

SHERBURNE C O U N T Y



*Sherburne County
Planning Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes
June 17, 2021
6:00pm*

The Sherburne County Planning Advisory Committee met in the Board Room at the Sherburne County Government Center in Elk River, Minnesota on June 17, 2021 to hold a public hearing for all unincorporated areas of Sherburne County in which the County has zoning and land use authority, along with the Township of Big Lake, the Township of Baldwin and the Township of Livonia, to consider the evening's agenda and other planning and zoning related topics.

Chairperson, Bryan Lawrence called the meeting to order and roll was taken.

The following members were present:

Chair, Bryan Lawrence, Baldwin Township; Vice-Chair, Bruce Aubol, Big Lake Township; Roger Nelson, Blue Hill Township; Lila Spencer, Livonia Township; Steve Demeules, Palmer Township; Bryan Adams, Orrock Township; Terrance Vandereyk, Clear Lake Township; David Jehoich, Santiago Township; Tim Dolan, County Commissioner

The following staff members were present:

Nancy Riddle, Zoning Administrator; Lynn Waytashek, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Marc Schneider, Senior Planner, Carrie Winter, Secretary; Gabby Holman, Environmental Specialist.

Sherburne County Planning Advisory Commission Minutes
June 17, 2021

Lawrence stated that the meeting was being recorded and announced that the Planning Commission is a recommending body. Items recommended for approval by the Planning Commission will be heard by the County Board of Commissioners on July 15, 2021 at 10:00am.

Nelson made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 20, 2021 Public Hearing. Adams seconded. Motion carried and the minutes were approved for the May 20, 2021 Public Hearing. Spencer abstained from the vote as she was not in attendance for the meeting.

Demeules made a motion to approve the Public Hearing agenda for June 17, 2021. Aubol seconded. Motion carried and the Public Hearing agenda for June 17, 2021 was approved.

Agenda:

1. **Amendment to the Sherburne County Zoning Ordinance:** Amend Section 5 Definitions and Rule of Language Construction, Subdivision 2 Definitions
2. **Amendment to the Sherburne County Zoning Ordinance:** Amend Section 17 General Development Regulations, Subdivision 2 Parking and Loading Regulations
3. **Amendment to the Sherburne County Zoning Ordinance:** Amend Section 18 Administration and Enforcement, Subdivision 3, Board of Adjustment

Agenda Item # 1 -6:02pm

Amendment to the Sherburne County Zoning Ordinance: Amend Section 5 Definitions and Rule of Language Construction, Subdivision 2 Definitions, looking to establish the following definitions: Improved Parking Surface, Motor Vehicle and Operable Motor Vehicles.

Marc Schneider, Senior Planner, presented the request to the Planning Commission including the board packet, attachments, and comments and a presentation which also includes information for agenda item #2.

PLANNING COMMISSION PACKET ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Draft Ordinance.

PLANNING & ZONING STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The County is looking to establish the following definitions: Improved Parking Surface, Motor Vehicle and Operable Motor Vehicles to be consistent with language from the County Solid Waste Ordinance and to assist the County in developing parking regulations for platted residential lots.
2. The County's Solid Waste Ordinance defines, Motor Vehicles and Operable Motor Vehicles and Zoning staff feels it is necessary to ensure these definitions are established in the Zoning Ordinance.
3. The definition Motor Vehicle is more encompassing than the State's definition of Motor Vehicle, it explicitly identifies types of vehicles which is not found in the State definition. The County's definition does not rely on the vehicle being licensed.

Proposed Amendments:

Section 5 Definitions and Rule of Language Construction, Subdivision 2 Definitions:

1. Improved Parking Surface: An area used for the parking or storage of vehicles that is overlaid or otherwise paved with concrete, asphalt, paving stones, crushed gravel, or other durable materials approved by the Zoning Administrator or delegated staff.
2. Motor Vehicle: Means every vehicle that is self-propelled including, but is not limited to, all-terrain vehicles, buses, motorcycles, passenger cars, recreational vehicles, semi-trucks, snowmobiles, boats and other watercraft, trucks, and vehicles used for racing or demolition derbies.
3. Operable Motor Vehicle: Motor Vehicle must be able to start and drive forward and reverse on its own power and steer, have front and back license plates and current registration tabs, fully intact windshield, working headlights, taillights, and turn signals, and tires that are inflated according to motor vehicle's standards.

Planning Commission Discussion Followed:

Adams asked if these 3 definitions are already in the Solid Waste Ordinance?

Schneider stated that 2 of 3 are in the Solid Waste Ordinance currently. Motor Vehicle and Operable Motor Vehicle are currently a part of the Solid Waste Ordinance. The definition for Improved Parking Surface is not a part of the current Solid Waste Ordinance and is a new definition that would be added.

Lawrence clarified that the current Zoning Ordinance does not currently have any of these definitions which is why we are hearing these tonight.

Lawrence opened the Public Hearing. No one from the public spoke nor were any comments were received.

Jehoich asked if the driveway is exempt from the parking area?

Schneider replied that this should be discussed with the second agenda item, what do we mean by driving area?

Lawrence stated that he reads this as specific to a parking area. It's not the travel portion coming off of the street up to the garage.

Schneider confirmed that it's an improved parking surface.

Lawrence added that it's something that is set aside.

Schneider continued, that many communities have something like this. He has used the term, improved parking surface, which will not strictly include only concrete, asphalt, paving, etc. rather a durable material that is approved by Zoning Staff.

Adams motioned to close the Public Hearing. Aubol seconded. The motion carried and the Public Hearing was closed.

Aubol made a motion to recommend approval of the Amendment to Section 5 of the Zoning Ordinance. Adams seconded. The motion carried and the Amendment to Section 5 of the Zoning Ordinance is recommended to the County Board for approval.

Sherburne County Planning Advisory Commission Minutes
June 17, 2021

Agenda Item # 2 -6:23pm

Amendment to the Sherburne County Zoning Ordinance: Amend Section 17 General Development Regulations, Subdivision 2 Parking and Loading Regulations, proposal to establish Permitted Parking Areas for Residential Platted Lots.

Marc Schneider, Senior Planner presented the request to the Planning Commission including the board packet, attachments, comments, and the prior presentation.

