

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: APRIL 16, 2026

MINUTES

The Wright County Planning Commission met on Thursday, April 16, 2026, in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Dan Mol, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with members present: Dan Bravinder, Charlie Borrell, Troy Beise, Pat Mahlberg, Jeanne Holland & Randy Wilson. Brian Wold, Assistant County Attorney, was the legal counsel and Scott Deckert, Planning & Zoning Assistant Administrator were present.

Mol questioned whether there were any additional items to be added to the agenda with Deckert petitioning the approval and signing of the final plat for Enclave at Lake Ida to the end of the agenda. Mol agreed.

ACTION ON MARCH 26, 2026 MINUTES

On a motion by Wilson, seconded the Bravinder, all voted to adopt the minutes for the March 26, 2026 meeting as printed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. STEVE BRUGGEMAN – Cont. 2/12 with revisions, 3/26

LOCATION: 10521 DOUGLAS AVE NW - 42.77 AC NW SW N OF RD & SW NW in Section 9, Township 121, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Silver Creek Twp.) Tax #216-000-092300. Property Owners: RALPH H & CHERYL M UECKER

REVISED - Petitions to rezone the property referenced from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) **and establishment of a Standard Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district**, as regulated in Sections 155.028, 155.047, 155.048, 155.057, & 155.059, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Paul Otto with Otto Associates

- A. Deckert reminded the Commission that this item was previously heard and involves a request to rezone approximately 43 acres from AG to A/R and to establish a PUD. He noted the property is dual designated in the Land Use Plan (LUP), guided by both Rural Residential and Resource Land. Because of this, he explained that the rezoning should be completed with a PUD to preserve natural features, particularly the stream in this case. He reviewed the LUP, current zoning map, and the proposed four-lot concept plan. Deckert pointed out the revised plan brings the property line directly along the stream, with three lots located to the east and one lot to the west.
- B. Otto stated that following the last meeting, they considered the discussion and revisited the concept plan. Ultimately, it was determined that four lots are a better fit for the area, with the creek acting as a natural barrier. He noted the proposed plan preserves natural resources and keeps the farmstead intact, allowing it to function as a conforming hobby farm with livestock.
- C. Borrell questioned what would happen if the creek were to change course over the next 30–50 years. Otto responded that, as a surveyor, it is his experience that if a creek meanders, property owners typically consider ownership to extend to the creek. He noted that if the creek were to significantly change course, the plat could be revised and the boundary line adjusted. He added that, in practice, most owners assume ownership to the creek, and any disputes could be addressed if they arise.
- D. No public comments.

- E. Mol noted that the Commission visited the site, the request had been discussed at a prior meeting, and the applicant incorporated some of the Commission's recommendations. He also noted the property is guided in the LUP for the proposed use.
- F. Bravinder stated he believes the applicant did a good job protecting the natural resources on the property and that the proposal represents appropriate development. He expressed support for the request.
- G. Bravinder moved to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners to rezone the property from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) and establishment of a Standard Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district based on the Standard PUD concept plan completed by Otto Associates, Project No. 25-0469 (noted Exhibit A), because it is aligned with the goals and policies of the Northwest Quadrant Land Use Plan. Motion seconded my Holland.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **DUANE ROLSTAD** – Cont. 3/26

LOCATION: 158 HALSEY AVE SE - 48.49 AC GOV LTS 1&2 in Section 05, Township 119, Range 24, Wright County, Minnesota. (Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-000-052200. Property Owners: BRADFORD R & JULIE A BURNS

Petitions to rezone the property referenced from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) to Suburban Residential-a (R-2a) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2), as regulated in Sections 155.028, 155.048, 155.051 & 155.057, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Duane Rolstad, Brad Burnes and Civil Engineer Scott Dahlke

