

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: February 13, 2025

Minutes

The Wright County Planning Commission met on Thursday, February 13, 2025, in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, Dan Mol, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with members present: Dan Mol, Pat Mahlberg, Sandy Greninger, Larry Smith, Jeanne Holland and Dan Bravinder. Ken Felger was absent. Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was the legal counsel present. Barry Rhineberger, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning office.

ACTION ON JANUARY 10, 2025, MINUTES

On a motion by Greninger, seconded the Holland, all voted to adopt the minutes for the January 10th, 2025, meeting as printed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. FRITZ COMPANIES – Cont. from 01/10

LOCATION: xxxx 30th St SE – Portions of the East 1/2 of the NW Quarter and the West 1/2 of the NE Quarter in Section 21, Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (Unnamed Lake - Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-100-211103. Property Owner: Cynthia Van Lith, Curtis Van Lith, Lori Thingvold.

Petitions for an Interim Use Permit for temporary mining (1-2 years) to extract the remaining aggregates that were left by the previous mining operation, and continue reclamation as regulated in Section 155.031, 155.048(D) & 155.100 of Chapter 155, of Title XV Land Usage of Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: John Fritz

- A. Rhineberger displayed the proposed site area and reviewed the request. This item was continued from the last meeting to allow time to meet with the Township, which has been completed. The request is for an Interim Use Permit (IUP) for a 1-2 year permit to extract the remaining aggregate left over from a previous operation. This is a 180-acre parcel, with 30 acres previously mined. The applicant has an active permit to bring in additional fill to complete the reclamation left from the previous operation. During this work, the contractor realized that additional aggregate material was yet to be mined. This request is for a 1-2 year temporary mining operation to remove the last of the aggregate materials and complete the final reclamation of the property. The Township approved the request at their latest meeting, and no further responses were received.
- B. Fritz stated that the Township required a \$10,000 cash bond, which he will provide as they continue to restore the property. Their main business is restoration.
- C. No comment from the public.
- D. Bravinder questioned the Township bond and how it would be handled, as he was under the impression that the bond would be something the County handles, not the Township. In Cokato Township, they had a solar farm bond that was handled by the County. Kryzer explained that solar farms are handled through a developer's agreement, while gravel pits are required, by ordinance, to provide \$5,000 per acre. Bravinder asked if the \$10,000 bond would be in addition to the \$5,000 per acre. Rhineberger clarified that this is under discussion at the meeting. Bond amounts have been adjusted previously, but in this case, he feels that the Township is requesting their own \$10,000 bond for road maintenance, not part of the reclamation. Bravinder pointed out that the Township minutes indicate a bond for both reclamation and road maintenance. Kryzer agreed, noting that they are asking for a separate \$10,000 bond for road

maintenance and cleanup. A condition could be added requiring a bond to be filed with the Township, pursuant to their requirements, prior to the commencement of any operations.

- E. Mahlberg questioned if the reclamation bond could be adjusted. Kryzer felt that the reclamation and road maintenance bonds are two separate issues and recommended against adjustments.
- F. Rhineberger mentioned that the staff report includes a proposed motion with a condition related to a financial guarantee of an unspecified amount. The ordinance specifies \$5,000 per permitted acre. The original permit was for 30 acres, but the area being worked on with this request is not 30 acres. Fritz believes the area would be closer to 10 acres.
- G. Bravinder asked if the Township had mentioned a haul route. Fritz responded that the route would avoid the new road and divert trucks to a County Road. The roads in question are 10-ton roads, and he does his best to properly direct the trucks.
- H. Rhineberger stated that the area in question is more like 8 acres, so if calculated off of 10 acres, the area will be well covered. Mol asked if there was already a permit for reclamation. Rhineberger confirmed that there is. Mol further questioned if more than 8-10 acres worth of bond is necessary. Rhineberger does not believe more is required and would be comfortable with the 8-10 acres, as this better reflects the work being done.
- I. Bravinder moved to approve an Interim Use Permit for 2 years to remove additional aggregate material from the site according to the mining plan submitted by the applicant with the following conditions: 1) Final reclamation must comply with the reclamation plan submitted by NorthStar Surveying from February 14, 2020; 2) A financial guarantee in the amount of \$40,000 must be put in place to guarantee reclamation, and a copy of the guarantee document must be submitted to the County for review; 3) All mining and final reclamation must be completed by February 13, 2026; 4) All requirements of the Township to be met with Township review in one year; 5) a \$10,000 cash bond must be submitted and held by Rockford Township prior to work commencing. Seconded by Greninger.

