going with the business, how many employees and what will traffic look like coming and going? Barthel – there are 4 office employees and customers do not visit the office. Only the employees will be coming and going. Mol – feels with 4 employees taking up parking spots there will be ample parking for the future.
- F. Mahlberg moved to approve a conditional use permit in accord with the plans held on file to allow construction of a 60 x 120 commercial building with 3 separate portions for different uses. The Commission also approves the request for a concrete business and storage for the concrete business in two of the designated areas within the building, with the following conditions: 1) the main access to the property must be approved and in accord with specification listed by the Wright County Highway Department; 2) Signage is in accord with the Wright County Sign Regulations; 3) lighting must be such that it not be directly pointed toward neighboring residential structures, 4) use of the third portion of the building will require a new conditional use permit for such use; and 5) conditions noted in variance remain in full effect. Seconded by Thompson.

DISCUSSION: Rhineberger addressed comment from member Felger related to parking. If the Commission desires a condition can be added that parking and the number of spaces are allowed as regulated by 155.081 of Wright County Code of Ordinances. Mahlberg – is it not already required to follow those regulations? Rhineberger – confirmed. Mahlberg stated he does not want to amend his motion.

VOTE: CARRIED

ABSTAINED: Daleiden

Commission member Mark Daleiden arrived during the discussion of item one (1), therefore abstained from voting.

2. **K-BUILT PROPERTIES LLC** - New

LOCATION: 14932 State Highway 55 NW – part of the SW 1/4 of the SW 1/4 North of the Northerly right-of- way of State Hwy. 55 of Section 15 Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Southside Twp.) Tax # 217-000-153303 Owner: K-Built Properties LLC.

Request a conditional use permit for an office and yard for a construction and roll-off dumpster company, K-Built Construction LLC. Future plans include a new 64x120 post frame building. Existing 1,768 sq. ft. building at the front of the property will be used as an office. Proposed hours of operation will be Monday - Friday 6:30 am - 6:00 pm. There are 8-10 employees. North of the future 64x120 building will be an area, approximately 40x90, for outside parking of equipment, trailers and dumpsters as regulated in Section 155.27, 155.029, 155.053(B) Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Adam Kuebelbeck and Jacob Konz, with K-Built Properties LLC.

- A. Rhineberger displayed the aerial photo of the property, as well as the proposed site plan. The property is a 1.55 acre parcel located on MN Highway 55, zoned B-1 Highway Business and had been operating as a used auto sales lot through a Conditional Use Permit since 2004. This request is for the operation of a construction and roll-off dumpster company to have an office in the existing building near the road, and storage of contracting equipment and outside storage of roll-off dumpsters behind the building. The site plan was reviewed. The proposal includes a new 64 x 120 storage building to be used for equipment. The business plan indicates 8-10 employees, with the proposed operating hours of 6:30 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday. The Township did approve. No other public comment was received.
- B. J. Konz – future plan is to remodel the existing building, near Highway 55, into office space. As stated, when the site plan was reviewed, the plan is to remove the smaller buildings and build a new building that will be used to store construction equipment out of the elements. Looking at the site plan, there is a parking area to the north, where the plan is to park roll-off dumpsters. Currently they have 30 dumpsters but would hope for room for expansion. Questioned the Commission if they have a number in mind. Mol – asked the applicant what number would be comfortable for them and their operation. Konz – not more than 50 or 60, at the most. Any more than that would get crowded. Rhineberger – those are primarily empty. Konz – confirmed they are empty and typically there is not nearly that many on site, 60 is worst case scenario.
- C. Mol opened the hearing to the public, no public stepped forward.
- D. Mahlberg – how many roll-offs are in the fleet? Konz – currently, 45. Mahlberg – the roll-off business is taking a dumpster from one site to another. Konz – most of the time they do not come back to the yard and sit, they go from site to site. Recently, most at one time was 18 and that was because 12 new were just purchased and they were gone within a week.
- E. Thompson questioned if there are plans for landscaping around the building for beautifying or making the dumpsters less visible. Konz – have discussed the option of planting trees as a barrier. Not opposed to vegetative screening. Kuebelbeck – with the new building going up next year the dumpsters wouldn't be visible as they will be stored behind that building. Konz – to the north is all agriculture field. There will also be some landscaping done around the building near the road.