- A. Deckert reminded the Commission that the item was first heard in March and continued for a site inspection. He noted the request is to rezone roughly 48 acres from General Agriculture (AG) to Suburban Residential (R-2a), with the ultimate goal of a five-lot platted subdivision. He explained that the property is designated as Agriculture in the Land Use Plan and, therefore, would need to be considered rare and unique to be rezoned. He noted that much of the discussion thus far has focused on the Plan, along with water and drainage concerns. It was noted that the Township provided approval, and additional comments from neighbors were received. Deckert displayed and reviewed the County Land Use Plan and zoning map, along with the 2024 City of St. Michael Land Use Plan Map, reminding the Commission that the area north of the property is planned to remain agricultural. Lastly, the most updated site plan, provided by the engineer, was displayed.
- B. Rolstad noted that after the site visit, it was decided to place more emphasis on water and erosion control. He explained that the amount of water flowing into the lake after development would be roughly the same as current conditions and acknowledged that, with additional time, he believes Dahlke, the engineer, will be able to provide a plan that could improve water flow.
- C. Dahlke, the civil engineer working on the project, stated he has begun preliminary design. He explained that what is being proposed is a stormwater management area at the south end of the property, adjacent to Halsey Avenue. He believes there is an opportunity to make significant improvements to the existing drainage conditions by incorporating a stormwater management basin.
- D. Borrell noted that during the site visit they discussed the need to clean out the ditches so that water does not continue to flow over the road and to ensure the stormwater basin is large enough to handle the water capacity. He explained that there is a tiled field to the east of the property and stated that if the property were developed, he would want reassurance that neighboring property owners would not be negatively impacted by any modifications to that tile. Borrell stated that, based on what he has heard from the audience, he is leaning toward supporting the request because of the proposed improvements to drainage. Mol reminded Borrell that the item before the Commission is strictly the rezoning and that the applicant can address these concerns during the design stage. Borrell asked the applicant to consider addressing drainage if rezoning is approved.
- E. Burns noted that the property is currently enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which is about to expire, and that several farmers have approached him about renting the land. His concern with the property being farmed is sediment entering the lake.
- F. Public comment.
 - Adam Plantenberg, who lives directly across the street from the property, stated that the criteria for changing the property to residential requires unique or special circumstances, and he has not heard anything that would meet that threshold. He explained that the property is currently covered in tall grass, which helps slow erosion and water runoff, but if developed, he believes runoff would increase due to added impervious surfaces and

compacted soils. He also expressed concerns about the safety of the holding pond for small children and the potential for overflow into neighboring yards. He noted that plans have not yet been finalized, leaving some uncertainty.

- G. Wilson stated that he does not see anything rare and unique that would justify a change in designation. While acknowledging that water issues could potentially be addressed, he expressed continued concern regarding field tiles to the east and the concept of the holding pond. He reiterated concerns about whether the property should be developed.
- H. Holland stated that her concern is Division Street. She noted that while residents of new homes may initially accept a dirt road, they may eventually request that the City of St. Michael or the Township pave it. She expressed concern of that financial cost as well as being unfair to farmers in the area who do not intend to develop their land. Bravinder asked whether the concern was Division Street or the new road; Holland clarified Division Street but noted the issue could extend to the new road as well.
- I. Bravinder questioned the history of back lots on Lake Martha. Using Beacon aerial imagery, Deckert explained that most smaller lots in the area predate the ordinance, with one area developed in 1986 and no recent development. Bravinder also asked about two lots north of the subject parcel; Deckert stated they are City of St. Michael parcels and from what he could find likely predate the ordinance. Bravinder stated he believes the area is well suited for development and that, with proper design, water issues could be improved. He noted that he would support the rezoning and described the property as an infill area, given the smaller lots nearby.
- J. Beise, speaking on behalf of the Township, stated that the Township views the property as a transition area, as noted by Bravinder. He added that after the site visit, he felt more confident that drainage issues could be addressed.
- K. Borrell acknowledged the property is currently in CRP but does not need to remain so. He stated that he has seen farmland produce significant runoff during heavy rains and is not convinced that returning the land to farming would be better for the lake. He expressed concern that if development does not occur now, the property could be subdivided into more lots in the future. He agreed with the Township's position that the request is reasonable and could help address drainage issues and improve lake quality by capturing sediment.
- L. Mahlberg stated this is a good use of the land, could address an existing problem, and has Township support, which he noted is meaningful. However, he expressed concern regarding the standard the Commission must follow, that rezoning is only appropriate if the property is rare and unique. He asked the applicant to explain what makes the property meet this threshold, whether related to resolving the water issue or other distinguishing circumstances. Otherwise, he cautioned that approving the request now may be premature, particularly if the property could be guided for similar use in a future Land Use Plan (LUP) update. He reiterated his request for any standout circumstances justifying the rezoning. Burns responded that there is no guarantee the property will remain in CRP beyond September, noting he has received interest from farmers to rent the land. He stated he would prefer his children use the property, which is why he is pursuing rezoning, and added that it would allow him to address runoff and improve lake water quality. Mahlberg acknowledged that water control is not typically part of rezoning decisions; however, given the significance of the issue and potential mitigation, he believes water mitigation could possibly support the "rare and unique" standard. Dahlke stated he sees uniqueness in the ability to connect to municipal sewer, eliminating the need for five septic systems. He explained that stormwater review compares existing and proposed conditions and based on the site's elevation, he believes exceeding standards would not require significant effort. Referring to the proposed site plan, he reviewed the topography, ravine, and holding pond area. While detailed calculations will come later, he expressed no concern about addressing existing stormwater issues.