DISCUSSION: Mahlberg questioned the hours of operation, as the application states Monday through Friday from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, with possible Saturdays. The Township has requested hours of Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 7:00 pm. Fritz stated that he does not need to work on Saturdays..

Bravinder amended his motion to include condition 6) Operating hours to be Monday through Friday 7:00 am to 7:00 pm. Seconded by Greninger.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **JACOB KOLASA** – New

LOCATION: 4375 STATE HIGHWAY 55 SE - PRT OF NE1/4 OF SW1/4 in Section 14, Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-100-144200 Property Owners: DEZIEL PROPERTIES LLC

Petitions for an Interim Use Permit to allow a business that fabricates aerial lifts and cranes with outdoor storage space, as regulated in Sections 155.031 & 155.055, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Jacob Kolasa

- A. Rhineberger displayed the proposed site plan and reviewed the request's details. The property has had a number of hearings over the years related to various businesses. This request is for an Interim Use Permit (IUP) to allow a business that fabricates aerial lifts and cranes with an outdoor storage area. The property is zoned General Industry (I-1), and the proposed use is allowed. The business is proposing the construction of a roughly 90' by 120' building. The septic system is currently in that area. Due to weather conditions, septic compliance is waived with the requirement that an escrow account is set up until the system can be certified, which is a standard procedure, and there is an escrow account. A narrative was provided in the staff report that discusses the number of employees and operation details. Outdoor storage is noted on the site plan. Wright County SWCD had provided a report on the property's wetlands and commented that tree screening needs to be maintained and remain. Rockford Township has approved the request. No other responses have been received.
- B. No comment from the applicant or the public.
- C. Mol questioned if there would be lights and where they would be directed. Kolasa stated that the plan is only for lights on the exterior of the buildings and maybe 1 or 2 yard lights, with all lights being directed down and not up or out. Mol asked what would be in the outdoor storage area. Kolasa stated that the area will be used for staging and, at most, maybe 1/3 of what is shown as outdoor storage. Mol - does not sound like a large lot of stuff, with Kolasa confirming.
- D. Greninger moved to approve an interim use permit for aerial lifts and cranes fabricating business with outdoor storage space in accordance with the narrative and site plan on file with the following conditions: 1) Continuous vegetative screening must remain in place, in accord with the plans on file; 2) Signage on site must be in accordance with the County sign regulations; 3) Wetlands must not be disturbed, altered, or filled unless proper approval has been received by the Wright County SWCD; 4) Proper building permits have been issued and all inspections performed; 5) Required septic system certification be performed by June 1, 2025, in accord with the approved escrow agreement; 6) This permit shall immediately and automatically expire upon transfer, except for the initial transfer to the applicant or applicant's business, termination of any lease agreement, or change in business operations or ownership. Motion seconded by Holland.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **KAYLA BARTHEL** – New

LOCATION: 14555 County Road 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 an Interim Use Permit to allow office space for a home general contracting business within a middle suite of an existing commercial building, as regulated in Sections 155.031 & 155.054, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Kayla Barthel

