

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: October 2, 2025

Minutes

The Wright County Planning Commission met on Thursday, October 2, 2025, in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, Dan Mol, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with members present: Jeanne Holland, Ken Felger, Sandy Greninger, Pat Mahlberg, and Dan Bravinder. Brian Wold, Assistant County Attorney, was the legal counsel present. Barry Rhineberger, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning office.

ACTION ON OCTOBER 2, 2025, MINUTES

Bravinder motioned to adopt the minutes for the September 11, 2025 meeting as printed. Seconded by Holland.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Estate of Frank G. Lushine – Cont. 8/21 & 9/11

LOCATION: 6070 PILGER AVE NW - part of Gov't Lot A in Section 33, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Southside Twp.) Tax #217-000-334401 Property Owner: CHERYL D LUSHINE QPERESTR and FRANK G LUSHINE QPERRESTR

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a three-lot unplatted subdivision, as regulated in Sections 155.029, 155.051 & 155.057, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Tana Crowell – relator representing the applicant

- A. Rhineberger displayed the updated concept plan and reviewed the request. The item was continued to allow time for revisions to the proposed subdivision. The location of the wetland was clarified and pointed out on the site plan. The bluff on what is listed as Parcel A was reviewed, and the setbacks were highlighted. Rhineberger reviewed a site plan showing the true buildable areas, meeting all required setbacks, on Parcels A and C. For Parcel C, Rhineberger roughly calculated 16,000–18,000 sq. ft. of buildable area and noted that, at that size, the style and layout of the home would be limited. Mol clarified that the 16,000 sq. ft. is on Parcel C and within the northern, yellow-highlighted area on the displayed site plan.
- B. No comments from the applicant or the public.
- C. Bravinder questioned whether both septic locations on Parcel C are acceptable as proposed. Rhineberger confirmed and noted that the locations are included on the survey as designed by a licensed septic designer. He further explained that septic systems are allowed to be located closer to the road than a building, and the proposed locations meet setback requirements. Bravinder also raised a concern previously mentioned about the bluff area on Parcel A and whether the displayed map accurately shows the bluff. Rhineberger explained the bluff setback line, along with other displayed setback lines on the site plan, noting that any structure placed within the yellow-highlighted area

would meet all required setbacks. Mol questioned the width of the buildable area on Parcel A.

Rhineberger estimated it to be approximately 90 feet wide, with ample depth. He added that Parcel A likely would not be ideal for a walkout home design due to the bluff location.

- D. Greninger asked whether the sheds shown on Parcel C would need to be removed. Rhineberger stated that the combined size is under the maximum allowed and the distance is acceptable, so they can remain. Greninger confirmed that the drawing shows a buildable area but noted that it is not a large area.
- E. Felger referenced the proposed motion provided by staff, which included a suggested 65-foot setback from the private easement, and questioned the rationale. Rhineberger explained that private easements can be problematic when structures are built too close, potentially leading to neighbor disputes. A setback provides a buffer for safety and access. He added that the 65-foot recommendation is a typical road setback, but the Commission may include, exclude, or modify it. Without a specified setback, a house or garage could be built as close as 5 feet from the easement. Felger questioned whether the easement was perpetual; Rhineberger confirmed it was.
- F. Mahlberg questioned the Commission's authority regarding a setback from a private easement. Rhineberger responded that it's not necessarily the Commission's business, but staff suggested it as proactive consideration. He explained that the easement provides access to another property owner's home and was established prior to 1977 and remains the only means of ingress and egress. Mahlberg asked if the recorded easement had been reviewed. Rhineberger stated he had looked at it but did not recall the specifics.
- G. Felger moved to approve a Conditional Use Permit for a three-lot unplatted subdivision, in accord with the survey completed by Otto Associates, Project No. 25-0375, with revisions dated 9-17-2025; with the following conditions: 1) Access permits, if required, must be approved by Southside Township prior to any construction activity or earthmoving taking place; 2) There are wetlands on the property, which must either be avoided or proper approval for wetland disturbance is approved by the Wright County SWCD, prior to the disturbance taking place; 3) With limited buildable area on Parcel C, any house placement must preserve both the primary and alternate septic sites noted on the plan. 4) Tree removal and shoreland alteration must follow Ordinance standards and requirements. Motion seconded by Bravinder.