- M. Wilson noted that responsibility for maintaining the stormwater basin remains unclear and is something he would want addressed. He also stated that there is insufficient information on how water will ultimately be managed. Mahlberg clarified that rezoning does not guarantee development but allows the applicant to proceed with a proposal that would address such issues at a later stage. Mahlberg stated that the Township has indicated the property meets its standards and that, whether through the current rezoning request or a future Land Use Plan (LUP) update, development is likely to occur on the property. Bravinder agreed and added that a competent applicant and developer will take note of the Commission's discussion and address these concerns at the development stage, as failure to do so would create challenges in obtaining approval. Mahlberg stated that the Commission's goal is to make a defensible decision. He noted that, aside from the proposed municipal water connection and the potential to address the runoff issue, he continues to struggle to identify the "rare and unique" characteristics that would distinguish this request from similar ones. He added that he would like to see demonstrable evidence showing that existing runoff conditions are problematic and that proposed conditions would result in measurable improvement, including a comparison to conditions if the property returns to agricultural use. He noted that the property is currently guided for agricultural use and is not being tilled only because it is enrolled in CRP and that there may be a case that returning the property to production could worsen runoff. He reiterated that the Township has also acknowledged the likelihood of future development on the property.
- N. Borrell noted that during his time on the Soil and Water Board, improvements to runoff control were incentivized to improve lake quality. He believes preventing the property from returning to farming and improving runoff could constitute rare and unique circumstances.
- O. Mol stated that while the County may be transitioning, it remains an agricultural county. He noted that although the Commission has heard for several years that the Land Use Plan (LUP) is outdated, no updates are currently in progress; therefore, the Commission must rely on and uphold the existing Plan. He stated that the property is agricultural land and is designated as such in the County Plan as well as the City of St. Michael Plan. He added that the surrounding area remains active farmland and emphasized that farmers generally take measures to minimize erosion and preserve topsoil through proper planting practices or by maintaining grass cover. Mol stated that he does not see rare and unique circumstances supporting the request. He went on to note that, from his perspective as a member of the Board of Adjustment, the proposal resembles the creation of backlots behind the lake. Referring to the site inspection, Mol noted there is approximately 40 feet of elevation to the top of the hill where the road would be essentially cut into a hill and questioned whether this represents appropriate development of the property. He added that, given the slope, a farmer would likely limit use to hay production rather than row crops. Mol also referenced Beacon aerial imagery to describe the property and adjacent farmland to the east, noting likely tile drainage systems and how contours and tiles influence water flow. While acknowledging virtually anything can be done with the right equipment, he questioned whether this is the appropriate location for development under the current ordinance the Commission is required to follow.
- P. Rolstad stated he has installed many septic systems in the area and observed that the drainage ditch to the north has likely filled with silt over time and is nowhere as deep as it once was. He believes that continued farming would worsen sediment flow, while development could provide an opportunity to improve conditions.
- Q. Borrell moved to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners to rezone the property from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) to Suburban Residential (a) R2a, with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) based on the concept plan completed by Civil Engineering Site Design, dated 3/27/2026, file number 01041, because we find the property is aligned with the goals and policies of the Northeast Quadrant Land Use Plan and the Township approves. Beise seconded the motion.

MOTION FAILED: 3–4

VOTE: AYE: Borrell, Beise, Bravinder

NAY: Mahlberg, Holland, Mol, Wilson

- R. Mol noted that the next step would be a motion for denial, withdrawal by the applicant, or a continuation for additional information. Mahlberg stated that if the request is denied with findings, the County Board would review and make the final decision. Wold confirmed that the Commission may motion to direct staff to prepare findings consistent with denial and forward the matter to the County Board for final action. Mahlberg stated that he views the County Board as the policy-making body with broader discretion, while the Planning Commission is tasked with applying the established standards. Commission members discussed whether revised plans addressing stormwater concerns would affect the outcome, concluding that it would be up to the applicant to determine whether to invest the time and cost to revise the proposal. It was noted that if the applicant withdraws, they may reapply at any time, whereas a denial could result in a waiting period of six months to one year. Following discussion of these options, the applicant indicated a preference to proceed and have the County Board make the final decision.
- S. Wilson moved to close the public hearing and direct counsel to prepare findings based on the record and discussion consistent with the denial of the request to rezone and continue the matter to the May 7, 2026, Planning Commission hearing. Motion seconded by Mahlberg.