- A. Rhineberger displayed site details and reviewed the plan. The property is located in French Lake Township and has appeared before this Commission several times in recent years. It was rezoned to General Business (B-2) in April of 2022, and a commercial building permit was approved for a structure with three separate sections for different commercial uses. A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a concrete business and subsequent storage was approved by the Planning Commission for the east unit of the building. An Interim Use Permit (IUP) for an off-sale liquor store was approved for the west unit of the building. In March 2024, the Planning Commission approved an amended IUP to allow the middle unit of the commercial building to be divided into two separate suites. Today's request is for an IUP to allow office space for a general contracting business in the middle suite of the existing commercial building. Additionally, part of the request involves amending the 2024 IUP to allow the middle unit to remain divided into two suites. The request specifies that the office space will be used strictly for office functions, with hours from 9 am to 5 pm, and will include 2 employees plus the business owner. Recommended conditions include prohibiting the use of the office space as a base for contracting equipment. French Lake Township has provided comments indicating they are comfortable with the middle unit being either a single or double suite for retail or office use. No other responses have been received.
- B. Barthel stated there is no plan for the occupant to store construction equipment at the site; this will solely be office space. Mol asked if work trucks would be left overnight. Barthel responded, "No, just daily office workers." Rhineberger clarified that this is how the narrative reads, but as time passes, things may change, which is why suggested conditions are presented for the Commission's consideration.
- C. No comment from the public.
- D. Mol feels the request is straightforward. He drives by the site daily and has not observed any concerns. Mol and Bravinder agree that this is a well-run business.
- E. Mahlberg moved to approve an Interim Use Permit for office space for a home general contracting business within a middle suite of an existing commercial building, in accord with the plans and narrative on file, and the discussion at this hearing, with the following conditions: 1) Use is limited to office space only, any use as a base of operation for the contracting equipment is prohibited; 2) Exterior storage of commercial vehicles and equipment is prohibited; 3) Signage must be in accord with County sign regulations; 4) This permit shall immediately and automatically expire upon transfer, termination of any lease agreement, or change in business operations or ownership. Seconded by Bravinder.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **ROBERT CARLSON** – New

LOCATION: xxxx Meridian Ave N – SW1/4 OF NW1/4 & NW1/4 OF SW1/4 in Section 07, Township 121, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (Ida – Monticello Twp.) Tax #213-100-072300. Property Owner: Robert Carlson, Dale Carlson, Christine Nigro, Shane Conlon, Shelby Conlon (Morgante)

Petitions to rezone from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shoreland District Overlay (S-2) to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) with a Residential-Recreational Shoreland District Overlay (S-2), as regulated in Sections 155.028, 155.047, 155.048 & 155.057, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: no representative

- A. Rhineberger mentioned that an emergency came up, and the applicant, who had intended to be present, is now unable to attend. As this is a rezoning request, the Township often likes to conduct a site inspection. If a site inspection is desired, he would suggest continuing the matter and scheduling the inspection.
- B. Mol asked the Commission for their thoughts on conducting a site inspection. Personally, he is familiar with the area. The property was restricted, and with rezoning, building sites will be created as part of the subdivision. The parcel is currently restricted, and the two entitlements have already been split off. Rhineberger confirmed and added that the property is included in the Land Use Plan (LUP), though this does not necessarily mean the Commission must approve the rezoning.
- C. Greninger stated that, given that the property is restricted, she would not mind taking a look.
- D. Mahlberg asked Rhineberger if the Northeast Quadrant (NEQ) Land Use Plan (LUP) was adopted in 2007. Rhineberger confirmed. Mahlberg noted that the history of two entitlements being deed-restricted in 2003 and 2004 was prior to the 2007 Plan. He inquired if any material changes in the quadrant plan would affect the initial decision to restrict land and use entitlements in a specific way under the old plan. He is hearing the property is guided a particular way. but that has nothing to do with the restrictions placed 2-3 years earlier. A discussion could be had with the applicants.
- E. Greninger stated she is familiar with the area and is curious why the property was restricted. Rhineberger explained the "1 per 40" rule and how the two entitlements were used, leaving the remainder of the property restricted. This type of restriction is common in the county for AG (General Agriculture) zoned properties. The Commission has seen similar cases where entitlements were used up, and the property was divided just before applying for rezoning. Greninger withdrew her request to visit the site.
- F. Smith stated that he is familiar with the area and does not feel the need to visit the site.
- G. Bravinder stated that historically if Monticello Township has concerns about a request, they ask for a site inspection. Referring back to Mahlberg's earlier question about the restriction being established before the 2007 Plan, Bravinder asked for clarification on the designation of the property prior to the plan's implementation. Rhineberger explained that the Rural Residential designation was added in 2007, and before that, the property was guided as AG. Rhineberger displayed the 2007 and prior plan and reviewed how classifications changed. Bravinder mentioned that he does not see the need to visit the property since it is aligned with Monticello Township's plans.