PLANNING COMMISSION PACKET ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Draft Ordinance

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. For years the Planning and Zoning Department has relied on the County's Solid Waste Ordinance to enforce unlicensed vehicles on residential properties, which does not deal with the location or the number of vehicles stored on a property. Complaints related to exterior storage of vehicles is one of the most common complaints filed to the Planning and Zoning Department and accounts for a significant amount of staff time.
2. Since 2019, the Planning and Zoning Department has responded to over 250 solid waste complaints. Junk vehicles is one of the most common complaints received and requires more staff time to resolve than other solid waste complaints. This is due mostly to the need to verify tabs and whether a vehicle is operable.
 - a. Issues connected to exterior storage junk of vehicles includes:
 - b. Repeat offenders.
 - c. Visual impacts on neighborhoods
 - d. Possible impacts neighboring property values
 - e. Environmental impacts
 - f. Demand on County resources
3. On June 1, 2021 Planning and Zoning staff presented the issue of excessive vehicle storage on residential properties and a draft ordinance to the County Board of Commissioners and their recommendation was to present the issue and the draft ordinance to the Planning Advisory Commission.
4. Current regulations in the Solid Waste Ordinance restricts property owners to no more than two unlicensed or inoperable vehicles. This solid waste ordinance is not a land use ordinance and does not restrict the number of licensed and operable vehicles. It is not uncommon for a landowner to license dozens of motor vehicles to comply with this regulation. Staff feels it is appropriate that the Zoning Ordinance establishes performance standards for the exterior storage of motor vehicles in residential subdivisions.

5. Staff is focusing on establishing reasonable limits that can be applied for outdoor parking areas within residentially platted subdivision. This draft ordinance would not apply to unplatted lots or commercial or industrial parcels.
6. To address the issue of excessive vehicle storage on residential properties. Staff feels a practical approach is to create a reasonable regulation that requires motor vehicles be stored on an improved surface and place limits on the amount of parking area related to the lot size.
7. The ordinance included in the Board packet is a result of numerous versions of ordinances that were vetted with the County Attorney's Office.
8. Staff is looking to discuss with the Planning Advisory Commission the following questions and obtain a recommendation for the County Board's consideration:
 - a. *What is a reasonable amount of improved parking area on residentially platted lots?*
 - b. *What should be the maximum amount of coverage permitted?*
 - c. *Establish the meaning of driveways within this ordinance?*
9. Zoning staff is recommending no more than 1% of the lot be covered with an improved parking surface and that the maximum amount of improved parking surface should not exceed 1,000 sq. ft.

Lot size in acres	1% of lot size
0.5	217 sq. ft.
1	435 sq. ft.
2.5	1,089 sq. ft.
5	2,178 sq. ft.

Proposed Amendment to Existing Parking and Loading Regulations:

Section 17 General Regulations, Subdivision 2. Parking and Loading Regulations

12. Permitted Parking Areas for Residential Platted Lots.
 - A. On residential platted lots, all motor vehicles, including, but not limited to, cars, trucks, buses, recreational vehicles, all-terrain vehicles, motorcycles, snowmobiles, boats and other watercraft, must be stored and/or parked on an improved parking surface at all times.
 - B. The lot area covered by impervious surface must not exceed the maximum allowed within the applicable zoning district.
 - C. Maximum parking area on platted lots exclusive of driveways shall not to exceed (to be determined) percent of the legal lot size of parcel and not to exceed (to be determined) sq. ft. of parking area.

Planning Commission Discussion Followed:

Adams asked why we are focusing on platted lots instead of all residential lots?

Schneider stated that more complaints are coming from residential platted lots. In a residential subdivision there are certain standards of use, expectations and protected covenants to establish the look of the building, the type of driveway, and these tend to go away.

Homeowners Associations don't stand by them, residents don't enforce them, and we are left with the Zoning Ordinance. To maintain a standard of development in a residential subdivision that might not exist on an un-platted, 20-acre parcel of land that is heavily wooded. This would be difficult to apply or justify these regulations on a property like that. People expect a certain level of upkeep when they move into a residential subdivision. The Ordinance does not have a lot of standards for this and this is a big challenge that we face in platted subdivisions.

Riddle added that originally un-platted lots were included, but there was so much kick back on it, that we decided, for the reasons that Schneider just stated to focus on the platted subdivisions.

Adams stated that a lot of times when Ordinances are changed, people are grandfathered in. What is the intention here? Will older properties be grandfathered in or is the intent to bring all properties into compliance?

Schneider stated that he intends that properties will need to comply by this. There may be properties that already have more than 1000 sq. ft. of improved parking area and this may need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis with the Attorney's office. Schneider's intention is that we are able to apply this Ordinance to all properties.

Adams asked if the Legal Department would back up Planning and Zoning staff when push comes to shove?

Schneider stated that they would. The attorney's office wants to see Ordinances that are easily interpreted and enforced. This Ordinance has been reviewed with the County Attorney's office and they support it. Tim Sime, from the County Attorney's Office had shot down an Ordinance after Schneider had gone out to Big Lake and Orrock Townships, saying, that was an Ordinance that could not be enforced. Sime understands this issue and has dealt with it for years, so Schneider believes that Sime will enforce this.

Lawrence added that he imagines that staff's biggest issue would not be the size of a parking area if someone was slightly over, rather they would be more concerned about a violation with the vehicles. If someone has an area that is clean and well kept and has no vehicles on it, but is over the size limit, this is not the goal.

Riddle replied that this is correct unless this was in the Shoreland District and is exceeding the impervious surface.

Nelson stated that we are talking about 2 different things; junk at the back of lots versus cars in people's driveways that their kids are driving to work.

Schneider stated that we are not talking about 2 different things. He wants to discuss this tonight with the Planning Commission, the definition of a driveway. The intent is not to cause troubles for people with cars in their driveway, this is where cars belong. You would need to have your vehicle on an improved parking area. The hope with the Planning Commission is to establish a meaning of driveway as it is not intended that this would be included in the sq. ft. because of the required setbacks.

Nelson stated in Blue Hill there are 300 plus lots and his problem with this is that this punishes the residents for a handful of violators, by making them go out and spend money on concrete or something to create a parking surface. This is unfair to those in compliance.

Schneider stated that this is the most common complaint that is received by the Zoning Office and this is the challenge that he is wrestling with.

Nelson said, I know.

Riddle stated that we are not driving around looking for this, these are calls that we get in our office, neighbors are looking at this. Someone can legitimately keep so many cars until they are selling them, they are inoperable, etc. so the scenario that Nelson is talking about is not what we are talking about.