MOTION PASSED (4–3)

AYE: Mahlberg, Holland, Mol, Wilson

NAY: Borrell, Beise, Bravinder

3. **JOSEPH DESMARAIS** – New

LOCATION: 4825 PITTMAN AVE SW – part of E1/2 OF SW1/4, Section 28, Township 119, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Cokato Twp.) Tax #205-000-283100. Property Owner: JOSEPH M DESMARAIS

The above location was incorrectly included in some notifications. As such, the notices were re-sent with the following corrected information:

LOCATION: xxxx 40TH ST SW – N1/2 OF NE1/4 OF NE1/4 of SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 119, RANGE 26, WRIGHT COUNTY, MINNESOTA (Marysville Twp.) Tax # 211-000-271100. Property Owners: JOSEPH M DESMARAIS

Petitions to rezone the property from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) to Suburban Residential-a (R-2a) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2), as regulated in Sections 155.028, 155.048, 155.051 & 155.057, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Joe DesMarais

- A. Deckert noted that the request is to rezone roughly 19 acres from General Agriculture (AG) to Suburban Residential-A (R-2a), with a possible two-lot division. The property is guided as Agriculture in the Highway 12 Land Use Plan (LUP) and should remain AG unless it is determined to be rare and unique. He noted that the Township's comments were included in the staff report and that no other comments were received. He went on to display and review the Land Use Map, noting that the only property not designated as Agriculture in the Plan is the resource land to the northwest. He also displayed the zoning map, as well as the City of Montrose LUP, which showed the property in question as being included in an area planned for low-density residential. Lastly, a concept plan was displayed.
- B. DesMarais confirmed that the Commission had received the letter from the Township. He noted that he has been working with staff for the last five months and expressed appreciation for their assistance. He explained that he and his wife purchased the property 46 years ago to supplement their small livestock farm. He noted that the property contains a DNR ditch as well as a private ditch, both of which require setbacks to be maintained. The intent was to use the property in conjunction with their farming operation and later sell it as part of their retirement. DesMarais stated that the property will not be able to be sold as an entire parcel for a (livestock) stable, as the City of Montrose has indicated it will not issue a permit for such use. He stated that he believes the property is unique, given that it has Clementa to the east and County Road 107 along the north side. He described the proposed division as shown on the concept plan, including consideration of access onto County Road 107, which he described as functioning like a freeway. It was noted that his County Commissioner and Township representative were present and had expressed their approval. He stated that his understanding is that township government is the closest representation of the people, and he agrees with that principle.
- C. Public comments.
- Richard Bodin, who lives north of the parcel, confirmed that the idea is to divide the property east and west, with each lot having one building eligibility. He stated that he would not want to see a large number of houses developed.
 - Nathan Bodin stated that if the standard is one building entitlement per 40 acres, allowing this change could open the floodgates for sprawling development. He noted that Mr. DesMarais has been a good neighbor, but questioned what would prevent similar requests elsewhere, such as splitting an 80-acre parcel into multiple sites. He stated that the area is still far enough from Montrose to avoid such development and expressed concerns about the road.

