

WRIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of: May 8, 2014

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Planning Commission met May 8, 2014 in the County Commissioners Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, David Pederson, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: Pederson, Dan Mol, Jan Thompson, Charlie Borrell and Jerry Pettit. Absent were: Ken Felger and Dave Thompson. Sean Riley, Planning & Zoning Administrator, represented the Staff; and, Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney was legal counsel present.

FREDERICK C. JUDE – Cont. from 4/10/14

LOCATION: 8120 – 113TH Street NW – NE ¼ of SE ¼, except tract described in Book 293 of Deeds, page 871, Section 3, Township 121, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Corinna Twp.) Tax #206-000-034100

Petitions to rezone approximately 38 acres from AG General Agricultural to A/R Agricultural-Residential and Rural Planned Unit Development District as regulated in Section 603 & 614 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance.

Present: Frederick Jude

- A. Pederson noted the request was discussed at the last meeting and some members were able to make an on-site inspection.
- B. Borrell asked for clarification on the separation of review by the County and Corinna Township. Riley stated the County has sole authority on changes to the zoning map. Township will review details for the subdivision. Action is whether the property should be rezoned A/R & Planned Unit Development District (PUD) and that recommendation goes to the County Board for final action.
- C. Mol asked if the design and layout for the Planned Unit Development would be heard by the Township. Riley noted the Planned Unit Development requires a preliminary plat layout and that is before the Commission for consideration on whether this meets the criteria for a PUD. With a traditional A/R the Commission does not need to see the layout to decide rezoning. Corinna Township could still modify the subdivision, but not too drastically that it is no longer a PUD. The lot sizes will be decided by the Township. Mol asked what the buildings are used for and if that is a commercial business. Jude indicated those are used for personal storage and workshop for his hobbies. He had tried farming the land but these are sandy soils. He plans to build a home out here for himself.
- D. J. Thompson questioned the division with the existing house and whether that has to be part of the plat. Riley stated it would not be included in the PUD. That has been owned by someone else and is the reason the balance of the land is currently restricted. J. Thompson asked if that owner would not have an interest in the outlot. Riley indicated they would not through the PUD; however, the owner could give a private easement. J. Thompson questioned the location of the outlot and design that does not provide direct access for one of the lots. Riley explained with previous PUD they have had both kinds of open space, some have smaller lots on both sides of a new public road that is built; a

person can travel down the road to get to it. Other designs have involved trails with access to the outlot. J. Thompson did not understand the significance of the common area here and questions the layout. Riley stated they have PUD that protect resources such as wetlands or flood plain; or it has been an orchard or farmland that continues to produce crops for an owner.

- E. Mol questioned the use in this case with the way they designed it is to encompass most of the low area. Some plats would have paths to wooded areas and paths to allow enjoyment of the open space. The buildings are located in close proximity to the wetland, no one would be able to hunt ducks on this low ground and the question is what use would the common space provide. Riley noted the planning concept of Planned Unit Developments in Wright County are more for protection and not have it attached to large sprawling lots and cut up. The Ordinance does not specify it must be set up with trails; if it were he would agree it should function for everyone in the plat. With a farm Planned Unit Development, they have land set aside in one case was an apple orchard and other instances have been farm fields and in those type of plats, no one else uses the open space.
- F. Borrell noted the property owner could handle access through easements to the open space for a path. Riley noted that is not what is being proposed on the plat, which would be the only way to guarantee it.
- G. Pederson agreed this is not the traditional PUD the Board usually sees. Riley agreed, they usually see a new town road with the 2-3 acre lots developed along the road with open space around it. Here they have a town road on two sides with only 39 acres in the plat. Whereas, usually the applicant is trying to cluster small lots along a new road. There are no criteria set for the size of the outlot. He understands it is tough to separate the plat layout from the rezoning issue. Pederson noted this sets the wetland aside and instead of creating square parcels the lot lines should follow the wetland. Since the wetland is what is being preserved they should pull the wetland out of the two lots. He questioned the authority they have with this project. Jude thought that is what they had done here. Borrell noted there are ten acres of wetland that they cannot do anything with anyway.
- H. J. Thompson noted a property to the southwest is a horse facility and she asked if there is much horse traffic on this road. Jude indicated he lives two miles from here and has only noticed horses by the property a few times a year.
- I. Pettit moved the Commission finds that the criteria in section 614.2(3) of the zoning ordinance are met, the Plan will meet the requirements for common open space as regulated in 614.9, and the Town Board has approved. Therefore the Commission recommends that the County Board approve the rezoning to A/R with the establishment of a Planned Unit Development District for a maximum of 5 lots in accord with the outline development plan reviewed, noting that the Corinna Planning Commission may require design changes prior to final approval of a preliminary plat. Borrell seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY