

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT / PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
May 14, 2019
7:00 PM

Guck called meeting to order at 7:00pm on May 14, 2019

Board of Adjustment/Planning Commission Members Present: Al Guck, Larry Smith, Steve Niklaus, Dick Naaktgeboren, Ben Oleson (Zoning Administrator)

Absent: Barry Schultz, Bill Arendt

Other in Attendance: Andy Stahlman, Paul & Patty Gustafson, Evan Carlson, James Evens, Deb Evens, Randy & Cindy Stevens, Shirley burke, Harlan Anderson, Deb Kutzner, April & Roy Miller, Mark Miller, Paul & Lisa Steffens, Diane Wiltermuth, Brad... Leo Kill, Michael Miller

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda; Smith made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Public Hearings

(Tabled from April 9 meeting) Requests related to the construction of a community solar garden consisting of approximately 7,000 panels on approx. 8 acres of land. Approvals required include an interim use permit for the construction of a solar energy farm.

Applicant: IPS Solar

Property Owner: Cory and Hazel Schueler

Property address: None

Sec/Twp/Range: 9-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000092401

Present: Evan Carlson, Andy Sullivan

Carlson: We have been though this you asked us to come back with a screening plan so that is what we did. Plan. We added in the places we discussed, we have a staggered row of pine trees six feet in height when they are planted with and additional row of dogwood. That is the thickest screening area we can provide. This should block the view from the road & property to the west.

Oleson: That is the reason it was tabled was for the screening plan. They have done that for all of the south and part of the east. There is a list of recommended conditions if it was to be approved in your staff report. The only one changed was the screening plan having to implement within 30 days of the solar panels installation or Sept. 15th.

Audience: Brad Lantto: I own the property to the north, I don't want to look at it. **Roy Miller:** I am the house next to it we don't want to look at it, and have concern with land value. **April Miller:** I just want to add that we put a lot of work into our property and I do not know what that will it do to our property values and I do not want to look at it. **Mike Miller:** Just want you to remember that 60 days ago you denied one that is 1000 feet from it. Your verbiage was it would deter property values and recreational use.

Niklaus: The one thing that stood out to me is the 7ft tall chain link fence with barbwire on top. Is that all the way around?

Carlson: Yes. The electrical code requires it, the barbwire is not required. The property values is not really an issue we got into a lot of detail on at the last meeting. We have a lot of evidence to show that it does not decrease the property value. We have gone out of our way to make sure we are providing screening to the land owner to the west. I do not see anyone else that has a direct line of site to the solar farm. There has been studies done indicating values did not change. Part of the reason is that you have something that promotes wildlife and you don't have further development. The land owner has made a choice to pursue a solar farm so that they can continue to own the property and they have some property rights and it is very important that the board considers the property owners rights.

Niklaus: The land owner has a lot of natural screening already. The tree's your planning on putting there, how tall are they.

Carlson: 6 ft

Niklaus: The barbwire gives the look of a concentration camp. I would like the barbwire to go.

Carlson: We could remove that, it would be behind the screening. So hopefully you will not see that.

Naaktgeboren: I feel the entire east side has to be screened not just half way.

Smith: Again, I have not been in favor. I would like to screening all the way around if it is approved.

Guck: I go back to the initial thought of the land use and to preserve Ag land as much as we can. I do not feel this fits that.

Carlson: We are using Ag land for non-agricultural purpose, however, it does preserve ag land for other agricultural uses in the future. There are lots of other ways that land owners to get a profit from there land such as development. This will preserve it for 25 years with natural growth.

Guck: Initially you were in the back, but could not do that due to cost and wanting to use fewer poles. First you said you could not do screening, now you can do it.

Carlson: At this point we are subsidizing this project with other projects that are other more profitable. It is a project that is still worth doing.

Guck: Why wouldn't you get together and do them all in one spot?

Sullivan: Legally we cannot do that. We cannot work any other developers within a mile. Just to be clear about the location of the array. It was preferred from the property owners to be in the south end rather than the back.

Carlson: Not sure if the others have the interconnection agreement and this is the one that has the interconnection agreement with Xcel. I don't want to get lost with hypothetical projects. Once this one is in you may be blocking any others that come in.

Oleson: So when Wright County adopted the ordinance they called them Interim uses with a 30 year life span on them, because of the state law that states we have to be as restrictive as Wright County we adopted the ordinance. We already had some language that called out for Interim uses and so instead of calling them conditional uses we call them interim uses. Once part of the ordinance allows for 30 years and one part that talks about interim uses generally will be granted for five years and then could be extended, there is some aspect as to the change in ownership, if the change in ordinance would occur and they are not permitted anymore it would start a clock of two years that they would have to remove the solar farm from the property. When we developed that part we did not have solar farms in mind since we did not have them at the time. So as of right now we have conflicting information. If approved as an

interim use and give it 30 years we still have something that could trigger the solar farm to be removed prior to the 30 years.

Niklaus: If approved it could box others out what does that mean?

Sullivan: It would be due to the capacity of the lines.

Niklaus: Do they need to be along major trunks?

Carlson: They need to be on three phase lines in Xcel's service territory. It has to be in a suitable area and there are not a whole lot of suitable areas.

Niklaus: I bring this up since this is the third one in a row.

Carlson: They may try, but I will not be back again. I feel we have satisfied the ordinance and gone the extra distance with the screening.

Mark Miller: My only thing is that there was one that was voted down, because they do not want to drive by it. They can't see it from their house they just did not want to drive by it. Now you have one that you have property owner's right next to it and they don't want it. To me this is not any different than the one they already turned down.

Carlson: There is an ordinance in place and we have satisfied the ordinance.

April Miller: As the property owner right next door, no one has personally contacted us until today.

Sullivan: The last time I was here I gave me everyone my card and I have made several phone calls trying to reach out.

Carlson: You cannot deny one because another was denied, we satisfied the ordinance.

Guck: It comes back to land use. If we cannot get a motion maybe we need to table it.

Sullivan: You are the ones that told us that we need to do the south and east side and that is what we did. You keep changing your mind.

Oleson: So you're going to table for more screening? Or you could approve with whatever amount of screening you want to see. If you are going to deny you may want to table for findings.

Guck made a motion to table based on neighbors don't like it, its and eye soar, its contrary to our land use and the screening is not proper.

Carlson: What do you need me to come back with?

Guck: Full screening plan to the east and north.

Carlson: So if we come back with that you will approve if screening is sufficient? This is the screening you asked me to provide last time so I can bring back additional screening details. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests related to the construction of a partial second story above the existing dwelling. Approvals required include variances for the expansion of an existing dwelling that is located approximately 10.1 feet from a side lot line (minimum 15 feet required) and approximately 68 feet from Sugar Lake (minimum 75 feet required).

Applicant: Randall Stevens

Property address: 11312 Hoyer Ave NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 2-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206091000080

Present: Randy & Jenny Stevens

Stevens: We are trying to get a little more space in the house to get more comfortable. House was built in 1973, not sure what the setbacks were at the time, we have no control over that so our thought is to go up.

Oleson: In terms of the addition it would be across the lake side part of the side with a porch to the back. Variances required is due to the house being 10ft from the side lot line, this would not go any closer than that, however, it is going up so it is an expansion. Lake set back to the deck is 51ft. Impervious is under the 25% and they are not adding to that. This is an older survey so as long as it is still correct they will be under.

Audience: Lisa Steffens: We posted comments out on the website, our concern is not with the design. The design is lovely, I'm sure it will look great. The fact that it is taking that house up it is very elaborate, when you look at the drawing it looks like it is part of the house, but, because the roof is getting lifted, every side of the house will be changing. Our concern was we have been there five years and there is a deck and a patio south side that is 2-3 ft from our property and flowers right on our property line. Our thought is that, it is difficult when we have people over or they do it just makes it uncomfortable when it is that close to our lot line. So our request was that they could take that deck and patio to at least the 10ft setback. They have to remove some of the concrete for the porch anyways so we thought it would be a good time to remove it all. Our experience has been when remodeling that things may need to be replaced and they may have to replace the deck anyways before they go up. **Paul Steffens:** I have done some construction and remodeling the place next to them and have found that typically under doors and decks there are rotting rib joints, so thinking they would want to make sure they are good before putting a second story on. If the deck is going to be redone, maybe they could shift it over. **Lisa Steffens:** We do not care about the impervious or the additional square footage we just care about the setbacks and gaining some additional privacy on that side. The other thing we would add is that when we got there five years ago it was very quiet, it is busier now, that is great that their family come to visit, however, we have noticed the difference with the noise. **Paul Steffens:** We were hoping that with them getting the variance they are getting something out of this and maybe they could give something back.

Paul Gustafson: We live on the Northside of the property. We would prefer that you implement proposal to get the house further from the lake and get to the 15ft setback on both sides of the house. That would be our preferred request. Understanding that is probably not going to happen. Because of the garage construction that we have a start and an end date of the construction. With the chimney on the northside of the house that they do to a gas fireplace so they do not have the chimney extension. To me with today's environment they go to gas. I do have a concern with where the construction material is going and how that will be taken care of. I want to make sure they are on their property. There was discussion the impervious, with many visitors there are areas with parking and will that become part of the driveway. The drainfield is in that area too so I feel all of that should be included.

Smith: Have you checked if the foundation will support.

Stevens: Yes we did do that. The architect has been out and checked the foundation.

Smith: I am looking at the concrete from the proposed garage to the new addition. Do you have an idea how you would run that over to your concrete area and your deck? Have you talked about moving that? The walkway area.

Stevens: We plan on keeping that the same. There would be a step to the addition.

Smith: The one thing is that you need to make sure you are staying under 25% impervious.

Stevens: That was the main reason for moving the garage, we were over and we were on the property line. So we wanted to correct those items.

Smith: Would you consider changing the deck.

Stevens: We never considered it up until it was brought to our attention on Saturday. We did not realize it was a problem. It is not something we thought of before until we were

approached. I appreciate wanting to maintain the 10ft setback, but there is a shed that is basically on the property line too so that is a little inconsistent.

Smith: Maybe it would be nice to consider that.

Stevens: We do enjoy that deck, we have a larger family and we like to have the kids and grandkids come out to visit. Sorry if they feel it's too noisy we will try to keep it down.

Paul Steffens: There is a lot of room to the north side of the home so moving it I think it could be just as big as it is now. There are certain times I feel I cannot run my lawn mower since I am only 2ft from the property line. At times we feel like were intruding on them.

Dick: Your encroaching on both sides and that is what I looked at when I was out there. You are so close to the neighbors.

Stevens: Just noting we took into consideration with the remodel. We have not had time to sit down and look what could be done. It was something sprung on us at the end.

Dick: The plan is good with me, I would consider you moving the deck over or cutting it off. I am thinking that has to be done.

Paul Steffens: This is a onetime thing, I think for the enjoyment for both of us

Niklaus: From our stand point we are looking at the setbacks of 10ft where it should be 15ft & 51ft where it should be 75ft.

Oleson: Yes it would be both side yard and lake setbacks that is what the variance is for.

Niklaus: What is being asked for are currently in existence.

Oleson: Correct it is not getting any closer just higher.

Niklaus: And the height does not block the view for either neighbor?

Paul Gustafson: The increase in height as shown and the chimney will change the view of the lake from the south side of our house.

Stevens: The chimney is actually being taken down.

Guck: My thoughts are with the side yard setback. Does the request seem unreasonable?

Stevens: I mean you get a little shocked that after five years they determine they didn't do their due diligence of their part when buying. I guess we are just so comfortable with the way the house is. That is the way it bought from the grandparents and it was never an issue and now it is an issue. I guess were just shocked.

Guck: Is that a side door?

Stevens: That is coming off.

Smith: I am assuming you are redoing the deck?

Stevens: We were going to just maintain the deck.

Oleson: One thing is that when you add conditions to a variance approval, the condition has to do with the variance they are asking for. So if you feel that the second story addition and the three season porch are somehow created and impact to make them move the patio, I think that you need to be clear, otherwise it would just be a request. If the deck is going to be moved to the other side of the house to compensate for that, it too would then need a variance.

Smith: If he was going to do any work to the deck, such as having to replace supports or footing they would need a permit for that?

Oleson: It would have to be a separate variance or you could approve that now indicating a certain sq ft or it couldn't be closer to the lake.