- Scott Wald, who lives just to the east, stated that he is concerned about increased traffic from additional residents accessing County Road 107. He noted that he and others purchased property in the area as a retirement setting and do not want to see extensive development. While he would not oppose someone building on their property, he expressed concern about increased traffic.
- Kirby Moynagh, District 5 County Commissioner, asked Deckert to display the Montrose LUP map. He stated that the primary issue is that the property is currently agricultural and actively farmed; however, if the City's plan comes to fruition the area is designated for low-density residential development (2–3 acre lots), which would result in more than two homes. Moynagh acknowledged Mr. Bodin's concern that approving the request could open the door to increased density, such as a one-per-10-acre pattern in the area. Moynagh emphasized that this request is not for higher-density residential development, but rather for two homes, which he believes would be compatible with the area and would generate minimal additional traffic accessing County Road 107, compared to a significantly higher number under greater development. He felt that it would be inappropriate to deny the request solely based on the County's current LUP, noting that the County Board has recently begun discussions on updating the Plan, with an estimated timeline of 18–24 months. Given that, Moynagh suggested the property could be designated as transitional within the next one and a half to two years. He expressed concern that denying the request now, particularly based on the current LUP, would require the applicant to reapply and incur additional costs, despite acknowledgment that the Plan is outdated and that growth patterns may support inclusion of this area in the future. Mahlberg responded that while future planning context is informative, the Commission is being asked to act under current policy, not anticipated changes. He didn't feel that the Planning Commission has the same discretion as the County Board, which serves as the policy-making body. Moynagh agreed that Mahlberg may be correct and noted that the Commission is being placed in a position of interpreting potential future conditions. He also clarified that his earlier statement regarding the property's likely inclusion may have been overstated. Mahlberg acknowledged the thorough rationale provided by the Township and the value of understanding potential future development; however, he stated that the Commission must identify a defensible basis under current regulations to approve the request. He emphasized that the Commission's role is to apply existing standards, not speculate on future amendments to the Land Use Plan. Moynagh indicated that he understood this position.
- Dusty Finke, who lives to the northeast of the property and is a relative of the applicant, stated that he understands the need to identify a rare and unique circumstance to justify rezoning. He suggested that the property's designation as agricultural land, despite not being well-suited for agricultural use due to wetlands and the presence of a DNR ditch, could be considered such a circumstance. He explained that the physical characteristics of the property support the argument that it is not ideal for agriculture. He noted that this is not a large parcel being proposed for high-density development, but rather a substandard agricultural property that does not lend itself well to its current designation, which he believes is what makes it unique.
- Joe Hickman, Marysville Township Supervisor, stated that the original request was to split off 10 acres with one building entitlement while restricting the remainder, which was ultimately denied by the Board of Adjustment. He noted that denying that request did not make sense, as the Township already contains many small, restricted parcels. He emphasized the need for a comprehensive LUP update and expressed concern about setting precedent for additional entitlement requests. He clarified that some of his comments reflected personal opinion and reiterated that the Township's formal position was included in its written response.
- Richard Bodin questioned why the City of Montrose would be determining who receives a permit. He expressed support for township-level (grassroots) government and questioned the role of townships if their input is not being considered.

- D. DesMarais stated that his proposal is an effort to be a good steward of the property. He believes that limiting development to two homes is preferable to the potential for more intensive development in the future and views the land as poor agricultural ground due to the presence of waterways.
- E. Borrell responded to Commissioner Mahlberg's comments, stating that if the Commission does not have discretion in cases like this, its role is diminished. He noted that staff is capable of interpreting the Land Use Plan but emphasized the Commission's judgment role. He stated that the property is not in a remote area and is within the City of Montrose's long-range plan. He acknowledged the importance of preserving agriculture but suggested that development pressures are already shifting that dynamic, and the agriculture preservation train has left the station. Wilson responded that if the property is included in the City's plan but not the County's, a determination must be still be made. He emphasized that even marginal agricultural land still serves an agricultural purpose and stated that he does not yet see sufficient justification that the best use is residential development. He added that he feels Wright County should prioritize farmland preservation.
- F. Bravinder moved to continue the item to the May 7th meeting, for a site inspection and to allow the property owner to meet with the Commission and explain why he feels the property is rare and unique. Motion seconded by Holland.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **JASON CARLSON** – New

LOCATION: 675 BOLTON AVE SW - TR DESC IN BK 242-194 in Section 02, Township 119, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Marysville Twp.) Tax #211-000-023201. Property Owner: ELOUISE A CARLSON REVTR

Petitions to rezone the property referenced from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2), as regulated in Sections 155.028, 155.047, 155.048 & 155.057, Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Jason Carlson & Jerry Carlson