DISCUSSION: Greninger asked whether the omission of the easement setback condition was intentional. Felger confirmed it was. Mol asked if a reduced setback should be considered. Felger stated that while he's open to discussion, he doesn't believe it's the Commission's role to predict future issues, and that 65 feet is excessive. However, he is open to a minor setback distance if others feel it is necessary. Mol agreed that 65 feet might be too much but noted that the Board of Adjustment (BOA) frequently deals with issues where buildings are placed too close to cartways. Felger reiterated that 65 feet is excessive but said he would consider a smaller number. Mol suggested 33 feet, equivalent to half of a 66-foot road right-of-way. Felger stated he would accept 30 feet as a compromise, noting that the parcel already has other setbacks, such as the 30-foot bluff requirement. He reminded the Commission that the easement is private and not necessarily their concern, though he remains open to input.

Bravinder asked about the width of the easement. Mahlberg noted that the written easement should specify its width and detail any restrictions. He commented that, given where the house and septic would be located, an issue may not arise but if a setback condition helps prevent future problems, he would not object to including one. Rhineberger displayed the property tax card, which noted that the easement is 20

feet wide. Felger stated that a 30-foot setback would be reasonable, and Bravinder agreed, saying that 20 feet is quite narrow and less than the width of a standard road surface.

Felger and Bravinder agreed to amend the proposed motion to include condition 5) A 30 ft. structure setback standard shall apply to the centerline of the access easement servicing the neighboring property through Parcel A.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **JENNIFER GARDNER** – Cont. 9/11

LOCATION: 199 Jansen Ave SE – part of the E 1/2 of the NE 1/4 in Section 03, Township 119, Range 24, Wright County, Minnesota. (Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-000-031108. Property Owner: JENNIFER GARDNER

Petitions to rezone the property from General Agriculture (AG) to Urban/Rural Transition (R-1), as regulated in Sections 155.028, 155.048 & 155.049, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Jennifer Gardner

- A. Rhineberger noted the item was continued for a site inspection, which has since been completed. No additional information has been received since the September meeting.
- B. Gardner stated she had provided the Wright County Highway Department's recommendation and review. There were no further comments.
- C. No comments from the public.
- D. As asked by Bravinder, Rhineberger displayed a map showing the current borders of the Township and the City of Hanover. It was noted that Hanover is represented in pink, Rockford Township in purplish and the City of St. Michael in light blue. Bravinder pointed out that the area to the north is referred to as Hanover Hills, consisting of approximately 2.5-acre lots. At the site, a representative from the City of Hanover stated that this area had posed challenges for development and they are trying to avoid that occurring again. Bravinder said the issue for him is that the pink area (as shown on the map), was annexed years ago and spans over 400 acres of agricultural land, is essentially holding landowners in the Transition Area hostage. No development has occurred there, and there are no plans in place. He expressed concern that landowners in the Township are unable to do what they want with their property. He referenced a similar situation in Howard Lake and mentioned that, when he asked the (Hanover) city planner about a 5- or 10-year plan, the response was that there was none. Mol confirmed. Bravinder believes the City sees potential development of the parcel as an impediment to expanding infrastructure westward. He questioned why over 400 acres of agricultural land was annexed into the City without a clear development plan.
- E. Flegler stated the property (annexed to the west) belonged to the Wetter's and he believes the owners had made efforts to develop it because the County had previously denied any activity, suggesting this was a last-ditch effort. Felger was at the site inspection and agrees that, in cases like this, cities often have vague plans to "someday" expand. He feels that allowing the Gardner's to develop their land would not halt the City's plans. Felger believes there are greater obstacles to extending City services, such as the large wetland and the river along County Road 20. He heard the city representative acknowledge there is no concrete plan and questioned how the City of Hanover can deny a private landowner the right to develop outside City jurisdiction. He believes there has been no clear justification and stated he does not support cities restricting property rights when there is no future plan. He is in favor of the proposal and noted that Rockford Township recommended approval.
- F. Holland stated that the City of Hanover Planner, Cindy Nash, was present at the site. Holland shared that she had spoken to a Hanover Council member whose concern was that approving this request would limit the neighboring property owner's ability to redevelop land within Hanover. She