Stevens: We were not planning on doing anything to the deck besides replacing a few boards.

Lisa Steffens: I just want to make it clear, Randy had made a comment that all the sudden this came up. It's not so much it was all the sudden, it's that we didn't see the plans until they got posted. We did not realize how elaborate it was. Once we show how elaborate it was it does connect the two. That porch is new space and the whole side of the house is going up a story. If

you are going to make that change it is connected. It is the give and take, you are going up and you should have to offset it somehow. The other thing is that it is a lot more active over there. A year ago it was pretty quiet, and just an issue as it becomes more active. We don't mind the noise it's a privacy thing.

Niklaus made a motion to approve the Variances for the expansion of an existing dwelling that is located approximately 10.1 feet from a side lot line (minimum 15 feet required) and approximately 68 feet from Sugar Lake (minimum 75 feet required).

Smith seconded the motion.

Naaktgeboren: I still would like to see with the motion we could take the footage on the south side and put on the lake side.

Niklaus: I agree that would be nice, but I don't see that is within our prerogative to do that. Nothing is being done to the existing, the variance is already there. I think that is an overreach on our part.

Lisa Steffens: The porch, the cement work under the porch is getting torn up so that is impacting the patio. **Paul Steffens:** the way I see it is as a give and take thing. We will give you the variance to expand with in the setbacks in turn we would like to see you give something back and try to correct something in the past. This is chance to correct. If it does not happen now it will more than likely never happen in my life time.

Guck: Is this something you want to discuss further?

Gustafson: There was mention about the purchase of the house, the couple in front of you have been guests at that house for many years and saw where that was, and the purchase of the house happened very recently, and so now its weather the garage thing or what they are doing now the neighbors get very little advance notice. So we got this opportunity only a few days ago when they published them just like when the garage was done. This is our only opportunity to change something that has been that way for a long time and to allow them to get what they want and allow us what we would like to have happen.

Niklaus: I understand the opinion of both sides, it is just a question of us either approve or deny.

Stevens: If we could move it back two feet. Would that make a difference?

Oleson: Even if the addition meets the setback it would still need a variance for an expansion. If you want them at 15ft you could make that a condition of the approval.

Niklaus: I do not think it is our role to try and mediate what is wanted in the neighborhood. I have made my motion and there was a second.

Motion was made and seconded. Motion approved 3-1. Guck opposed.

Requests related to the construction of a 45 x 260 mini-storage building. Approvals required include a variance for the construction of a structure approximately 135 feet from the centerline of a state highway (minimum 160 feet required).

Applicant: Leo Kill

Property Owner: Andrew Freeman/ American Mini-Storage LLC

Property address: 9754 State Highway 55 NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 33-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000332201

Present: Leo Kill

Kill: We have room for a third building in there. All the buildings were set at 135ft and the new setbacks seem to be 160ft and we think the state setback may be 180ft. We are not exactly sure

what they should be, however, we would like to variance have the setback the same as the other buildings.

Oleson: This one got kind of complicated. Couple different things going on. Originally the variance was due to our ordinance states they need to be 160ft back from the center of the highway. In 2005 the County created a map at the request of MNDOT to preserve land for possible future expansion. According to Sean Riley they were trying to keep buildings out of that area so if they ever did expand there would not be buildings that would need to be an issue. The line varies up and down the highway, however in this location it is about 180ft.

Kill: I may be able to make 160ft work, but 180 ft would be too far. The buildings all sit 25ft apart.

Oleson: Normally for zoning setbacks you would hear the request. Because this is part of the Wright County Official map and not part of their zoning ordinance there is a question as to who handles this variance request. This is before us, I talked to Sean Riley to see who should be handling and have not received an answer. So regardless who grants the variance, there in language that states who ever grants the variance it starts a 6 month waiting period before you can start building. That 6months is to give MNDOT a chance to decide if they want to purchase that area. I think what we can do tonight is you could table or treat it like your granting a variance with maybe a condition in there pending legal opinion or MN DOT. We did get feedback from MNDOT and they did not mention anything about expansion only no additional access to Hwy 55, so they apparently are not opposed.