Lawrence replied that Nelson is talking about if a policy is set, who it will affect. If we set this Ordinance this will affect everyone. He understands that the goal is to have something with teeth to address the non-compliance, but in return everyone is expected to be compliant.

Riddle stated that we get these calls from townships all of the time, in fact we just got a call last week from one of the townships that had 10 vehicles.

Nelson added that he knows that this is his township, he knows that this is a problem, but it is so unfair to the people that are compliant.

Schneider stated that this is helping to deal with nuisance neighbors. This is giving us a tool. He is not saying that he created the perfect Ordinance, he is looking for input and there will be challenges. He is trying to create an Ordinance that enforces a certain standard of development for platted subdivisions that many times the developer intended but didn't have the tools to enforce.

Lawrence asked of the pictures shown tonight in the presentation, how many are from a platted development?

Staff replied, "All of them."

Lawrence asked Holman what percentage of these complaints that Holman visits are platted versus not platted?

Holman replied that 60-70% of these are platted because people can see those a lot easier, compared to someone who is living on 10-20 acres. Right now, Holman has 49 open Violations and 24 are for junked vehicles.

Lawrence asked if the process of dealing with violations will still be the same, even if the Ordinance changes? This will give us more teeth, just helping everyone to realize the expectation. Going through Zoning and the Attorney's office will still be the way to deal with them?

Holman confirmed, saying that Zoning and Solid Waste will most likely be working together more closely on these properties.

Riddle stated that this will give us more teeth, right now they license them and the cars can sit there, but with this, even if they license them, they need to be on the improved area.

Waytashek added that we are not trying to penalize people that are in compliance, it's the opposite of that, there are people who are calling the Zoning Office about their neighbor when they are frustrated when things are not being resolved to their satisfaction when they have a neat yard next to it. We are trying to prevent their property values from being decreased and addressing their frustration.

Lawrence opened the Public Hearing.

Steve Fuchs, 22216 185th St NW, Big Lake came to the podium. He, his wife, and others (Fuchs stated that the first 2 rows of the audience) are here from Big Lake Township and Knick, Knack, Knoll and Meadowlands. He has been involved in this since 2019. He has talked with Holman, Schneider, and Riddle. Zoning badly needs this ordinance, in their words, they need this Ordinance to get under control this growing problem of junk and blight properties. These are tough words, but it explains the problem that we are faced with. One of the properties is shown in the presentation tonight. The problem is that this junk and blight is occurring on people's back yards, side yards, front yards, driveways and now on township roads. He understands Nelson's concern about kid's cars to go to school, but these vehicles sit and sit, for 5 years and they are licensed, but they are not being used for kids to go to school. The problem is that when their friends come over they park on township roads. 2 or 3 weeks ago, there was a \$700,000 house that burned down and 12 fire vehicles had to get around these cars to get to the fire. This is an eye sore issue, but is also a public safety issue. Neighbors are complaining to neighbors. Neighbors are complaining to Zoning. 250 calls. This is going to go to 300 calls. This problem is not going away, with subdivisions filling up and more people living in these platted developments, this problem is only getting worse. In the Patriot News, County Commissioner, Raeanne Danielowski was quoted as saying that a property was going to be sold for \$20,000 less due to a neighbor with junk and blight that was next to them. Who would want to live next to a house that has 15 cars sitting in it or a house that has a dozen vehicles in their backyard, a house that has 3 or 4 boats parked in their back yard, a house that has 3 or 4 personal watercraft, a house that has 7 or 8 trailers parked on the property? No one wants to live next to that. So, the property owner has to take a \$20,000 hit because of junk and blight and that's why they are here. They have three concerns, property values decreasing. Secondly, these vehicles are full of stuff and are a perfect habitat for rats and mice and are a public health nuisance. If we don't get rid of these vehicles or confine the space, we are going to have a rodent problem and rodents move. Lastly, they are concerned about the environmental damage with the sandy soil. Water doesn't hang around long in sand. There are cars and snowmobiles and personal watercraft and boats that are parked on sand and next to waterways that they will drain into. It will be a matter of time, with sunlight baking on these vehicles that with rainwater is going to leach out these chemicals and drain into the water and the wetlands. He suggests that if gravel is going to be considered as a parking surface then it should have a clay barrier underneath it to stop the leaching. He is a strong property rights person and he also has rights to protect our properties. That is why he is here, that is why his

Sherburne County Planning Advisory Commission Minutes
June 17, 2021

neighbors are here. We have to get this under control. What started out as 1 property 3 years ago is now 3 properties. When a property is sold and they see all of this stuff parked around, they think that they can do the same thing. Support this ordinance, develop it, it's badly needed and if values go down, the townships and the county will have a lot less tax money to deal with.

Greg Felber, 25409 189th St NW, Big Lake came to the podium. He feels that the way the Ordinance is put together is overly broad for the whole County. If there is vehicle saturation on a property, the environmental concern is a different concern than the way that the property looks to other people. In the 1990s, the city of Dayton had a property, which is still there, that made any of these properties look empty. This person had hundreds and hundreds of vehicles, including airplanes and combines. Judge Summerville, after they sent people from the EPA and the State out there, found that there were no EPA violations. Judge Summerville believed that one man's trash is another man's treasure and that you have the right to do that. If the neighbor doesn't like the way that your property looks, then why should you have to put \$80,000 into a new building or \$20,000 into an additional parking area on the property? He thinks that if he doesn't like the way a neighbor's property looks, then he should have to put up the fence or barrier. He thinks this should be a township by township issue. Ultimately, when you write an Ordinance this is going to fall to law enforcement to enforce that Ordinance. Is it worth their time to go out and get into a confrontation because you don't like your neighbor's car? He has 27 years working in law enforcement and these kinds of Ordinances cause a lot of trouble for law enforcement.

Kevin Hiller, 10785 261st Ave NW, Zimmerman came forward. He didn't come here with any preconceived notion on this. He commends the County on trying to do something, but he questions whether this is going to accomplish anything. If driveways are eliminated, what is going to stop someone who is creative, from trying to expand the driveway?

Nelson motioned to close the Public Hearing. Aubol seconded. The motion carried and the Public Hearing was closed.

Adams asked if a 5-acre lot gets a lot of complaints.

Holman stated that a typical complaint is on a 2.5 acre lot, not many on a 5 acre lot.

Schneider added that lots larger than 5 acres are being developed more and more.

Adams asked if these are platted.

Schneider replied, "Yes."