emphasized that both property owners' rights must be acknowledged. Holland explained that recently Hanover's administrator gave a presentation showing increasing demand to move into the city, with Wright County being the fastest-growing county in Minnesota. She suggested placing the request on hold to allow the City of Hanover and Rockford Township to develop a joint plan. If approved, she believes the neighboring property owner would be left in limbo. She mentioned that Hanover Hills (to the north) was not able to receive trunk sewer and water service due to being landlocked, and that's a similar concern here. She encouraged a meeting between the Township and City. Felger noted he asked the City Planner at the site who initiates such conversations, and while he couldn't recall the answer, he agreed someone needs to take the first step. Bravinder referenced an annexation agreement between the City of Cokato and Cokato Township where it spelled out that land annexed but not developed within 3 years is returned to the Township. This forces cities to plan more deliberately, rather than using broad "blanket planning," which seems to be the case here. Holland also referenced a similar structure between the City of Monticello and Monticello Township, where a joint board discusses future planning. She believes Hanover and Rockford Township should follow a similar process. Felger asked how soon that could happen. He noted that the Transition Area in the Land Use Plan was meant to be collaboratively managed by the County, City, and Township, but that coordination has not occurred. Greninger added that the Transition Area has existed for 26 years and questioned how long residents must wait. She asked if there is a way to compel the City to clarify its intentions.

- G. Mol asked Rhineberger to explain Wright County's Land Use Plan for the property in question. He clarified that the County, not the City of Hanover, has jurisdiction and he wanted to know how the Plan classifies the land. Rhineberger stated that the property is designated as a Transition Area and currently is zoned General Agriculture. Transition Areas were intended to promote joint planning between growing cities and adjacent townships so that Township development wouldn't overwhelm city infrastructure. These areas do not grant cities veto power over township land but are meant to encourage communication. Ideally, orderly annexation agreements are established to outline when, where, how, and why development occurs. In this case, no such agreement exists. Ultimately, the property remains under Township jurisdiction and therefore under County authority for rezoning. The Township and City are encouraged to provide input but cannot block the request outright.
- H. Holland stated that the City Council was unaware this discussion was taking place. Although the property is within the Township, she believes the City should have been involved. She said a (City) council member confirmed the Council had no knowledge of the request. Gardner responded that she had contacted Ms. Nash before beginning the process and has an email to prove it. Holland clarified that the elected officials themselves were not informed. Felger acknowledged the Township has a newer board and stated Rockford Township supports the request. Holland questioned whether all implications were presented to the Township and whether they understood the potential consequences for neighboring landowners. She emphasized that orderly annexation processes include weighing the pros and cons jointly and believes a decision shouldn't be made without understanding what the Township was told. Felger agreed it was odd the City Council wasn't aware. Holland said she didn't want to make a decision that could hinder the neighboring landowner's ability to sell or develop. Felger replied that the landowner could petition to return to the Township and noted that there are numerous obstacles to extending Hanover's services, especially westward along County Road 20.
- I. Bravinder referred to a September 4th letter included in the staff report from Collaborative Planning LLC. He pointed out that the bottom of the letter shows copies were sent to Jennifer Nash (City Administrator) and the City Council. He questioned why they claim to be uninformed if the communication was sent. Bravinder expressed frustration that if City officials aren't reading emails, that's not the applicant's fault. He then asked Gardner about her plans for the property. Gardner stated

she had considered annexation but ruled it out due to distance, the need to cross multiple properties, and road limitations. She felt three lots were more appropriate than 15 and better suited to surrounding properties. Bravinder said the proposal fits well with the area and the riverfront. He noted that in other places, like Cokato, services can run along roads without crossing private properties. He disagreed with Holland's concerns and said this plan aligns with current land use and will be compatible for many years. He added that properties already annexed can petition to return to the Township and confirmed his support for the proposal.