Niklaus made a motion to approve variance for the construction of a structure approximately 135 feet from the centerline of a state highway (minimum 160 feet required) with the following conditions:

1. That any concerns from MN DOT are addressed to the satisfaction of MN DOT staff.
2. That a variance must also be granted to Wright County's TH 55 Official Map which currently prohibits buildings to be constructed within about 175 feet of the centerline of the State Highway.

Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests related to the construction of a 12 ft x 30 ft addition to an existing dwelling and the replacement of a 10 ft x 14 ft screen porch. Approvals required include variances to construct a dwelling addition that will be approximately 3.5 feet from a side lot line (minimum 15 feet required) and attached to a dwelling that is approximately 70 feet from Clearwater Lake (minimum 75 feet required) and approximately 29 feet from the top of a bluff (minimum 30 feet required).

Applicant: James and Debra Evens

Property address: 9633 Keats Ave NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 16-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206031000260

Present: James & Debra Evens

Evens: We have a building built in 1962 we are trying to bring it up to code and put a little addition on it. We want to put in a new well so need a place for the pump and water heater.

Oleson: The variance is due to the side yard setback, because of the angled property line it gets about 3.5 ft on the one side, the other side is 14ft. These are all approximate, we do not have a

survey yet at this point. The bluff is just under the 30ft required to the existing deck and he is currently 70ft from the lake, however, the addition is to the back.

Evans: We are looking at redoing the porch roof, so it will be the same footprint just the roof line would be different.

Audience: None

Dick: You are close on the north side yard setback, however, my concern is going closer than you are now. I would like to make sure you are not any closer.

Evans: I do not have a problem with that, My question would be can the roof line come out and just move the building back a little?

Dick: I think the roof line should follow the building. I do not have a problem with anything else.

Niklaus: I am good with what Dick said.

Smith: I am good with that. Are you doing new footings?

Evans: Yes, I'm not sure there are footing there now.

Guck: The septic is good?

Oleson: Yes

Guck: I am ok with it.

Oleson: you do not want it to go any closer than the existing foot print if you want then to get a survey.

Naaktgeboren made a motion to approve variances to construct a dwelling addition that will be no closer to the side lot lines than the existing dwelling - approximately 5 feet (minimum 15 feet required) and attached to a dwelling that is approximately 70 feet from Clearwater Lake (minimum 75 feet required) and approximately 29 feet from the top of a bluff (minimum 30 feet required). The addition shall be approximately 12'x 30' except that it must be downsized as needed to meet the required setback with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant submits a survey of the property providing the exact setbacks of the existing and proposed buildings to the side lot lines, the lake and the top of the bluff.
2. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.
3. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of rainwater from the lot prior to it flowing into the lake. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, establishing or maintaining a buffer of native vegetation along the shoreline, or other acceptable best management practices. Once approved, the plan should be implemented at the time of construction or within a reasonable time period after construction is completed and maintained indefinitely.

Smith seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Lot line adjustment to add approximately 160 square feet to parcel 206091000070 from 206091000050.

Applicant: Paul and Lisa Steffens/Wilma B. Grant Trust

Property address: 11300 Hoyer Ave NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 2-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206091000070

Present: Paul & Lisa Steffen

Steffens: We are looking at it up by the road take a little pie shape and move from the Grants property to our property. The goal is getting us to the 20,000 sq ft in the hopes of expanding our garage. We do not have plans drawn yet, but know we want to make it larger.

Oleson: The reason it is before you is that it is a lot line adjustment. Like she said is to get to 20,000 sq ft so they can expand their garage. That will be a separate application and they will have to work on some impervious issues. This is just for the lot line adjustment.

Steffens: We are going to look at redoing most of the yard, I included a picture of what we are thinking of doing.

Oleson: In this case their lot is expanding so their impervious will get better and Grants will still be under.

Audience: None

Steve: I'm good.

Dick: So you are going to rebuild the same size?

Steffen: It will be larger, however, moved away from the side yard.

Smith: Is now the time to reduce the impervious?

Oleson: Not at this time, it would be addressed with the proposal to build a garage.

Steve moved to approve Lot line Adjustment to add approximately 160 square feet to parcel 206091000070 from 206091000050.