- H. Mol asked if the item needed to be continued due to the applicant's absence. Kryzer responded that if approval is granted, no.
- I. Mahlberg asked if the property owners were the same in 2003. Rhineberger believed the property was still within the family at that time, but he would need to research to confirm.
- J. Mol acknowledged that this is a restricted parcel of agricultural land, but the 2007 LUP designated the area for growth, and Monticello Township wants the growth to occur here. He noted his concerns about the entitlements being used up and the land remaining designated as agricultural while the LUP calls for growth. Bravinder responded that this situation has been seen before, and he doesn't fault people for moving entitlements off agricultural land. At the time, the intention was to continue farming the land, but 20 years later, with growth in the area, landowners are now trying to take advantage of the situation, which happens frequently.
- K. Rhineberger stated that the parcel has been in family ownership since before 1997 and has likely passed through the family for quite some time. Mahlberg clarified that under the pre-2007 LUP, the property was zoned and guided as AG. Rhineberger confirmed this and explained that the original 1988 plan allowed townships to update their plans individually. The original plan was from 1988, but amendments were made in some townships, with Monticello's having an update occur around 2005. Rhineberger displayed and reviewed the designation changes from the 2005 to 2007 maps.
- L. Holland - the town clerk, wrote that the property is owned by family members and that they are likely in the process of dividing the property. She believes the request makes sense. Mahlberg agreed, noting that the family is likely at the end of their ownership and that a previous owner made a conscious decision on how to use the entitlements. Mahlberg's concern is that the intervening land use plan change is not holding people to their original decisions, allowing them to potentially benefit twice.
- M. Bravinder asked to see the zoning map. Noting that this property is contiguous with others. Rhineberger pointed out properties northwest of the parcel that were rezoned after the 2007 LUP update. Mol added that he is familiar with properties in that area that were rezoned roughly three years ago. Prior to rezoning, the land was irrigated cropland, and the lots were in the LUP.
- N. Greninger asked if the agricultural land surrounding the property is currently being farmed. Mol confirmed that some of the land is farmed while other areas are open, wooded spaces.
- O. Mol suggested that the questions being raised might be better suited for the applicant, and he proposed continuing the matter to allow the applicant to be present. However, if there is confidence in the request, any member may motion for approval.
- P. Bravinder moved to continue the matter to the March 13, 2025, meeting to allow the applicant to be present. Seconded by Greninger.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **AARON HAHO** – New

LOCATION: 2895 Cty Road 4 SW – THAT PART OF GOVERNMENT LOT 2 OF SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 119, RANGE 28, Wright County, MN. (Cokato Lake - Cokato Twp.) Tax #205-000-144402.
Property Owner: AARON O HAHO & NICOLE E HAHO

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a two-lot platted residential subdivision, as regulated in Sections 155.029, 155.050 & 155.057, Title XV, Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Aaron Haho

- A. Rhineberger presented the proposed site plan while reviewing the request. The property was recently rezoned, and this request pertains to a residential two-lot platted subdivision, with one lot designated for a new residential site. Each lot will be at least 2.5 acres in size, with 200 feet of road frontage (lot width) and 300 feet of depth from the road. It was noted that the preliminary plat does not include any drainage and utility easements, which are typically required. There is some concern regarding significant drainage on Lot 1. Rhineberger used the proposed plan to review the area of concern and emphasized the importance of a public easement. The Commission has two options: to require an updated drawing showing the public easement or to allow the Zoning Administrator to review and approve it prior to the final plat. Cokato Township has approved the request. The Wright County Highway Department stated that no additional access to the property would be allowed on County Road 4 SW. The two acceptable options from the Highway Department are either having both lots share the existing access or providing access for the northern lot off 28th Street SW. However, due to the drainage and utility easement, work cannot be done in the easement to facilitate this access, making this option unlikely. The common access aligns with the preliminary plat and is the preferred solution. One neighbor commented that the drainage area on the northern lot is prone to flooding, which limits the buildable area. They are concerned about filling in this area. According to the preliminary plat, there is room for two septic sites and an adequate buildable area.
- B. No comment from Haho or the public.
- C. Mahlberg stated that the Zoning Administrator is likely more knowledgeable about the drainage and utility easement, so it is not a concern for this Commission to review.
- D. Bravinder explained that the Township has an extensive history with this area. Using the displayed Beacon site, he reviewed the drainage and water issues. Last year, the Township met with Wright County Soil and Water (SWCD) and the MN DNR to discuss the situation. One issue is that to the west, into the DNR Property, there are two culverts intended to handle the water. However, these culverts are backing up because the holding area silts in and doesn't function properly. The SWCD hopes the DNR will allocate funds in 2025 to address this issue, which would reduce the impact on properties to the east. The Township has been working on this problem for years and, at a point, included the County Commissioners in discussions. There is a 4-ft culvert under County Road 4, and the pressure must be consistent all the way to the lake, which it is not, and the current culverts cannot handle the pressure coming under County Road 4. Once the DNR agrees to resolve the issue, much of the pressure on the Haho property will be alleviated. This waterway is dry at times and full of water at other times, but it is not a continuous creek bed. The township road has a berm to protect against overflow flooding, which has occurred.