- J. Mol noted that the land is currently zoned AG, and the request is to rezone to R-1. He questioned whether this would amount to spot zoning, given the surrounding agricultural land and larger lots. The Land Use Plan designates the area as Transition, not R-1. He expressed concern about precedent and whether this is appropriate planning. He asked if smaller lots could disrupt protection of surrounding larger lots. Felger replied that the area is not necessarily excluded from the possibility of R-1 zoning under the plan. Bravinder asked if the Transition Area designation affects zoning directly. Rhineberger clarified that it does not prevent a property owner from applying for rezoning. If it did, the application wouldn't be before the Commission. He explained that only potentially viable requests reach the Commission, and it's up to them to decide whether a change is appropriate. Similar to what occurs when a large agriculture parcel, in the middle of nowhere and not in the LUP, comes before the Commission for rezoning.
- K. Felger speculated that the 400 acres to the west, within Hanover, were seen by developers as prime land. He questioned why no development has occurred if the location is so ideal. He believes this proposal doesn't prevent the City from eventually developing that land. He stated that utility easements don't need to follow public roads and could run across private land if necessary. He doesn't believe the Gardner request would "put the brakes" on City development. He said the real challenge is Hanover's own infrastructure limitations. Citing examples like Golden Valley and Plymouth, he said even areas with flawed early planning can be developed if market forces support it. He does not believe the Gardner property impedes future development and reiterated his support.
- L. Rhineberger provided background on the property to the west, as previously mentioned. He noted that this is not the only area in the County where large tracts of land have been annexed into cities but remain undeveloped. This particular property was annexed in 2005, just before the economic downturn. It is likely that development was in the planning stages at the time, but circumstances halted progress, and the land has remained undeveloped since. Rhineberger also elaborated on the direction provided by the Land Use Plan (LUP) regarding Transition Areas. These areas are intended to serve as buffers between urban and rural development, while also promoting collaboration between cities and townships as they make land use decisions.
- M. Felger stated he was prepared to make a motion; however, Rhineberger interjected to point out that the proposed motion in the staff report contained incorrect parcel numbers and legal descriptions. He offered to assist with drafting a corrected version. Before the motion was read, Mol noted that member Mahlberg had a comment.
- N. Mahlberg stated that, under Section 155.028, the amendment being considered *only be used as a means to reflect changes in the goals and policies of the Community, as reflected in the policies, plan or changes in conditions in the county*. He observed that the Planning Commission does not have the authority to compel communication between parties. He suggested that the body receiving the Commission's recommendation may be more suited for making broader policy decision. After reviewing the Land Use Plan (LUP), he expressed difficulty identifying any specific changes in

community goals or policies that would justify the proposed rezoning. He questioned whether transitioning to 1-acre lots is appropriate for this area. Even setting aside the zoning issue, he noted uncertainty about how the proposed lots, slightly over 1 acre, fit within the existing character of the immediate area. He suggested that a 2.5-acre lot might be a more suitable size and stated he is struggling to see what change is being reflected or supported by approving the rezoning.

- O. Felger then requested Rhineberger to read the proposed motion from the staff report, including the corrected parcel numbers.
- P. On behalf of Felger, Rhineberger read the motion recommending approval to the Wright County Board of Commissioners to rezone Tax Parcel #215-000-031108 from General Agriculture (AG) to Urban/Rural Transition (R-1), stating that the property aligns with the goals and policies of the Northeast Quadrant Land Use Plan. Felger added that the Township of Rockford recommends approval. The motion was seconded by Bravinder.