Thompson stated that would be nice to see done and likes that a new approach is being taken with the property.

- F. Rhineberger – addressing the Commission, stated that in the staff report a few items of the proposed motion were intentionally left open for the Commission to address. The Commission will need to determine the allowed times of operation as well as the number of allowed roll-off/dumpsters will need to be added into the motion.
- G. Daleiden – what are the normal hours of operation? Konz – 6:00 am is for the construction workers. The roll-offs tend to leave between 6:30 and 7:00 am. Understand there is residential area to the west and do not want to make a lot of noise in the yard super early. Daleiden questioned if there are Saturday hours? Konz – if anyone is there on Saturdays it would be one of them, as the owners, doing yard work or working in the shop.
- H. Mahlberg – the proposed plan indicates a 90 x 140 rectangle area in the back of the property, there is no way 50 roll-offs will fit there. Would like to make sure the motion make sense with what is needed and what will work. Konz – when the plan was drawn, they had not been aware there would be a stipulation on the number of allowed roll-offs. The north area of the property will be the ideal area for roll-off storage. Mahlberg stated that description and discussion was helpful.
- I. Thompson questioned if there is anyone else, besides herself, that is thinking of having a statement regarding landscaping included in the motion. Personally, would appreciate a written statement that the applicant is willing to do landscaping on the property and will park the dumpsters behind the buildings. Mahlberg – asked what is meant by landscaping. Thompson – trying to get an idea from other members what might be acceptable. Feels that when a site has a lot of construction material and dumpsters, that are highly visible, they should be screened. Konz addressed the aerial photo and explained the layout. Kuebelbeck – the two existing buildings and the new building will provide screening. Konz – the type of equipment is no different than the property to the east and far less than the pontoon and boat storage. Mahlberg – screening makes some sense with the residence to the west being that close. Looking at the aerial the properties appear to be sharing a driveway with no real break between the 2 properties. Would not be in favor of installing screening to hind the boats from the dumpsters. Thompson – solar farms do require a distance away. In her opinion they are less obvious than the situation being discussed with dumpsters coming and going. The business to the east has been around for a while and obviously does not have a condition for landscaping, which is unfortunate. Mahlberg – feels this is more of an industrial area than where solar farms tend to be located. Agrees, that it would be nice for the residence to the west to have screening from next door industrial uses. Not sure about comfort with requiring screening. Thompson believes any business that fronts a highway should contribute to the wellbeing of the neighbors that are diving by.
- J. Daleiden – there appears to be a shared driveway, as well as access off of Highway 55, are there plans to eliminate the shared driveway? Konz – there is an easement that was required at closing. There are no intentions of closing that shared driveway access. Daleiden – there is a give and take with the neighbors to the west. Konz – confirmed.

- K. Felger – narrative did not include Saturdays. A motion will be created with specific days and times, so if they are not adequate now is the time to discuss and possibly add Saturday hours. Konz – it would be a good idea to add an occasional Saturday. Mol – suggested a timeframe, such as 8:00 am - noon. If there are trucks coming and going now and again without those Saturday hours an issue could be created. Rhineberger – an occasional Saturday is difficult to enforce. Bravinder – questioned the hours for the business to the east. Stated he would have no problem with granting the same hours on Saturday as the marina operation that is to the east. Mahlberg – what time is the marina open Saturday? Is not a fan of a 6:00 am start time for Saturday but would be okay with 8:00 am for Saturday start time. Kryzer – J & J Marine hours are 8:00 am – 1:00 pm on Saturdays.
- L. Bravinder motioned to approve a change of use of the existing building to a contractor's office, the operation of a contracting business on the property with exterior storage as noted on the plans provided, including the on-site storage of roll-off containers, and new 64 x 120 building storage, based on the plans submitted and testimony given by the applicant at the hearing, with the following conditions: 1) hours of operation are limited to 6:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday and 8:00 am to 1:00 pm Saturdays; 2) only empty roll-off/dumpsters may be stored on site and are limited to a maximum of 50; 3) lighting must be such that it is not directly pointed toward neighboring residential structures; and 4) signage must be permitted and in accord with the Chapter 155.097 of the Wright County Code of Ordinances. Seconded by Daleiden.