- E. Greninger asked if the Commission had previously visited the site. Kryzer responded that a rezoning to the west was recently done. Haho confirmed that it was to the north in 2019.
- F. Holland questioned whether the Township's response, which states that the Township authorized approval, included a discussion on the topic at the meeting. Bravinder clarified that there was a discussion before the meeting with the applicant present. However, the issue was not discussed at the meeting because it had already been vetted beforehand. Rhineberger explained that the subdivision ordinance states that *if a subdivision contains or is traversed by a watercourse, drainage way, channel, lake, stream, or drainage field tile, the Planning Commission must provide one of the following at its discretion: (a) a stormwater easement, (b) drainage right-of-way, or (c) park dedication*. Typically, a drainage and utility easement of 10 feet in width is placed along property lines and connects with existing easements. In this case, while there is a drainage way through the property, the preliminary plat does not show the required easements. Without the proper public easements, it could lead to legal issues when improvements are needed.
- G. Mol reviewed the options, which are either to continue the item and require the easement to be drawn on the preliminary plan or to allow for administrative approval. Rhineberger expressed a preference for the Planning Commission to review the plan, but it is up to the Commission to decide. Mol suggested that due to the water and flooding issues, and the DNR concerns, the item should be continued so that the Commission can review the easement on the plan. Mahlberg agreed that Bravinder provided a thorough explanation and that if Bravinder believed it would add value, it would make sense for the Commission to review the plan.
- H. Rhineberger addressed the applicant and directed him to contact his surveyor to discuss what the Commission would be looking for. Haho asked if an easement is required on the northern property line. Rhineberger replied that he believes the surveyor, being more familiar with the property, will be able to assess what is needed for the easement. There is also a 10-foot easement that should be applied around all lots. Haho had these easements removed because he interpreted the ordinance as requiring them only when necessary. He argued that a 10-foot easement on the north side is not needed due to a hill, and there are no gas utilities in the area. Additionally, electricity is supplied underground along the highway, and providers install service where they see fit. He does not want to grant easements unless absolutely necessary. Mol responded that while Haho owns the property today, it was originally designed for a single entitlement, and this request is creating a second homesite. In 40 years, new owners could face issues if easements are not established now, which is why such measures are put in place. Haho said he understands but is trying to protect his property rights. He then questioned what is needed for the waterway easement. Kryzer directed the applicant to have his surveyor consult with the Zoning Administrator.
- I. Greninger moved to continue the meeting until March 13th to allow time for the applicant to address the easements. Seconded by Holland.

VOTE: Mol, Greninger, Holland, Smith, Mahlberg ABSTAINED: Bravinder

MOTION CARRIED

6. **KEITH RAISANEN** – New

LOCATION: xxxx Oliver Ave. SW – PRT OF W640FT OF NW1/4 OF NW1/4 WH LIES N OF S528FT&SLY OF SLY R/W LN OF RR in Section 35, Township 119, Range 28, Wright County, MN. (Cokato Twp.) Tax #205-000-352206. Property Owner: KEITH A & HEIDI L RAISANEN

Petitions to rezone a 0.048-acre portion of the property from General Agriculture (AG) to Suburban Residential (R2), as regulated in Sections 155.028, 155.048 & 155.050, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Keith Raisanen