Riddle added that it also depends if there are trees on the lot and if other lots are close in proximity.

Lawrence reiterated that a lot of larger lots now are platted and would fall under this Ordinance.

Schneider agreed.

Spencer referred to Hiller's comment about a driveway, how would you account for someone who added impervious surface to get back to an outbuilding and parking all kinds of vehicles on that?

Schneider replied that he does not intend to include the driveway as a part of the improved parking area.

Lawrence asked, if this is in addition to the parking area?

Schneider confirmed that he is not counting the driveway leading up to the accessory building or the driveway leading up to the house. He is talking about areas that are outside of that. Someone could have multiple vehicles parked on a driveway. The County Attorney is not advising that we go down the path of regulating the number of vehicles someone can have on their property. Its more reasonable to identify a parking area in a platted subdivision with grading and drainage built in. The stormwater calculations account for the house, driveway, accessory buildings and that is why we are trying to limit how much impervious surface someone can put on their property.

Adams asked if it would be beneficial to define what a driveway is?

Schneider added that this is a good point. We could establish a definition for a driveway.

Riddle added that we did talk about this and we are concerned as things are piled up in the driveway and this is not counted, then this could be a problem.

Spencer referred to the comment from Felber who indicated that he had been in law enforcement. What is the process for the Sheriff and enforcement? Will having this in place get rid of the problem faster?

Riddle said that it will, because we will have more teeth, we don't use law enforcement for this. The only time that law enforcement is used is if safety is a concern for the staff member conducting the site visit. We do our own enforcement and then we go through the County Attorney's office and it will end up in Court. Our enforcement process would not change. It

allows us to get it upstairs, to the County Attorney faster, or to get the property into compliance without it going to the County Attorney.

Vandereyk stated that using the 1% suggested limit with a 12 x 20 area is roughly 4 vehicles on a 2.5 acre lot. This seems reasonable. This would be 9 vehicles on a 5 acre lot.

Lawrence added that this would be in addition to the driveway; anything in front of the garage.

Schneider stated that Commission Schmiesing, when this information was presented at County Board had stated that 2 neighbors can have the same amount of stuff on their property and 1 neighbor can keep it orderly and has delineated a boundary where they will keep their stuff and the other neighbor has it scattered all over. This is ensuring that the residential subdivisions have a little more order to them than what currently exists.

Aubol made a motion to recommend approval of the Amendment to Section 17 of the Zoning Ordinance with the staff recommended 1%.

Riddle asked what the recommendation is for the TBD sq. ft. Does the Board want to recommend the 1,000 sq ft?

Adams replied that this would be the 1%.

Riddle stated that it would be 1% or not to exceed 1,000 sq ft.

Vandereyk stated that this would be 2,000 sq ft. on the 5-acre parcel.

Riddle replied that this is an example.

Lawrence asked if the proposal is that a 5-acre parcel could not exceed 1,000 sq ft?

Riddle clarified by saying that the recommendation with a 5-acre lot at 1% is 2,178 sq ft.

Aubol added to the motion that for a 5-acre lot, he would recommend using the chart provided by staff to allow for a maximum of 2,178 sq ft.

Riddle asked if the revised motion is to eliminate the, "not to exceed 1,000 sq ft"

Aubol replied yes.

Adams asked if anything should be added for the definition of a driveway?

Aubol stated that he would refrain from that.

Lawrence reiterated that there is a motion to not exceed the 1% as a guide for allowable impervious surface on a lot.

Vandereyk seconded.

Lawrence clarified that this motion is for 1% with the “not to exceed” being eliminated.

Vandereyk confirmed.

Lawrence stated that with the previously approved definitions, which he does not have an issue with, however, when using those definitions and applying them to this proposal, you have a four-wheeler, golf cart, boat, all of these things technically would need to be parked on an impervious surface when not in use.

Spencer asked if this would also include RVs?

Lawrence confirmed that this would include RVs. When staff puts the definition in here, it's going to be your riding lawn mower.

Spencer asked, trailer?

Schneider stated that trailers would not be included as the definition of motor vehicles would be used.

Lawrence added, because these are not self-propelled. Recreational Vehicles would refer to your motor home, but not your fifth-wheel motor home because it's not motorized.

Spencer agreed.

Aubol clarified that impervious surface includes crushed gravel.

Lawrence replied that would be the definition, yes.

The motion carried with roll call vote with Jehoich, Adams, Demeules, Aubol, Spencer, and Vandereyk voting in support of the motion and Nelson and Lawrence voting against the motion.

This Ordinance Amendment is recommended to the County Board for Approval.

Agenda Item # 3 -7:02pm

Amendment to the Sherburne County Zoning Ordinance: Amend Section 18 Administration and Enforcement, Subdivision 3, Board of Adjustment.

Nancy Riddle, Zoning Administrator, presented the request to the Planning Commission including the board packet, attachments, and comments.

PLANNING COMMISSION PACKET ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Marked Up Version of the Draft Ordinance
- B. Clean Version of the Draft Ordinance

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. In early 2021, the County Board of Commissioners appointed a Subcommittee to review for consideration potential changes to the current structure and operation of the Board of Adjustment. The Subcommittee met several times to consider potential changes to Section 18, Subd 3 of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs the Board of Adjustment. Recommendations from the Subcommittee were discussed at a joint special meeting of the County Board and Township Association. The County Board reviewed the recommendations from the Subcommittee on April 20th and directed County staff to modify draft language relating to who may serve on the Board of Adjustment.
2. The Subcommittee presented their revised draft ordinance on May 4, 2021, to the County Board of Commissioners who then directed Zoning staff to present the Subcommittee's recommended amendments to the Planning Advisory Commission at a public hearing.
3. A summary of Subcommittee's recommended amendments are provided below:
 - a. Subd.1(A) modifies the criteria for appointing members to the Board of Adjustment and includes additional changes in response to comments the Commissioners received at the March Township Association meeting. Specifically, the current draft removes prior draft requirements for appointing a city resident and mandating one member from each commissioner district. The current draft now emphasizes a goal of appointments based on geographic diversity, to the extent possible based on the applicant pool.
 - b. Subd. 1(B), (C) (D) and (E) were added or modified to be consistent with the rules governing appointments and operation of the County's other boards and commissions.
 - c. Subd. 1(B) language was further amended pursuant to County Board direction of April 20th, 2021 regarding who may serve on the Board of Adjustment.
 - d. Subd. 2, 3 and 4 were added or modified to reflect current practice and to be consistent with the rules governing the County's other boards and commissions.
 - e. Subd. 5 is amended to add clarifying language.