Naakgeboren seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Amendment to various parts of Section 6 (Zoning Districts and District Provisions) and Section 762 (Solar Energy Farms and Solar Energy Systems) of the Corinna Township Land Use Ordinance to prohibit solar energy farms in all zoning districts.

Applicant: Corinna Township

Oleson: We formed a sub-committee which was a couple planning members and town board member to talk about solar farms. They met and the recommendation from the committee was to prohibit solar farms. So that is the recommendation from them. What is in front of you is a draft that would do that. Anything existing or already approved would start the two year clock unless we change that section to allow for any already approved solar farms to continue there for the full 30 year term. So there are a couple of things to consider. One is to go with the recommendation of the sub-committee and to ban them. The other option is to ban any new ones but to allow any approved ones to continue for the 25-30 years or you could do something different such allowing them with additional. Restrictions. You can actually recommend changes to the ordinance tonight or you can table for more discussion or. Just as a reminder we are on a moratorium and that lasts for up to a year.

Audience:

Carlson: My question would be does your ordinance ban any other uses that may be more annoying to others, such as chicken coops, hog barns, if not why solar farms. I feel it is treating us unfairly compared to other uses in the area, they are not that bad, their quiet, they do not make any sound, it's a good way to preserve agricultural land, It's a good way for farms to make money, sometimes were saving the family farm. To me should not be treated any differently than any other uses that could be more annoying. There no exclusion for hog barns or feed lots. We're trying to do silent, order less solar farm. Solar Farms in MN have demonstrated a good track record. Environmentally unfair to the solar farm industry.

Guck: Is that correct as far as other things that are ban?

Oleson: There is a list that are allowed without a public hearing, and then others are listed with needing a Conditional Use or Interim use with time limits on them. Anything that is not listed is prohibited so there are lots of things prohibited, just not listed out.

Niklaus: So a feed lot of 499 animals do not need a Cup?

Oleson: There are standards that they have to meet, the County addresses those issues.

Carlson: I would like to see solar farms under the CUP section. The 5 year reapplication process, who would finance a project that might be dead after 5 years. Who will spend one to two million on a project that could be gone in 5 years? We need to be in operation for the duration of the contract. You're treating feed lots better than your treating solar gardens. I think it would be fair to move solar to conditional like the other uses.

Sullivan: I have a comment on the agricultural portion. There have been many studies done about what solar could do compared to other things that could be produced on the land, ethanol being one example. Solar produces something between 20 times to 100 times the amount of energy per acre than other fuel like ethanol.

Guck: There only 18% efficient correct?

Carlson: That means were collecting 18% of the sun light. It's not 18% of the efficiency of any other electron generated.

Smith: Why aren't people putting them on their house?

Carlson: We are working on that. If you want to work in energy in MN you are talking solar that is what we have in MN. It is 4 to 20 times more efficient than ethanol per acres. Are you actually expressing banning solar or are you talking excluding it from interim and conditional uses?

Oleson: If it is not listed it is prohibited.

Carlson: Is the proposed draft expressly banning it?

Oleson: We don't have a list of what is banned we just do not list as a permitted use.

Sullivan: This was passed by the state in 2013 because not everyone has means to install on their house. These projects serve Xcel and they credit homeowners, condo owners, and a business. Most of the people that benefit from these are cities, townships and schools. The idea is that this is access to solar and clean energy and a break on energy cost.

Smith: I wish the whole township had Xcel energy and then maybe I would look at this differently. It is really a small part of our township.

Guck: The local school district runs right past this, has that been looked at.

Niklaus: The school does have solar.

Diane Wiltermuth: As a property owner of this township I would love to hear what the justification is to ban solar farms. It is the way the world is going. We are Wright Hennepin they have lots of them. I do not find them offensive.

Carlson: People would not lease to us if they did not want to do it. Yes you have people that are opposed to it. That is not a reason to deny, you have people opposed to a feed lot and any number of things that are allowed.

Harlan Anderson: I'm from Cokato Township. I was on the moratorium committee when Wright County had a moratorium. I think that it went well and they did a good job of writing the ordinance. One thing I heard earlier was about the cleanup, they put a lot of money into Wright County Treasurer for the cleanup. When they get done with it, everything will be cleanup. I have one on my farm, I see it, I'm proud of it. I requested they not put a screening. I'm a farmer and raise a lot of corn and beans. I do not support ethanol it is the most expensive crop I raise. With my solar farm I tell people it is a fenced in area with funny looking sheep in it and from a mile away you don't even see it. My experience is very positive. I have not had any complaints and it not screened. What questions do you have? I was on the solar committee, I have a solar farm you can ask me any questions.