- A. Rhineberger displayed details of the property as he reviewed the request. Items number #6 and #7 are linked with this part of the request to rezone a 0.048-acre strip of the northern parcel, which is currently General Agriculture (AG). The land will need to be rezoned to Suburban Residential (R-2) so it can be attached to the southern lot. If the rezoning doesn't occur, the subdivision can't happen. The situation is that a pool structure was built across the property line. The property owner owns both lots, which are considered separate buildable lots. Since they are in separate zoning districts, a rezoning is necessary to amend the subdivision to include the 0.048-acre portion. Cokato Township has recommended approval of the request, and no other comments have been received.
- B. Raisanen felt the explanation was complete, and there was no comment from the public.
- C. Bravinder stated that keeping the pool house with the pool and adjusting the lot line makes sense. This also allows a new home to be built on the applicant's other property. It's a straightforward request.
- D. Mol, also a member of the Board of Adjustment, noted that similar situations often come before them, especially concerning property lines. He struggled with this request, as the owner should have known the property line locations. He questioned why rezoning should be granted for a mistake made by the property owner. Mol expressed concern that allowing this change might set a precedent for others to build on property lines and later request zoning and lot line changes. He asked whether the building could be moved. Raisanen explained that the building is on a cement slab with a hydrant inside, making it immovable. Mol disagreed, stating that anything can be moved. He worried about setting a precedent that property lines could be easily changed. Bravinder noted that this situation is different because the property owner has owned both parcels for a long time, and the mistake seems understandable. He argued that this case doesn't set a negative precedent. Mol agreed that the ownership of both properties is a factor but still questioned whether rezoning should happen due to a mistake, especially if the building could be relocated.
- E. Smith questioned the age of the building. Raisanen responded that it is roughly 22 years old. He explained that, since owning both properties, he never gave the lot line much thought until the property was surveyed for the new home to the north. He was unaware that the building extended over the line, as they had owned both properties for over 22 years.
- F. Kryzer pointed out that there is also a shed in another location on the property that encroaches 4.2 feet over the property line. He suggested that, if approved, this issue be addressed as part of the subdivision

conditions to be corrected. Raisanen confirmed that the shed will be moved and that discussions have already taken place with the prospective buyers.

- G. Mahlberg moved to recommend approval of the rezoning of that portion of tax parcel 205-000-352206 noted as “proposed description of parcel to be rezoned...” on the survey prepared by Meyer-Rohlin Land Services, File No. 24379, dated 12-20-2024, from AG-General Agriculture to Suburban Residential (R2) to the Wright County Board of Commissioners. Seconded by Smith.

VOTE: Bravinder, Greninger, Holland, Smith, Mahlberg NAY: Mol

MOTION CARRIED

7. **KEITH RAISANEN** – New

LOCATION: 5160 Oliver Ave. SW – PRT OF NW1/4 OF NW1/4 in Section 35, Township 119, Range 28, Wright County, MN. (Cokato Twp.) Tax #205-000-352205 & -352206. Property Owner: KEITH A & HEIDI L RAISANEN

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a one-lot subdivision and waiver of platting requirements, as regulated in Sections 154.12, 155.029 & 155.050, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Keith Raisanen

- A. Rhineberger displayed the site plan and noted that the property details and request were reviewed in relation to the previous item and rezoning portion of the request. The Township approved this request.
- B. Raisanen felt the explanation was complete and there was no comment from the public.
- C. The Board was asked by Chairman Mol if there were questions or items to discuss, and hearing none called for a motion.
- D. Mahlberg motion to approve a Conditional Use Permit for a one lot unplatted subdivision that attaches that portion of tax parcel 205-000-352206 noted as “proposed description of parcel to be rezoned...” on the survey prepared by Meyer-Rohlin Land Services, File No. 24379, dated 12-20-2024, to tax parcel 205-000-352205, with the following conditions: 1) County Board approves of the rezoning request; 2) A full survey of the resulting lot be provided to Planning and Zoning prior to transfer; 3) Parcels be combined into one parcel number at the time of transfer or an Administrative Order be signed by the property prior to transfer; 4) Existing shed located over the east property line be moved to a compliant location. Seconded by Greninger.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Barry Rhineberger
Planning & Zoning Administrator

BR:sd

cc: Planning Commission
Kryzer
Twp. Clerks