- f. Subd. 6 is amended to specify that any appeal to the Board of adjustment must be filed within 30 days of the order or decision being appealed, and to add clarifying language.
- g. Subd.7(E) is added to specify that the Board of Adjustment may add conditions when granting a variance, which is current practice.
- h. Subd.7(F) is amended to remove the requirement that an applicant submit a Township comment form as part of the original application.
- i. Subd.7(G) is added to provide a process for the Board of Adjustment to receive Township comments on an application.
- j. Subd.7(H), (I) and (J) are modified to clarify language and to reflect the current process in administering applications.
- k. Subd.7(K) is modified to current law and to provide clearer language on variance criteria.

Planning Commission Discussion Followed:

Adams asked what the intent is of the definition of a qualified candidate? What are we looking for?

Riddle stated that there isn't a definition, but things that we ask on the application and that we are looking for are some experience with land use so they understand what Variances are. The application asks questions about if they have read the Zoning Ordinance, if they have experience with Variances, are they working in the community on things that are related, it could be a number of things, there is no specific definition.

Adams asked Riddle if, in her experience a lot of qualified people are trying to apply.

Riddle replied, yes, there are people that are on lake associations, involved in the community, we get all sorts of people applying. Some have no experience. Some might be in a field that they have worked in land use, for example, a surveyor and they are familiar with what we do, that could be considered qualified.

Aubol asked about the meeting that was held earlier this year, it was brought up that the Board of Commissioners felt that a member of the Board should be from an incorporated area. All townships are unincorporated. All issues are in township areas. Is this still insisting that an incorporated resident be on the Board?

Riddle replied that it does not say this. Not to say that the Board couldn't appoint someone from a city, but it does not specifically say that this is a requirement.

Aubol stated that he is firmly against an incorporated individual serving on that Board. Relative to what happens, it's all township business.

Spencer agreed.

Dolan stated that the Ordinance currently allows for that, so there is no change with that.

Riddle agreed.

Aubol asked if this is the intent of the Commissioners?

Dolan asked Aubol to clarify.

Aubol clarified stating, is it the intent of the Commissioners to move ahead with this, against the wishes, he believes, of all the townships, and appoint a person to the Board, who is not a township resident?

Dolan stated that the wishes of the Board, as of right now, are not to change that portion of the Ordinance. There is no change to who is eligible based on where they live.

Aubol stated that this doesn't answer his question, if you don't change the Ordinance that gives the Board the luxury of that appointment, then you can still put a city resident on this Board.

Dolan stated that this is correct.

Aubol added, to which I am against.

Dolan replied that this is noted.

Lawrence added that what he believes that Aubol is saying, is that if we are looking at making adjustments to this Ordinance as specific as we are seeing, from the township perspective, one of the changes should be that all appointees should be from unincorporated areas.

Aubol agreed.

Vandereyk ask what is the logic behind not having elected township officials?

Riddle replied that there is some wording in statute, although it doesn't specifically say that you can't have township people, it depends how you interpret it. We have always interpreted it as County elected officials. It was discussed that this may allow for 2 comments when an elected township official is also on the Board and for decision making ability.

Dolan agreed with Riddle and added that this gives more citizens the opportunity to serve their community.

Vandereyk stated that elected officials are the most connected to the community and on the town board.

Dolan replied that he would not argue that this is accurate.

Riddle stated that this is true, and it goes back to how this all started. There were many people who wanted to serve on the Board of Adjustment and this is where the discussion came from to open it up to more people to participate.

Lawrence added that because it is at the discretion of the County Board of who to appoint, who they want to appoint, they can still appoint without eliminating a section of the populous in this

process. The Board could change in the coming years and maybe they will feel differently, now there is a policy. Another point that has not been brought up; the Board of Adjustment is the only final decision body in the County. Their decision is final. To compare this to other committees, even the Planning Commission, the Board of Adjustment has more authority. The Board of Adjustment is very unique. Lawrence has a problem comparing this to other boards and commissions for this reason.

Demeules added that he has an issue with the exclusion of elected officials. He is on the Board of Adjustment. He has a problem with the Board saying that unless there is a lack of qualified and desirable applicants, he should apply and then sit around waiting until someone comes to him and asks him to be on the board for another 3 years because they can't find anybody else. This grates him the wrong way. When he was appointed to the Board, he does not believe that there were a lot of people applying at that time. He is glad to hear that so many people want to be on the Board of Adjustment. He hopes that they know what they are getting themselves into. It is not a popular or easy position. There is something about the 2-terms too. It takes a while to get your feet wet and to understand this stuff. We do have classes; he's taken these classes. He has went to classes on this own and paid for these classes on his own just to try to understand it better. He tried to be dedicated to it, but now when he sees this, the dedication is ridiculous when all of the sudden, he's out. It's not because of the money, he can guarantee that. It's not because of the joy and happiness that his decisions bring to everyone. Palmer has a large percentage of Variances and it's justified that Palmer has a couple of people on the Board of Adjustment. It became even more prevalent when we went to 7 commissioners on the Board of Adjustment. There are a lot of issues that he likes to see because of the water issues and the small lots. He can see that it may get to the point when Palmer is not represented except for the comments and who knows what happens to those. He is totally against excluding elected officials, term limits, 2 is not enough, you just start to understand the ins and outs.

Dolan replied that these changes do not exclude anyone from applying. As Lawrence noted, right now the appointments are at the County Board's discretion. This was the Boards attempt to be fully transparent and to help you understand their priorities. The goal is to get more people involved in the processes of the County and spelling this out as the preference. Should that not be available then we would expect township supervisors and other people that are involved in other things to step up. We know that this group of people has always stepped up. We do that on the County Board and our goal is to diversify the amount of people involved in County processes. Just so you know, nothing in here excludes anyone, we took this language out.

Lawrence said that he differs, this is not a vision statement, this is not a set of goals, this is an Ordinance. This is setting policy for how the County will operate for how Riddle is going to enforce different things, how the staff is going to look at them. You are setting policy to say, exactly like Demeules stated, that as a township official, why should I even apply, I may not even be looked at because of the way that this is spelled out. Yes, it is at the discretion of the

County Board. If you have goals and a vision statement saying that you want more involvement, as township officials we are here to say that we all want more people involved in the process. We are not opposed to that. We are looking for that.