DISCUSSION: Thompson stated she still thinks that based on the progression of the development of Annandale and Kimball that any new industrial park like this should have reference to screening to protect the houses that will be built in the area. Would like to make it clear that she will not vote to approve the current motion because nothing is included regarding screening. Felger – questioned if member Thompson would like to amend the motion.

Thompson moved to amend the motion to include a condition that screening be included along the property to enhance the desirability of the homes that will be built in the future.

Thompson – this is part of a CUP that will go on and on so in 2 years when houses are developed around the area, or the applicant has moved on the screening will be present. It seems to be something that as a future thinker, for the community, she would like to see all areas along highways be required to landscape and screen for upcoming buildings for the future.

Felger seconded the amendment to the motion that member Thompson presented.

Daleiden – in reviewing the aerial questioned where member Thompson envisioned homes would be built. Thompson – if others are not sure where homes might be built would suggest a site visit. Discussion continued around the aerial photo and potential areas of where homes would possibly be built and how neighboring cities will expand. Thompson is asking the Commission to require screening for future residences that could be built in the area. Felger – agree that screening should be installed at the back of the lot. Feels that a site visit is not needed, and discussion can occur with specifics ironed out at this meeting. A line of pine trees, behind the existing building, but southwest of the proposed building and parking area. A line of trees in this area would hide what is happening in the back area of the property. With aerial photo displayed further discussion was had as to where a line of screening pine trees should go.

Mol – understands what both members are asking for, but without a plan written on paper where trees will go and no plan to discuss for the exact required location it could be interpreted differently. Feels it would not be fair to the Commission or applicant to require screening without a written plan. Felger – trying to keep the request fair and expedient, does not feel a site visit is necessary and does not feel that the request needs to be delayed another month for a landscape plan. The applicant is willing to install a line of trees, simply suggested installation of trees in a line near the propane tank. Would like some assurance that some screening will go up in the general area of the existing propane tank.

Greninger questioned if the concern was not future development to the north, in the field. If the line of trees is going near the existing propane tank that is not screening the field to the north. Felger – when will the development be? Greninger – the concern mentioned related to screening for future homes and growth in that area. Felger – talking about right now with screening from the highway.

Bravinder – addressing the growth scenario. Personally, lives in Cokato, which a progressive town for the area, and they have not had more than 3% growth in the last 10 years. Does not see the area being discussed to have major growth.

Daleiden called for the motion.

Mol – called for a vote on the motion to amend the original motion to include required screening.

VOTE: IN FAVOR: Felger & Thompson; NAY: Mahlberg, Mol, Bravinder, Daleiden, Greninger
MOTION FAILED

Mol – called for additional discussion on the original motion, as presented by member Bravinder. Noting no additional discussion called for a vote.

VOTE: IN FAVOR: Mahlberg, Mol, Bravinder, Daleiden, Greninger, Felger; NAY: Thompson
MOTION PASSED

3. **MAC MALECHA** - New

LOCATION: 1616 40TH Street SE – part of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter and the North Half of the Southeast Quarter of Section 20 Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Rockford Twp.) Tax # 215-100-204305 Owner: Mindy J. Brummer Trust

Petitions amendment to the existing mining permit to include the crushing and recycling of asphalt and concrete materials. Asphalt and concrete rubble would be stockpiled throughout the mining season and would be crushed once yearly for a period of 3-4 weeks in accordance with normal operating hours. Also requesting a warmup period to start equipment at 6:30am.as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.048(D), 155.057 & 155.100 Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances, and the Rockford Township Code of Ordinances.