- A. Deckert explained the request is located in Marysville Township and involves the rezoning of approximately 50 acres from AG to A/R to allow for a four-lot subdivision. He noted the property is designated as Rural Residential in the Land Use Plan, which supports residential development. Deckert further explained that the proposed plan includes one driveway that may need to cross a floodplain or wetland, which can be addressed during the subdivision stage. He displayed and reviewed the Land Use Plan (LUP) map, zoning map, floodplain map, and a rough concept plan. He also displayed a map showing a 500-foot setback from an existing feedlot, noting that any new home must be located outside of that setback. It was noted the Township submitted recommendation of approval.
- B. Jason Carlson stated the property is identified in the LUP and acknowledged the restrictions related to the feedlot. He expressed confidence that they can work with Soil and Water on the driveway issue.
- C. Public Comment
- Eric Knudson stated he would prefer the property remain farmland and noted that Marysville Township is adamant about preserving land in the area. However, after speaking with neighbors, he noted they agree that if the land is not preserved as farmland, the A/R designation is acceptable.
 - Richard Phipps questioned whether the property could be further subdivided into smaller lots. He expressed concern that a developer could purchase all four lots and subdivide them further. He noted they moved to the area for privacy and space. Mol responded that future development cannot be predicted and that additional subdivision is a possibility. Deckert added that anyone may apply for further subdivision; however, all such requests would require review by the Planning Commission and County Board. Mahlberg reiterated that the current request would allow for lots no smaller than 10 acres.
- D. Bravinder stated he supports the request, noting it is consistent with the Land Use Plan and compatible with surrounding properties to the north and south.
- E. Wilson stated the request aligns with the Land Use Plan and is reasonable.
- F. Mahlberg noted that the criteria considered by the Commission for rezoning have been met and that the property is consistent with the Land Use Plan.
- G. Wilson moved to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners for rezoning from General Agriculture (AG) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2) because we find the property is aligned with the goals and policies of the US Highway 12 Corridor Land Use Plan. Motion seconded by Bravinder.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **CAROL LEE** – New

LOCATION: 4825 PITTMAN AVE SW – part of E1/2 OF SW1/4, Section 28, Township 119, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Cokato Twp.) Tax #205-000-283100. Property Owner: GALEN M & CAROL LEE

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a one-lot unplatted subdivision, as regulated in Sections 155.029 & 155.047 & 155.057, Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Carol Lee and Myron Klinkner

- A. Deckert reminded the Commission that the property was recently before them for the rezoning portion of the request and was approved to be rezoned to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) with a Residential-Recreational Shorelands District Overlay (S-2). This request is to divide off approximately 21.5 acres as a one-lot unplatted subdivision, with most of the property located below the ordinary high water mark of Brooks Lake. He noted the Township recommended approval based on the information submitted and that the request meets ordinance standards. Deckert then displayed and reviewed the aerial image and survey showing the proposed new lot.
- B. There were no comments from the applicant or the public.
- C. Bravinder noted that, at the Township level, the plans have not changed since they were originally reviewed, and further development on the property is unlikely due to the low-lying areas, which is why the Township approved the request. Bravinder then asked the applicant if she was aware of the Park Dedication Fee. Lee stated she was not, so Deckert explained the fee, noting that per the ordinance, a \$1,000 fee is required for each newly created lot. He clarified that, in this case, a \$1,000 fee would apply and that, if approved, staff would assist with the process. Lee acknowledged and indicated her understanding.
- D. Beise moved to approve a Conditional Use Permit for a one-lot unplatted subdivision according to the survey provided by Northstar Surveying, dated December 2025, Job Number 2025204, with the following conditions: 1) The park dedication shall be paid prior to transfer; 2) Transfer of the lot is required prior to permit issuance; 3) Access permits, if required, must be obtained from Cokato Township prior to the issuance of a building permit; 4) Tree removal, especially within the shore impact zone, must follow all Ordinance standards; 5) 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. Motion seconded by Holland.

DISCUSSION: Bravinder noted that the Township requires a permit for the driveway and that the applicant would need to contact the Township to review the process. Lee confirmed.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **MICHAEL KLEIN** – New

LOCATION: 13924 100TH ST NW - PRT OF NW1/4 SWLY OF SPRING BEACH AND SPRING BEACH 1ST LOT-003 BLOCK-002 in Section 14, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Lake Augusta - Southside Twp.) Tax #217-000-142205 & 217-052-002030. Property Owner: MICHAEL J KLEIN

Petitions for a Conditional Use Permit for a platted 2-lot residential subdivision, as regulated in Chapter 154 & Sections 155.029, 155.050 & 155.057, Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances and Subdivision Regulations.