Dolan said this is not what it sounds like.

Lawrence said, no, you hear us wrong, and if he speaks out of turn, let him know, we do not get involvement.

Demeules added that we ask, we don't always get.

Lawrence continued; this is a unique spot right now when a lot of applicants came in. This is wonderful. None of us felt bad about the number of applicants that came in. Once again, this is a unique committee, a unique Board with unique powers and unique authority in dealing with issues that supervisors look at on behalf of our residents that we represent. The way that you are spelling this out is that many who have served in these roles for years are now eliminated unless no one else is there to serve in these roles.

Dolan stated that this is correct, our first preference is to go to people who are not township supervisors and if we can't fill those, then the next option would be available to us.

Spencer asked Demeules who sponsored the trainings that he went to?

Demeules stated that these are offered by the same Association that the County used. He started to get emails and he took another class.

Spencer asked, for someone who has never had any experience with the township, how difficult is it for that person to take on that responsibility, because she understands that it is a huge responsibility.

Demeules stated that there is a lot that you need to know. He went through a couple of Variances and that didn't qualify him. You have to know the Ordinance; you have to know the regulations as much as possible. You aren't going to know them all. It's ridiculously complicated, he thinks, but he is just one person on the Board.

Dolan asked, based on that assessment, are there requirements to run for township supervisor?

Demeules said that he has a background.

Dolan replied that he is asking in general. This is not required to serve as an elected official, is this correct? So, just by being an elected official does not further qualify you over someone else?

Demeules replied that they are seeing these things all the time, they are taking phone calls, they are understanding the issues with the Variances, they are living in the communities. We understand it more than the regular person.

Dolan replied that this is a fair statement, but there are no requirements to have this knowledge to start as an elected official.

Demeules stated that there are no qualifications to be a parent and have a kid.

Lawrence opened the Public Hearing.

Kevin Hiller, 10785 261st Ave NW, Zimmerman came forward. He is a Livonia Township Supervisor, he asked Dolan why the County Commissioners want to limit the pool of applicants? You have final say so on who you are going to get, so why limit your applicants? If there is a township supervisor who has been on the Board and there is no one else, why would you exclude them? Why wouldn't you want them all there and then pick the best qualified applicant?

Dolan stated that the Ordinance does not limit anyone from applying. It simply states that preference will be given to non-supervisors.

Lawrence read the following from the Draft Ordinance Amendment, "In addition, no elected township or municipal official shall serve as a member of the Board of Adjustment unless" and then stated that this shuts them off from applying.

Dolan replied saying, this is not what it says. You have to read the Ordinance as a whole.

Lawrence said that you have to read it in part, as an applicant, you think that there will be plenty of applicants, so I'll just wait to get the call.

Dolan stated that if someone is going to read only part of the Ordinance, he doesn't want them on the Board of Adjustment.

Spencer asked what Ordinance number the Creation of the Board of Adjustment is? Is only part of it listed here?

Dolan clarified that it's all listed here, but Lawrence was just reading part of it.

Todd Maloney, Livonia Township Supervisor came to the podium. He asked, "What is the difference/benefit between having incorporated vs unincorporated members?" He's leaning toward unincorporated, but this is a question for the Planning Commission.

Lawrence replied that the Board of Adjustment has never heard a city's Variance. One has never been brought. It does hear township Variances on a regular basis. A township is unincorporated, a city is incorporated, so having a person from an incorporated area sitting on the Board, they have no jurisdiction on it. They are not living in the township and have no skin in the game, whereas township officials are living in those areas.

Aubol added that he cannot vote for a city mayor and a city member cannot vote for a township supervisor.

Maloney stated that he would like to see it unincorporated if at all possible.

Jay Swanson, 27709 112th St came forward, he is the Chairman of the Board for Baldwin Township, he reiterated that the draft Ordinance Amendment does say, no elected township or municipal official shall serve as a member of the Board of Adjustment. He was here for a County Association of Townships meeting a couple of months ago and there were

Sherburne County Planning Advisory Commission Minutes
June 17, 2021

Commissioners here also, and all attendees expressed their disdain for a change in the Board of Adjustment. As Lawrence had stated, this is a final decision. This is not a visioning committee. If the County wants to form a Visioning Committee to get more people involved, this is wonderful, but do this on the other side. When he reads this and it says that no township officials will be considered, right off the bat, then he will tell you that he represents 7,500 people and what this tells him is that these 7,500 people are expecting him to come her tonight and represent them in what we are talking about and 7,500 people have told him that if there is a Board of Adjustment or something like that, that he should be on that. What the language in here says, is that if no one else is available, if anyone but a township official. He has a problem with 7,500 people putting him in a position, where now he is disqualified. This is a final decision making Board that is going to be put together by 5 Commissioners. So, these 5 people are going to decide who represents the 7,500 people that put him in office. This doesn't make sense. He believes that this is a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. The Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission only deal with township issues. The cities and incorporated areas have their own thing going on. To think that a citizen in the city gets to decide if one of his residents, a Baldwin township resident gets to put up a deck, that is ludicrous to him and makes absolutely no sense to him. To become a township official, there is no criteria, other than your willingness to spend \$2 and your willingness to go door to door and talk to people and see if they agree with you and you agree with them, then you get their vote, this is how you become a township official. Then there is a one term learning curve of 3 years to get anyone up to speed on how any of that works. These people who do that are the ones that make the commitment to do as such. He has been on the Board for 12 years now. When you all of the sudden say, we are going to pick another citizen or someone from a city; this is not right. State Statute says that at least one member shall be a resident of a township located within the County. He is willing to bet that in 1939 or whenever this was put together that the Counties were pretty sparse for those who wanted to look at Variances. Now, in Sherburne County, with 7,500 in Baldwin and 7, 000 in Livonia, we have large townships. With developments and parking issues like we have heard, to exclude, which this language does, it does not fit. Please vote against this language.

Roger Johnson, 4560 115th Ave, Clear Lake, Palmer Township. He is presently the Chairmen of the Board of Adjustment and has been on the Board of Adjustment for 15 + years. He is still learning at this job as he is doing it on a monthly basis. He agrees to what is being said about term limits, it takes at least 1 term to become partially knowledgeable about what goes on in the process. To limit the Board of Adjustment to 2 terms is doing a discredit to the Board of Adjustment and to the residents of this County. It takes more than 6 years to be a good member of the Board of Adjustment. You will lose a lot of good people with this amendment. The other thing that comes int play is the definition of elected officials. What is the definition of an elected official? Does that include the clerk and the treasurer?