Guck: What's the closest neighbor are you the only neighbor? Any lakes in the area?

Anderson: Brooks Lake is on the corner of my property. Closest neighbor is 800ft. Neighbors did not object. They thought it was a healthier, safer and not offensive.

Naaktgeboren: I can see why a farmer would want to have one. It is guaranteed money. There are payoffs for everything here.

Carlson: There is a tax credit.

Dick: According to the paper the rate payers are picking up the tab to pay for the solar, is that true?

Sullivan: All of the solar farms that we are applying for right now are under a brand new tariff called a value of solar. It has been highly contentious and highly studied deal where Xcel wants to explain where they value the solar at. Other people are representing what the solar is worth to them. They had to come to an agreement so we know exactly what Xcel will be paying for this energy and the idea is that it will break even for them. It is not costing them nor are they making a profit.

Niklaus: I do like the concept of solar, it's clean and quiet. I drive by the ones in Big Lake, I choose to drive by it, you didn't live there first and now it you are coming and setting them up by someone's home. I think some ground work at the beginning would have been helpful. There is a difference between driving by and me being here first and now having to look at it for 25 years. I would like to see some nice screening.

Anderson: We did a lot of leg work, so you are correct up front work is good.

Sullivan: We have attempted to do that all across the state with a lot of success and I did reach out to Roy numerous times and I stayed after last meeting to talk with him and his parents and they vocalized they were fine with it as long as we screened that first path and when I talked with him today and it was ok with it.

Carlson: It's kind of hard when they say they would be ok with it if it was on their property but it's not.

Guck: You have all this steel around them, one of the problems I have is the energy it takes to create a solar farm, is it worth it or with the energy you are going to save.

Carlson: In Illinois I did some work with them, I leased a bunch of land in order to determine which land get the solar farm. They action of the sites in a lottery if you win the solar farm goes in.

Niklaus: If they produce is not our issue. What we are looking at is do we want them in Wright County. Do we want them in current housing areas? I do not like the idea of having them taken out once there put in

Carlson: We do not like the 5 year interim, since we would not want to have to remove them. You have a year to talk about this, maybe you do have meetings and look at an area that would work to have solar farms. Do what they did at Wright County and take your time. I am willing to work with you on this.

Smith made a motion to table for further research. Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Niklaus made a motion to approve the April 9, 2019 meeting minutes. Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report

- Permits

- Correspondence

- Enforcement Actions

- Findings of Fact - Previous PC/BOA Decisions: Naaktgeboren made a motion to approve the findings of fact for Fitzsimmons, Roos, Baird, Pederson & GAP Holdings. Smith seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Other Business

Trunk highway 55 that we had to deal with tonight, are you ok with the County has to deal with it? Board was ok either way.

In regards to the 160 ft road set back that we have is more than what the county requires which is 130 ft, I am thinking we just copied what was in B1-zoning district to the B2 in error when we did some changes last year. To change that we are going to have to change it back. Do you want to put that on the list or do you want to do it next month. Board would like to do as soon as possible to get it corrected.

We have had a couple situation with American with Disability Act request: This one was a ramp down to the lake, the landings were going to be larger than the 30 sq ft we allow. I talked to townships attorney, the way its sounds we are to make reasonable accommodations under federal law. My questions was if we allow for the ramp going to go down the hill because they need it, what happens when they sell the property to someone that is not. Mike Couri's answer was, you could make them sign something and put on record that it would have to come out once they sold or no longer had the disability. We can do that administratively by developing a form, we just have to make sure we ask it correctly. The other thing we could do is amend the ordinance stating we adhere to the ADA and make reasonable accommodations. If it was a form we would memorialize the agreement and it would be recorded on their deed/abstract. Board felt it could be administrative unless it was something that could not be removed.

Guck made a motion to adjourn. Smith seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously at 9:23 pm

Prepared by Jean Just