- A. Rhineberger informed the Commission that the applicant has requested a continuation of the item in order to meet with the Township and further discuss the proposal. The original response from the Township was negative as the applicant was not present at the Township meeting. The applicant has signed the appropriate continuation form and wavier of the MN Statue 15.99. Staff would recommend a motion to continue the matter to the July 21, 2022, meeting.
- B. Daleiden moved to continue the hearing to July 21, 2022, at the applicant's request. Felger seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **CRAIG MCADAMS** - New

LOCATION: 693 –90th St. NE – Part of NE ¼ & part of Gov't Lot 2, Section 19, Township 121, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (North Lake– Monticello Twp.)Tax #213-100-191200 Property owners: North Lake Acres LLC.

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a simple platted seven-lot residential subdivision as regulated in Section 155.029, 155.047 & 155.057 Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Crag McAdams with North Lake Acres, Paul Otto with Otto Associates

- A. Rhineberger displayed the preliminary plat as he reviewed the property details. The property is 104 acres; however, the northern portion has been approved for a two entitlement divisions by the Board of Adjustment. The remaining property was rezoned to A/R Agricultural-Residential by the Planning Commission in February. This is the next step of the process with the submission of the plat request, as the proposal includes a new road. Proposal is for standard A/R lots, each meeting requirement of being at least 10 acres with 300 ft. of road frontage. This is not a Planned Unit Development. To get to the area the division requires a new road and includes 2 lake shore lots, that meet minimum requirements for NE lake in A/R zone. The proposed development plan was displayed with road information included. Received Township response and engineer reports, both provided to Commission. SWCD indicated wetland information on the preliminary plat is not consistent with the information they have recently determined. There is some Township questions and would like some further clarification on a few road details.
- B. Otto – meet with Township and their primary concern is access to 90th street on the north. They want to see that on the ground, so it will be staked for their review. When designed the idea was to place where the new road should go to follow the knolls and adjusted lot lines to get the required sizes. When addressing concerns of the Township does not expect the new road to move within the development. Would ask the Commission to consider that the design of the lots can be slightly adjusted if the road needs to move at 90th street and not affect the required standards being met. If the road moves on the north and the variance conditions are not met, they will need to go back to the BOA for approval of the entitlement divisions. The other change the Township asked for is a T-turnaround versus the proposed cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac proposed is actually larger than what would be a T-turnaround. The wetland concern is that the original determination was there was not a wetland but when SWCD did a site visit they determined there is indeed a wetland. The wetlands do not affect the road or anything with the lots that cannot be worked around.
- C. Bravinder questioned if wetland #2 listed on the proposal will affect the access onto properties to the west. Otto – that wetland has a 1,000 sq. ft. de minimis. Designed a shared driveway over the wetland that is 860 sq. ft. so the de minimis can be met to get to the back of Lot 2 and 3. McAdams – the preliminary research showed high ground and the field visit by SWCD indicated wetland, so that wetland line changed. Advised to apply for the de minimums of 1,000 sq. ft., or less, with that application currently being reviewed.
- D. Kryzer – indicated the Township wants a T-turnaround. Does that T-turnaround fit into the proposed cul-de-sac if platted as the right-of-way? The plat can show the cul-de-sac, but a T-turnaround is built