Dolan stated that this language is by State Statute.

Johnson said that he is asking Dolan for his definition.

Sherburne County Planning Advisory Commission Minutes
June 17, 2021

Dolan replied that an elected official is any elected official, whether County wide or a Commissioner.

Johnson said then you're eliminating even more people than just the supervisors.

Dolan said that this is eliminated by statute and the only thing that was added was any municipal official or township official, so a mayor can't be on it, city council member, a township supervisor, anybody who holds an election certificate.

Lawrence stated that he is referring to many clerks that are elected in townships.

Johnson agreed and added that there are some clerks and treasurers that are appointed. Are they allowed?

Dolan said that he would defer to Sime on this as most of this language is pulled from Statute.

Johnson stated that there is nothing in here that talks about the process of interviewing applicants. Will you just choose based on the application? Will there be a telephone interview? An in person interview? How will you compare person A to person B?

Dolan stated that the current process is an application process and then an interview process from there. It has changed over the years, but ultimately, it's at the Board's discretion.

Johnson added that as far as appointments, a member of the Board of Adjustment turned in their resignation in April of last year and it took 8 months for the Board of Commissioners to act on that position. Johnson does not think that this is a timely manner to reappoint someone to the Board of Adjustment. They were operating with 4 of 5 Board of Adjustment members. This needs to be addressed in the Ordinance, it should be a maximum of 2 months to appoint someone to fill that void. This gives time to put the notice in the paper, do interviews etc.

Dolan stated that this is a fair statement and good point.

Johnson went on to say that there are current Board of Adjustment members that do not participate in the meetings, they do not ask questions, except for Yay or Nay on a motion. He doesn't know if they go to the sites as recommended by Johnson and Riddle.

Lawrence stated that this Board and the Board of Adjustment were unanimous in the change of adding 2 more members to the Board to increase to 7, they wanted to see that change to bring additional individuals in to participate in the process.

Bud Stimler, 10740 80th Ave, Clear Lake came to the podium. He is against 1 member on the Board being a resident from the township. He stated that this doesn't make any sense. Everybody should be a resident of the townships. As far as terms, as member Demeules stated, you just learned this job, every Variance that comes in is something else to learn. Whoever is on the Board, the terms should be longer not shorter. And all of the sudden this pool of applicants has showed up. Clear Lake, Blue Hill and Palmer townships fall under Commissioner Schmiesing, will the townships have access to the applicants so that the township knows who is

going to represent their township? Are these applications available to see who these people are instead of a disgruntled township resident who may come in. We have them at Town Board sometimes. They didn't like the no parking sign so they run for town board just because of 1 issue. Can we see these applicants before the Commissioners appoint them?

Lawrence asked for Stimler to clarify, is he asking for the township to review the applications as well?

Stimler confirmed.

Riddle added that this is not the current policy and never has been for the applications to be sent to the townships to review. She would need to talk with legal on this, just like applications for employment, these are not public.

Stimler stated that he is not asking for all of them, he's asking that after the Commissioners pick 1 or 2 that may represent the township, then these be sent to that township.

Riddle stated that they are not representing a township.

Stimler, replied, a Commissioners District.

Riddle stated that this isn't being done now, either. We want them to be spread out geographically, but Board of Adjustment members are representing the entire county, not a specific township.

Dolan stated that he can't speak for his colleagues but based on conversation that they have had; the Board would be excited for a pool of applicants to be pushed to the Board by the townships. He has no qualms with the township endorsing non supervisor candidates that would be a good fit and pushing them to the Board. The goal is not to take the township out of the process, or eliminate that input, it's having the township input be a different vehicle than the Board of Supervisors. So, if applications opened up and Clear Lake said here are 3 people that would be a good fit, he would be excited about that.

Stimler said he agrees, but flip that, when you get that applicant, the township should be able to say, this applicant isn't qualified to be on the Board. He's got problems that only the township knows.

Dolan asked if once the Board recommends an applicant, that it go back to the Township.

Stimler confirmed.

Dolan said that he can't speak for the Board but personally he would not have a problem with that.

Lawrence said that as elected officials, it is our role to help push candidates to these roles as they open up, there is no question on that, these may be supervisors or they may be residents. The only reason that Lawrence got on the Board of Adjustment originally is because a supervisor came to him and said, we have no applicants, would you apply? He has noted that

after the County has selected a couple of candidates that they come back to the township officials for approval.

Hiller stated that Livonia Township had an issue with a family that was asking for a Variance. They came to the township Board and 3 or 4 of the township supervisors put boots on the ground and went and looked at what they were doing. What they were asking for was being good neighbors, they were going to put a secondary building back in some trees, in a nutshell they were being good neighbors. 5-0 the township said they wanted them to do it. It came to the Board and it was shot down. There was no one from Livonia township on the Board and to this day there is no one from Livonia Township on the Board. He thinks that it's hard when the township has looked at something and they are a big Township, we are different from other townships, when we don't have representation on the Board, it is frustrating. It wasn't fair to these folks and he doesn't see anything in here that says that there will be at least one from each township. There should be equal representation. Do you agree with that and is there anything in here that would make that happen?

Riddle said that Statute says only 7 members and there are 9 townships so not every township can be represented.

Hiller said that they certainly shouldn't use any of these 7 spots for someone in the city.

Lawrence asked about #3, Meetings, is this a simple majority of the members in attendance for the meeting or of the Board?

Riddle replied that this is of the Board. So, we should have 4 members present and a majority of that. This is the way that she reads it.

Johnson stated that this is how it has been, if all members are not present, then it's a simple majority of those that are there.

Aubol asked if we wanted to include that virtual meetings could be included if necessary? Since it talks about place, time, etc.

Dolan stated that the spirit of that is the County Board, like we did, with a pandemic, the County Board would suspend those rules according to what's allowed and this would fall under the County's Jurisdiction for all Boards.

Riddle asked for clarification.

Lawrence replied that Aubol is asking if it should be in the criteria of how meetings are held. For example, in a special situation, this is how we will operate.

Riddle stated that they did not think about this, other than what Commissioner Dolan has explained.

Lawrence stated that in person meetings should be the requirement. We made it through everything, but there is a lot of value to in-person meetings with an applicant.

Dolan said he can speak for the Board and he agrees.