Present: Michael Klein

- A. Deckert reminded the Commission that the property was rezoned in July 2025 to Suburban Residential (R-2) with the Residential-Recreational Shoreland District Overlay (S-2) on portions of the property located within 1,000 feet of Lake Augusta. He noted the request is essentially a reconfiguration of the existing two parcels into two buildable lots, one being 2.5 acres and the other 3.15 acres. The preliminary plat was displayed and reviewed.
- B. No comments from Klein, the public or the Commission members.
- C. Mahlberg motioned to approve a Conditional Use Permit for a two-lot platted subdivision in accord with the record of these hearings and the preliminary plat of East Valley View, completed by Meyer-Rohlin, File No. 25126, dated 12/09/2025, with the following conditions: 1) Prior to the filing of the final plat: a) the park dedication shall be paid with the other fees as noted on the plat check list; b) a title opinion is submitted and accepted by the County Attorney; 2) No construction may commence until the County Board has approved the final plat; 3) Access permits, if required, must be obtained from Southside Township prior to the issuance of a building permit; 4) Livestock is prohibited, except as allowed by the Wright County Code of Ordinances. Motion seconded by Borrell.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. **MARLON FEHN** – New

LOCATION: 6734 EDMONSON AVE NE - PRT OF E1/2 OF NW1/4&TH PRT OF SW1/4OF NE1/4 in Section 35, Township 121, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Monticello Twp.) Tax #213-100-352100. Property Owner: MARLON M FEHN &TERESE M FEHN

Petitions for an Interim Use Permit (IUP) to operate a non-commercial contractor's yard for a machinery moving and rigging business contained within a proposed 15,660 square foot building with an outdoor storage area between the home and the new building, as regulated in Sections 155.003(30), 155.031, 155.048 & 155.057, Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Marlon & Terese Fehn

- A. Deckert noted the request is for an IUP to operate a non-commercial contractor's yard for a moving and rigging business. The operation would be relatively small, with two employees, a large storage building, and some outdoor storage. He stated the Commission should consider items such as outdoor storage, noise, and screening. The Township recommended approval, and no other comments were received. Deckert then displayed and reviewed an aerial image of the property, along with the proposed site plan and building plans.
- B. M. Fehn stated they have two trucks and three trailers. The intent is to load and unload inside the building, with some storage located to the south of the building and under the lean-to.
- C. No comments from the public.
- D. Wilson stated the request appears to be a good use of the property and asked what would be stored outside. He expressed concern that the operation could expand over time and wanted to understand what would be stored indoors versus outdoors. He noted he does not want to see items brought to the site without a designated place for storage, resulting in them remaining on-site indefinitely. M. Fehn responded that the intent is for all items to be stored indoors or under the lean-to, with outdoor storage limited to trailers.
- E. Bravinder noted the ordinance requires screening adjacent to residential properties and asked about the tree line to the south. M. Fehn explained that during the summer, the trees provide effective screening. He also pointed out two sheds on the aerial photo that help block the view from the neighboring residence. He added that they have spoken with the adjacent property owners, who are supportive of the proposal.
- F. Beise noted he frequently travels past the property and believes the proposed use would be compatible with the surrounding area.
- G. Beise moved to approve an Interim Use Permit for a non-commercial contractor's yard in accord with the plans and narrative submitted and the discussion at the hearing, with the following conditions: 1) All work must be conducted off-site; 2) Exterior storage is limited to the location noted on the site plan; 3) The proposed commercial building must be permitted and receive a passing final inspection prior to the property being used for business purposes; 4) Any change in use or expansion would require an amended IUP; 5) Outdoor screening requirements must meet the requirements of section 155.078 of the Wright County Code of Ordinances, where applicable; 6) Township to review in one year, with subsequent reviews at an interval established by the Township; 7) This permit shall immediately and automatically expire upon transfer, termination of any lease agreement, change in business operations or ownership, or change in homestead classification. Motion seconded by Holland.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. **RANDALL ADICKES** – New

LOCATION: 6548 DAGUE AVE SE - PART OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 3, TOWNSHIP 118, RANGE 25, WRIGHT COUNTY, MINNESOTA (Franklin Twp.) Tax #208-200-033201. Property Owners: RANDALL J & KRISTINA M ADICKES

Petitions for Interim Use Permit (IUP) to operate an auto repair business within a new 2,000 square foot building, as regulated in Sections 155.031, 155.048 & 155.103, Chapter, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Randy Adickes