then at a later date, if it is decided a cul-de-sac is a better option, then right-of-way is already there for the conversion. Otto – did not discuss the right-of-way issue at the Township level. Kryzer – can the turnaround be in the design drawing as a cul-de-sac, to address the right-of-way, but a T-turnaround built within that circle? Otto – probably, the T-turnaround that the Township is proposing is smaller than what he was expecting to see. Rhineberger – the proposed T-turnaround is roughly 71 ft. all the way across. Otto – proposed cul-de-sac is 132 ft. at the full width. If needed could go with a larger circle. Rhineberger – would suggest designing the cul-de-sac to meet the required T-turnaround specifications. Just because there is a platted cul-de-sac does not mean that is what needs to be built. As long as the hammer head (T-turnaround) is built to the Townships requirement within that circle it would not be a problem. Otto – no problem with that concept as there is plenty of room. McAdams – planned as cul-de-sac but if a hammer head can fit into the area he is not opposed to the idea.

- E. Mahlberg – asked why a hammer head or T-turnaround is preferred over the cul-de-sac. Questioned if this is a case where this particular road engineer prefers hammer heads or is this standard practice for the Township and County. Otto – experience is the preference is related to who is maintaining the road. The Township indicated it would be easier to come in straight and turn around. This decision was driven by the Township, related to preference in plowing, not the engineer. Bravinder continued to explain the process of plowing related to the hammer head versus cul-de-sac.
- F. Jordan Cox – neighbor to the west, asked to see where the new road coming onto 90th street will be located. Otto and McAdams used the proposed plan and aerial to explain the location of the road. Cox was satisfied with the explanation.
- G. Daleiden – concerned with the comments from SWCD. Would like to see approval before moving forward with the request. The proposal could be changed, especially with the hammer head conversation included.
- H. Rhineberger questioned Mr. Otto if house location on Lot 2 will have to change because of the delineation. Otto – no, that is the reason for the de minimus request, which is pending approval. Consultant indicated the approval should go through, which will allow the house location to remain as proposed. Rhineberger – proposed Lot 3 house location is by the road but there is high ground to the west, even with the current plan a person may want to move the home farther off the road. Even with current delineation a concern is that when purchased the driveway is installed across a wetland before staff is even aware of what is happening. Questioned if the de minimus includes a potential location for Lot 3 to have a house site on the other side of the wetland. Otto – intent is for Lot 2 and 3 to have a shared 20 ft. wide driveway. The thought is giving Lot 3 the option to build near the road or the back of the lot and the shared driveway with the de minimus will allow for this.
- I. Thompson asked Mr. Otto to explain how the driveway will be built across the wetland. Otto – with the driveway for Lots 2 and 3 they choose the lot line based on the narrowest area of wetland so that it can be crossed while staying under the de minimus. Thompson – curious as to how a driveway can be built across a wetland. McAdams – when the consultant did a site visit this location was flagged as not wetland. When SWCD did a site visit they indicated the area was actually a very narrow strip of wetland. The de minimus application is in the process of being reviewed. Otto –

roads are frequently built across wetlands but with a driveway it must stay under the allowed de minimums. Roads and driveways have different requirements when it comes to wetlands.

- J. Felger questioned if Lot 2 and Lot 3 could each have their own driveway, cross their individual wetland area, and meet the de minimums. Otto – no. Possibly could if they each apply for their own de minimums. The application submitted is for the entire property as a whole, for a single de minimums. Both lots could possibly apply independently for their own de minimums. Thought was applying for the de minimums at time of platting was the better route and the crossing over the wetland will be built when the road is built. Felger – there will be separate driveways that converge over the wetland and then separate to their own building sites, with proper easements. Otto – correct. During development stage the only area of the driveway that will be built is over the wetland. Felger – house sites are shown as 60 x 60 pads on the proposal, not sure how hung up the Commission should get on the house sites. Correct if wrong, but as a property owner the right to build anywhere on the lot is possible. Rhineberger – that depends on what the Commission decides. In the past there have been times the Planning Commission is very specific that a house location must remain where indicated on the proposed plan. If the owner would like to build in an area other than the approved plan location, they must go back to the Planning Commission for approval. Otto – the house location of Lot 3 could be moved, and this situation completely avoided. The Commission has put stipulations on where houses sit but that is typically with Planned Unit Developments with smaller lots and more restrictions. If the new road was not needed there would be no need to be before the Commission asking for approval for these lots.
- K. Daleiden questioned when an applicant applies for the house permit can there be a requirement that before being issued all of the proper documents must be provided. Rhineberger – that is a common condition and occurrence. Otto – would be comfortable with that type of condition. Believes that if SWCD approves or denies the wetland crossing, staff will be able to figure out if lot dimensions are met and address any other issues. Confident the items that need to be addressed by SWCD and the Township can be worked through with Staff.
- L. Mol – Township did approve with a few conditions.
- M. Felger moved to continue to the July 21, 2022, meeting to allow time for staff to draft a motion consistent with what was discussed. Motion seconded by Thompson.