Adams asked what the difference is when using shall or must on Item #6.

Riddle replied shall means you absolutely must do it, so she's not sure why Sime suggested this change.

Spencer stated that must is more defined than shall.

Riddle replied that usually shall is used in Statute and she can check on it.

Vandereyk asked about Article 7, F-5, why the comment form was eliminated?

Riddle stated that it was eliminated here, but then is talked about further. In the past it had been written into Ordinance that we can't publish until the comment form is received back from the township and the application is considered complete. We were getting complaints that this was taking too long for the applicant, sometimes taking 2-3 months so this is saying that we will still send it to the township for comment, but we will move on with the process while we wait for the comment form. The item will not be discussed at a meeting until this has been received. This speeds up the process for the applicant.

Lawrence stated that they are still taking township comment, it's just not coming from the applicant.

Riddle stated that the township will not be able to table the item, they will need to provide a comment to keep it going.

Adams asked if there is a requirement that the applicant must come to the township?

Riddle replied that she does not think that we are requiring that.

Demeules added that the only time an item has been tabled is when the applicant is not present.

Lawrence asked if all townships give comment, he knows that in the past some have waived their opportunity.

Riddle stated that they do send in a comment, but sometimes it just says, no comment. We have asked the townships to be very specific with their comments. If it just says drainage, what does that mean? The township should be clear on whether they are recommending approval or denial and the reason why.

Nelson motioned to close the Public Hearing. Jehoich seconded. The motion carried and the Public Hearing was closed.

Lawrence stated that he had made a couple of notes, first on creation of membership, he read what was there originally and he has a hard time finding what was wrong with it originally, compared to what we see today, that is red lettered out 1) We should not exclude anyone from a township from applying or being appointed, whether elected or non-elected. 2) We are opposed to the short term limits due to the learning curve, whether your township supervisor or County Commissioner, there is a learning curve to any position that anyone holds and it takes time to get up to speed. 3) This Board should have no city representation on it. The Board

of Adjustment is unique, it's unlike any other committee. 4) Township review of applicants, if possible before an applicant is appointed. There doesn't seem to be issues with the latter changes and we would like to see less Findings that are worded easier. The Board of Adjustment is unique, unlike any other committee. Lawrence does not believe that he has seen a County Commissioner sit on the Board of Adjustment. We would strongly urge revisions to the first part of this Ordinance Amendment. County Commissioners have stated that they want to hear our voices and know what we think. This is our second meeting, and these are things that you have heard over and over again that we think needs to be adjusted in the creation or membership and the beginning part of the Board of Adjustment.

Dolan stated that it is excluded by State Statute that a County Commissioner be on the Board of Adjustment. Dolan then asked for a point of clarification as many comments have revolved around the appointment process and the qualifications of a township supervisor to serve in that position. Is it this Boards wish that township supervisors are given preference?

Lawrence said No, and asked to be corrected if he speaks out of turn. Historically, township supervisors have served on the Board and they have background knowledge. They come as a qualified individual. So, when you say that you want qualified applicants, they definitely are. If there are other qualified applicants, then they should be considered as well. We are asking that they not be excluded in the way that the language is stated.

Aubol added, excluded or deferred.

Dolan stated that what is stated in the Ordinance as it sits right now, could be done in practice without any change to the Ordinance. The County Board, as it sits right now, could decide to give preference to non-supervisors unless this is specifically addressed in this. This is why he's asking if Township Supervisors should be given preferential treatment due to being uniquely qualified. This would need to be in the Ordinance because as of right now, this is not the case.

Demeules agreed that township supervisors are uniquely qualified but he does not believe that they should be given preference.

Nelson does not agree.

Vandereyk stated that there was discussion about excluding incorporated residents.

Adams added they need to be residents of the township.

Lawrence said that this was covered in his third note, but he wants to be clear that the Board of Adjustment should have township residents. If anything is to be excluded it should be the city representation on this specific board.

Dolan clarified; you are looking to exclude applicants from incorporated areas.

Lawrence confirmed. He then asked if anything was missing.

Adams asked if term limits were in there? We prefer longer terms or to eliminate the restriction.

Dolan asked if the Commission has a suggestion on term limits?

Lawrence stated that there is a natural rotation that occurs and adding 2 more members has assisted in this. They will gain and grow; then other individuals will retire. Generally speaking, they do not see a need for a term limit.

Dolan asked, the wish of the Board is that this will be a lifetime appointment.

Lawrence replied that the term is 3 years and then they need to reapply.

Dolan agreed, but said in theory someone could indefinitely hold that position.

Lawrence replied, yes, someone could but every 3 years they have to go through the application process and it will still be up to the Commissioners to make that decision.

Dolan stated that the reason that he is asking is because there can be someone who serves, is not reappointed and then 15 years down the road applies again, we want clear direction on that.

Lawrence stated that they would like to see the term limits eliminated as the Commissioners still have the ability to reappoint or appoint someone new.

Nelson added that in the last round of applications, all of the applicants did not get interviewed. He then made a motion to reject Subdivision 3.1 A, B, C of the proposed Amendment to Section 18 of the Zoning Ordinance and accept the rest of the changes.

Dolan stated that we may not be able to completely exclude all of B, because some of this is in State Statute and may not be able to be revised.

Nelson said that this is not all in State Statute.

Dolan said that he is not saying that it is all in State Statute. A portion of B is in State Statute and is incorporated into our Ordinance.

Nelson stated that it may be, but we are a recommending body and we are rejecting A, B, C and to go back to the way it was.

Lawrence stated, not rejected, but revised.

Dolan just wants everyone to know that eliminating B would be next to impossible since it comes from State Statute.

Lawrence said that there is a large part of B that is not from State Statute and can be revised. We would like to see this Statute.

Dolan agreed that some parts of B are not from State Statute and that this is published.

Lawrence said that they would like to see this back with the revisions to A, B, C, not rejecting A, B, C. Ultimately, this will be up to the Board of Commissioners.

Jehoich seconded the motion.

Sherburne County Planning Advisory Commission Minutes
June 17, 2021

The motion carried and the Ordinance Amendment for Section 18 is recommended for approval with the exception of Subdivision 3.1 A, B, C which are recommended to be rejected.

Closing:

Lawrence thanked Dolan for being in attendance tonight and listening to the concerns.

Nelson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Demeules seconded. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 8:08pm.

Submitted by Carrie Winter, Secretary