VOTE: Bravinder & Felger NAY: Mahlberg, Holland, Mol, Greninger

MOTION FAILED

- Q. Mol asked the Commission members how they would like to proceed, whether there would be another motion or further discussion.
- R. Bravinder questioned whether the applicant would be willing to put the item on hold, possibly sign a waiver, and allow time for the Township and the City to meet and discuss. He expressed uncertainty about whether a motion could be drafted that would compel such a meeting. Mol suggested having the City and Township attend a Planning Commission meeting to explain their reasoning. Gardner stated she would need to look into what would be required to coordinate such a meeting and could not make that decision at the moment. Mol then asked the applicant whether she wished to proceed or withdraw the application. Gardner stated she did not want to withdraw and would accept a denial. Mol clarified that the last motion did not pass, so the request had not been denied; rather, a decision had not yet been made. He explained that even if this Commission recommends denial, the request would still go to the County Board, which has the final authority.
- S. Felger addressed the applicant and suggested she consider requesting two lots instead. Gardner replied, "maybe," but emphasized that she is not requesting a variance and believes her request complies with all ordinances, which is where her frustration lies. She asked whether she would need to reapply if she decided to continue. Rhineberger explained if withdrawn, the applicant could reapply at any time. If denied at the County Board level, reapplication would not be permitted for 6 to 12 months. Mahlberg pointed out that if the Commission makes a decision tonight, the public hearing would be closed, and no additional public comments would be heard at the County Board level. He explained that the back-and-forth during the current meeting helps build the record the County Board will use to make its decision. Mahlberg expressed that a motion should be sent to the County Board. He feels that the discussion at this meeting provides a record for the Board to make the decision without official recommendation from this Commission. He believes the County Board has more leverage to facilitate discussions between the City and Township. Mol asked if Mahlberg was prepared to make a motion with Mahlberg questioning what a motion would look like. He asked

Rhineberger if a such motion has ever been done. Mol said he did not recall this occurring. Rhineberger noted that a similar motion was once passed in relation to a solar setbacks ordinance amendment.

- T. Mahlberg clarified that he voted "no" on the earlier motion not because of the "Transition Area" designation, but because he doesn't see any indication of City action. He doesn't believe the area should continue to be restricted indefinitely without movement. However, he does believe R-1 zoning is inappropriate for this location. Greninger agreed with Mahlberg.
- U. Mol asked if the Commission move the request forward with no recommendation so that the applicant could take her case directly to the County Commissioners. Rhineberger explained that ordinance amendments typically originate from a demonstrated need or desire and sometimes come directly from the County Board. He feels that a lack of recommendation might be viewed as the Planning Commission not fulfilling its responsibility. Holland asked whether a motion could be crafted that would neither deny the request nor approve it but rather continue the matter until a meeting between the City of Hanover and the Township could be held. Mol agreed that continuing the matter could give the applicant time to work with the City and Township and potentially bring them to the next meeting to testify. Rhineberger noted the 120-day deadline ends on December 19th. Mol said the item could be continued to the November meeting, giving the applicant insight into the Commission's concerns and time to consider next steps. Rhineberger added that more time could be given if the applicant signs a waiver. He reviewed statutory timelines, noting that the most prudent course of action, given the uncertainty of a City/Township meeting, might be to withdraw and reapply. Mol noted that no representative from Rockford Township was present to speak, and he would like to see a representative attend and go on record with their position.
- V. Holland said the City of Hanover should also be represented. She expressed concern about potential political fallout if local property owners feel they are being restricted in how they can use their land. She warned that this could become a significant political issue for Hanover and that both the City and Township should be talking. Mahlberg asked how rezoning a single parcel in an area already full of rural residential lots could trigger political fallout. Using the original map displayed earlier by Rhineberger, Holland explained that during the site visit it was noted the property to the west (shown in pink) wouldn't have access to City sewer and water due to the need to travel along County Road 20, effectively landlocking it. Mahlberg questioned whether the division of a single lot is the critical barrier to extending sewer and water behind the property. Gardner replied that it's possible to run a line and assess the cost to the new lots. Mahlberg said infrastructure can be installed if there is motivation to do so. Bravinder reminded the Commission that during the site visit, it was noted that residents of Hanover Hills couldn't afford to extend infrastructure and currently rely on septic and wells, which are still allowed, even within the City. He noted that although infrastructure installation may not be allowed, annexation is still possible. Holland asked if the property in question could be annexed. Bravinder confirmed that it could, noting that up to 60 acres can be annexed per day under current law. Mahlberg said the situation would be different if they were dealing with undeveloped land slated for major change. In his view, Jansen Avenue already has around 20 homes and consists of small rural lots, so he doesn't understand the City's concern over sewer and water infrastructure. Mol stated that this is why the Commission needs to focus on the rezoning issue strictly as it pertains to Wright County.