- A. Deckert explained the request is for an IUP to operate a small auto repair business out of a new, not yet constructed, 2,000-square-foot building. The use would be limited in scale, with one to two employees and typical daytime business hours. He noted the Township recommended approval and suggested the Commission discuss outdoor storage, the number of vehicles, and compliance with home-extended business standards.
- B. Mol questioned the number of vehicles that would be on the property. Adickes stated there could be anywhere from three to possibly a dozen vehicles outside at a time. He noted he cannot always control what a tow truck may drop off during closed hours, but he will manage it as best he can. Mol also asked if there was a plan for screening; Adickes stated there were no current plans for screening.
- C. No comments from the public.
- D. Bravinder questioned whether there was an established agreement with a towing company. Adickes stated there is not; however, it is possible for a towing company to drop off a vehicle for repairs without prior approval. When that occurs, he either has prior history with the customer or must wait for someone to contact him regarding the vehicle.
- E. Wilson moved to approve an Interim Use Permit for a Home Extended Business for auto repair in accord with the plans and narrative submitted and the discussion at the hearing, with the following conditions: 1) All conditions of section 155.103 of the Wright County Code of Ordinances must be followed; 2) The proposed commercial building must be permitted and receive a passing final inspection prior to the property being used for business purposes; 3) Township to review in one year, with subsequent reviews at an interval established by the Township; 4) This permit shall immediately and automatically expire upon transfer, termination of any lease agreement, change in business operations or ownership, or change in homestead classification. Motion seconded by Holland.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **REMLE HOLDINGS LLC** – New

LOCATION: 9423 DARROW AVE SE – Part of GOVERNMENT LOT 2 in Section 22, Township 118, Range 25, Wright County, MN. (Franklin Twp.) Tax #208-200-222401. Property Owner: REMLE HOLDINGS LLC

Petitions to amend an existing Interim Use Permit (IUP) for a riding academy with equine-assisted services to allow for services to occur within a new proposed barn building instead of existing barn, expand pasture areas, and add a walking trail, as regulated in Sections 155.003(121), 155.031, 155.048 & 155.057, Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Caryn Brakenridge (Conscious Counseling Solutions, LLC & Conscious Cornerstones, LLC) and Andy Elmer (Remle Holdings LLC)

- A. Deckert explained that the request is to amend an existing IUP for an equine-assisted therapy operation. The applicant is proposing to shift operations into a new barn, expand pasture areas, and add a walking trail, with the overall use and scale remaining essentially the same. He noted the request is generally consistent with the ordinance, with considerations related to traffic, noise, and site layout. The site plan and building plans were displayed and reviewed. Deckert noted the Township approved the request.
- B. Elmer noted the walking trail already exists but was not included in the previous IUP approval, so they want to ensure it is formally incorporated into the permit. He explained that, from a business perspective, nothing has changed. The original plan was to use the existing barn, but after receiving renovation estimates, it was determined that constructing a new barn would be a better investment.
- C. There were no comments from the public.
- D. Mol reminded the Commission that they had visited the site last fall. He asked if there were any questions or concerns; none were raised.
- E. Bravinder moved to approve an amendment to the previously issued Interim Use Permit for a riding academy with equine-assisted services, in accordance with the discussion, plans, and description held on file, with the following conditions: 1) Proper building and change of use permits be obtained, inspections passed, and a certificate of occupancy issued prior to clients being allowed inside any structures; 2) Days and hours of operations are limited to Monday through Thursday, 9 am to 7:00 pm, Fridays from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, and Saturday and Sunday, 9:00 am to 4 pm; 3) Limited weekend hours and occasional small group events from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm, not to exceed 24 weekend days per calendar year; 4) Due to being in the Shoreland District, property is limited to 9.99 animal units; 5) Any change in use or expansion requires an amended Interim Use Permit hearing; 6) This permit shall expire upon transfer of the property, termination of any lease agreement, or change in business ownership or operations; 7) Township review shall be combined with the 2025 IUP approval and be conducted a year from this approval, with subsequent reviews at an interval established by the Township. Motion seconded by Holland.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. **FINAL PLAT APPROVAL - The Enclave at Lake Ida**

- A. With no discussion, Beise moved to approve the final plat of The Enclave at Lake Ida (Silver Creek Twp.) and authorize the Chairman's signature. Motion seconded by Borrell.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE INSPECTION

The Board scheduled a site inspection for Wednesday, April 26, 2026 with the Commission to meet at 8:30 a.m. at the Government Center.

Meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Deckert
Assistant Planning & Zoning Administrator
SD: sld

cc: Planning Commission, Twp. Clerks