MEETING MINUTES
POPE COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION
Thursday April 28, 2022

The Planning Advisory Commission convened in regular session on Thursday, April 28, 2022 at the Pope County Courthouse, 3rd floor Meeting Room.

Members Present: John Messenger (C), Ivie Cooley (VC), Mark Halls, Roger Isdahl, Ron Feigum, Ted Kannegiesser, Larry Lindor (County Commissioner) and alt Paul Gerde (County Commissioner)

Other Officials Present: David Green and Jessica Hill (Land & Resource Management, staff)

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Messenger at 6:04 p.m. with the following items being addressed by the chair:

Additions and Corrections to the Agenda
There were no additions or corrections to the agenda

Review minutes of March 24, 2022
The minutes of the Planning Advisory Commission meeting held on Thursday, March 24th, 2022 were submitted for approval. Motion by Lindor to accept the minutes as written. Motion seconded by Feigum. Motion carried with no dissenting votes noted.

General Business
Director Green states that there are several handouts relating to Carrying Capacity and lake development that is available for reference. The items are not complete reports but they could be looked up online if there was any interest.

Tabled/Old/Other Business:
There was no tabled or old business to act upon.

New Business
PUD/CUP-RV Park Proposal, applicant David Schirmers

Chairman Messenger introduces the item followed by staff report as presented by Director Green. Staff concludes with a recommendation of tabling the item until further information is presented from the applicant. Questions from the Planning Commission to staff include:

Cooley asks why the campground is positioned close to the lake on the parcel. Director Green responds by indicating it is not abnormal for a shoreland property owner to position their home or resort, as it may be, as close to the lake as possible so as to have a nice view of the amenity. *Cooley* asks what the setback to the city limits are. Director Green indicates city setbacks are unknown at this time. *Cooley* asks what will happen to the tree lines on the property. Director Green explains Schirmers has not yet indicated the number of trees he would like to remove as of yet and that the Planning Commission may inform this number.

Halls asks how much shoreline the applicant has. Land & Resource Management staff Jessica Hill, utilizing GIS mapping tools, measures approximately 560 feet. *Halls* points out that he owns a fifty-foot-wide lot on Lake Gilchrist, and that if this area of Lake Villard had fifty-foot-wide lots then the potential total number of docks or mooring sites would be similar to that of the calculated 11 mooring sites based on the PUD standards.

Cooley asks can someone request an EAW? Director Green responds, yes it can be citizen initiated, however the EAW must show specific environmental impacts are plausible. Director Green goes on to explain the EAW process.

Isdahl asks what zoning districts are present on the applicants site? Director Green responds, Shoreland-Recreational Development and Non-Intensive Agriculture. Within the S-RD zoning district a campground is an identified conditional use.

Commissioner Lindor states, if the application meets the ordinance and statutes, the Planning Commission does not have a way of looking at it in the context of if the public opposes? Director Green responds that the Planning Commission needs to have a bases of denial, the vote is not based on a popularity contest. Director Green goes on to explain the appeal process.

Cooley asks further clarification regarding the EAW process in regard to the shoreline. Director Green states the MN DNR would likely be the Responsible Government Unit (RGU) and that the MN DNR also regulates cattails and what you are able to remove.

The applicant was not in attendance to defend the application.

Chairman Messenger opens the Public Hearing and seeks comments from members of the public who are in attendance. There were no citizens in attendance that spoke in support of the proposal. The following citizens presented their concerns with the proposed development:

Glen Ross posed a question regarding how the RV park would be taxed. He commented on increased jet ski and boating activities on the lake and on potential impact to bull rush vegetation in the area where mooring or docks may be placed. He also questioned whether or not the RV park could get more docking sites.

Terry Albers commented on potential impacts to the lake as a result of another RV park and questioned whether there would be a separate well for the RV park.

Clifford Timm, worried about erosion from the trail down to the lake and exactly how many trees and bushes would be impacted.

Cheryl Pachan I came to the lake for my peace and relaxation. The lake is more populated and is dangerous for our kids. Are they going to be building steps down to the lake? This type of development will impact fisheries. Proposal is being irresponsible. She also stated that she was worried as to who would be providing enforcement.

Craig Lindman stated that he had been living on this lake for the past 55 years and commented about a road project that resulted in loss of access to Lake Amelia. He argued that there was a property value loss as a result of the project. He pointed out the density of development relating to Canary Beach resort and the Thorfinson's sites and their combined impact to water activities. He said that there is already too much pressure on the fishing habitat. He pointed out that the access to the RV park, as proposed, is on a fairly sharp curve and that it would lead to a disaster.

Jeanne Boettcher stated that they had just built a new home on the lake a few years ago. She pointed out that it is already crowded on the lake and is concerned that more jet ski and boating use will create a dangerous situation. She also pointed out that there were a lot of lily pads and weeds in the area where mooring may be located and that would be sure to impact where everyone fishes.

David Guindon stated that he had been on the lake for 35 years. He pointed out that the area where the mooring may take place is a fish spawning area. He said that those on the lake now are aware of this and take precaution to avoid impacting the area. However, if the mooring sites were located there that there would be boats going in and out of the area and tearing it up. He questioned where would the spawning area be relocated to.

The public hearing portion of the meeting concluded at 7:06 pm.

The Site Team (Messenger and Kannegiesser) report on their findings stating that based on their perception of the topography that stormwater runoff shouldn't have a direct impact on the lake. After the site team report there was more questioning from the PAC members. Cooley comments that she is concerned that there is nothing that prevents the owner from seeking additional sites in the future. She referenced a recently acted upon proposal relating to an RV park located on the southside of Lake Minnewaska. Cooley also points out her concern with some discrepancies in the proposal and has more questions but there is lacking some specific information.

Commissioner Lindor makes a motion to table action on the issue until the next (May) meeting of the Planning Commission. This motion is seconded by Feigum and is subsequently supported by a unanimous vote of all members.

<u>Proposed Zoning Map Amendment -</u> NW, NW, SE, Section 9, Township 125 Range 37 Glenwood township

Director Green presents a summary of the proposed zoning map amendment which is initiated by staff. The facts include that a welding and fabrication shop has been in existence on this parcel predating the adoption of county wide zoning in 1999 at which time the area was designated as an agricultural zoning district. The zoning district directly west is commercial and directly east is City of Glenwood. There are mining operations located southwest of this parcel. The change in zoning will not necessarily change any existing land use patterns. It will make the current land use on parcel 09-0275-002 conforming. A public hearing was noticed for this issue. There were

no members of the public in attendance. Discussion ensued including questions from Halls regarding the loss of agriculturally zoned lands. It was explained that in this case that the zoning change would not change the existing use and that it was not likely that it would ever revert back to agricultural use. The site team (Messenger and Kannegiesser) weighed in and stated that the current use was industrial in nature and that the zoning change seemed appropriate. With no further question, motion is made by Isdahl to recommend approval of the proposed zoning map amendment. The motion is seconded by Kannegiesser. The motion is supported by majority vote of all members. Opposed by Halls.

Adjournment 7:33 p.m. Chairperson Messenger seeks motion to adjourn the Planning Advisory Commission meeting. Motion to adjourn is offered by Commissioner Lindor with a second by Kannegiesser. Motion carried with no dissenting votes noted.

Respectfully submitted,

David Green/Director
Pope County Land & Resource Management