- W. Bravinder asked whether continuing the matter to the November 20th meeting would still comply with the statutory timeline. Rhineberger stated that if the Commission intends to recommend denial, another meeting would be needed to approve Findings before going to the County Board. He expressed concern that November 20th may be too late without a signed waiver. Discussion followed about process, timelines, and deadlines related to the Planning Commission and County Board. Mol asked the applicant if she would be willing to sign a waiver. Gardner asked for clarification on timing, and Mol reviewed the process, noting it could take approximately 3 months and would not fit within the 120-day deadline unless a waiver is signed. Mahlberg suggested continuing the matter to the October 23rd meeting, giving the applicant time to consider her options. If the Commission issues a denial at that meeting, there would still be time for the County Board to hear the request in December. Holland noted the last County Board meeting of the year is December 16th. Mahlberg expressed concern about that timing. Rhineberger said a recent amendment allows the Zoning Administrator to refer an application directly to the County Board without a recommendation if time constraints make that necessary. The relevant section is 155.028(B)(1). Mahlberg stated that his interpretation of that section is that the provision is only applicable when no recommendation has been made. If the Commission does make a recommendation, the provision likely does not apply. He then asked whether Findings are required for a rezoning denial. Rhineberger replied the Commission often relies on meeting minutes for approvals and Findings for denials, MCIT (Minnesota Counties Intergovernmental Trust) highly recommends formal written Findings for approval and denial.
- X. Mol concluded that he would like to see the matter continued to the next meeting. He noted that the applicant had now heard the concerns, both supporting and opposing, and that input from the Township and City may still be helpful. He explained that continuing the matter allows the applicant time to decide whether to request two lots instead of three as some members have indicated two might be more acceptable. Gardner asked what difference two lots would make. She noted that concerns seem focused on water line access, which would remain regardless of whether she added two or three lots. Mol replied he feels that two lots would better match the lot sizes in the surrounding neighborhood. With three lots, the existing structure would become nonconforming and hasn't been fully discussed. Additionally, a shared driveway between two of the lots could be a concern, as the Commission has previously struggled with shared driveway approvals. He said reducing the request to two lots would allow for a single home and single driveway, which may be more acceptable. However, he emphasized that he couldn't predict how the Commission would vote and the decision to make changes or connect with the City and Township remains with the applicant. At this point, he stated that a final decision is not being made and continuing the item is the best course of action.
- Y. Bravinder moved to continue the item to the October 23rd meeting to give the application time to address concerns of the Planning Commission with both the City of Hanover and Rockford Township and come back to with Commission on the 23rd to revisit the issue. Motioned seconded by Greninger.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **WILLIAM HEINONEN** – New

LOCATION: 15725 US HIGHWAY 12 SW – PRT OF N1/2OF NW1/4 in Section 33, Township 119, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota.(Cokato Twp.) Tax #205-000-332205. Property Owner: R3 PROPERTIES LLC

Petitions for an Interim Use Permit to operate an auto sales lot with detailing in an existing building on the property, as regulated in Sections 155.031, 155.055 & 155.057, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Bill Heinonen

- A. Rhineberger displayed the proposed site plan and reviewed the request. The request is for an interim use permit to operate an auto sales lot with detailing services in an existing building in Cokato Township. The parcel is zoned General Industry (I-1) and is designated as a “Transition Area.” The applicant currently operates the same business just south of the parcel in question. The business plan is included in the staff report for the Commission to review. The City of Cokato had no objections, and Cokato Township recommended approval.
- B. Heinonen stated that he is simply moving his operation approximately 250 yards, as the crow flies.
- C. No public comments.
- D. Bravinder stated that he sees no issue with the request, as it involves the same zoning and business operations as the existing site, and the operations will remain unchanged.
- E. Mahlberg moved to approve an interim use permit to operate a used auto dealership in an existing building on the property, in accord with the discussion, plans and narrative on file with the following conditions: 1) No more than 6 vehicles be stored or placed outdoors; 2) All required permits and inspections are obtained; 3) This request is subject to a one-year Township review with subsequent review at an interval established by the Township; 4) Any change in use or expansion requires an amended Interim Use Permit hearing; 5) This permit shall expire upon termination of any lease agreement or change in business ownership or operations. Motion seconded by Greninger.

DISCUSSION: Rhineberger noted the Township did not request a township review, but staff thought it was important with the business staying the same to include as part of the proposed motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Barry Rhineberger
Planning & Zoning Administrator

BR:sd

cc: Planning Commission & Twp. Clerks