DISCUSSION: Rhineberger – if the Commission is choosing to delay a motion for approval, does the Planning Commission want to see any updates to the proposed plan? This way any conditions can be reflected on the plan itself. Felger – would agree. Discussion of the hammer head could be addressed before the next meeting and included in the plans as well as addressing the wetlands. Otto – doubt there would be approval by that date for the wetland crossing. Felger questioned what would be the harm if that wetland approval is not received. Otto – more soil borings would need to be completed and the house site would be moved closer to the road. Felger – feels the proposal is reasonable.

Otto addressed the Commission to be clear on what is being asked to be provide at the next meeting. The cul-de-sac will be figured out with the hammer head and road right-of-way. Update plans with the road changes the Township Engineer has requested as well as update the wetlands, drainage, and utility easements. Provide the proposed wetland crossing that was submitted to SWCD.

Mahlberg – reflecting the hammer head as part of the drawings is fine but thought the direction of discussion was there would be enough right-of-way for a cul-de-sac in the future, if wanted. Otto – the cul-de-sac size can be addressed to meet the hammer head requirements. Felger – if the hammer head and cul-de-sac area are adjusted will Lot 5 be affected with a change in acreage if? Otto – there is room there for adjustments and the lot line might not even change.

Bravinder – concerned with the hammer head being installed and property owners installing vegetation and fences in the actual right-of-way. Mahlberg – people disrespect the public right-of-way all the time. Thinking the dedicated right-of-way in this situation will be very small and do not believe that a person will be planting their prized oak tree in this small area of the right-of-way.

VOTE: IN FAVOR: Mahlberg, Thompson, Bravinder, Greninger, Felger; NAY: Daleiden, Mol
MOTION PASSED

5. **PLAZA RINA LLC** - New

LOCATION: 9859 Clementa Ave NW – Part of the E 1/2 of NE 1/4 of Section 15 Township 121, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Silver Creek Twp.) Tax # 216-000-151400

Commission to review the existing Conditional Use Permit for a riding academy as regulated in Section 155.027, 155.029 & 155.048 Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances Subdivision Regulations.

- A. Rhineberger – this item was brought up by staff and Commission regarding the revocation process with the property owner being notified of this hearing date. The property owner's counsel has been in contact with staff and Mr. Kryzer and have requested continuation to the August 11th meeting. The property owner and their counsel have set up a meeting with Staff to discuss amending the existing conditional use permit to make some of what they desire to do on the site legal. Therefore, proposing the revocation hearing be continued to the August 11th meeting with the probable outcome being an amendment request application is brought forward. At the August 11th meeting, there could be two items heard related to this property, one being the revocation and the other a potential amendment to the current CUP.
- B. Daleiden motioned to continue the matter to August 11, 2022, at the property owner's request, noting the property owner has agreed to hold no further events until the situation has been addressed. Seconded by Mahlberg.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Rhineberger
Planning & Zoning Administrator

BR:sd

cc: Planning Commission
Applicants/Property Owners
Twp. Clerks