

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
RICE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Commissioner's Room / Government Services Building
Thursday, April 7, 2022 at 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

A. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order both in-person and electronically by Chair Preston Bauer at 7:00 p.m.

Members present were: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan.

Members absent were: Michael Streiff

Staff present were: Director Julie Runkel, Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell, Administrative Coordinator Anna Aguilar, and Planner Jeremy Edwards.

Commissioners present: Jeff Docken.

Others present: see Sign-in Sheet and Registrant List.

B. Motion by Charlie Peters, seconded by Jill Ellingson, Reading of the Notice.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

C. AA - Item #2 - Kielmeyer TEPP - applicant is requesting to table until the May 5, 2022 BOA meeting.

Motion by Jill Ellingson, seconded by Julia Hogan, Approval of the Agenda.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

Motion by Jill Ellingson, seconded by Charlie Peters to table Item #2 - Kielmeyer TEPP - until the May 5, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

D. Motion by Charlie Peters, seconded by Jill Ellingson, to approve the minutes of March 3, 2022.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

II. New Business

1. Temporary Equipment Placement Permit/Kielmeyer (Donkers) - Section 12, Walcott Township

Corey Kielmeyer, on behalf of landowner Paul Donkers, has applied for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

for a temporary equipment placement aggregate crushing operation from April to December of 2022.

The property is described as: Part of the S1/2 of the SE1/4 of Section 12, Walcott Township, Rice

County, Minnesota. The property address is: 22762 Gates Ave, Faribault, MN 55021. PID#:

15.12.4.75.001. The property is Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Charlie Peters, seconded by Jill Ellingson, to recommend approval of the Temporary

Equipment Placement Permit with the following conditions and findings for Corey Kielmeyer, on

behalf of landowner Paul Donkers. The property is located in Section 12 of Walcott Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – Kielmeyer (Donkers) –
Temporary Equipment Placement Permit**

1. The permittee shall comply with all rules, regulations, requirements, or standards of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Army Corps. Of Engineers and other applicable federal, state or local agencies.
2. The applicant or operator shall furnish a one-year \$50,000 bond or other financial surety for haul road and site restoration. All financial surety shall be reviewed and approved by the Rice County Attorney's office.
3. This TEPP is to allow for an aggregate crushing operation and shall be valid from April 26,

2022 until December 19, 2022.

4. The hours of operation shall be limited to between the hours of 6 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 6 a.m. to 3 p.m. on Saturdays.
5. Applicant to be responsible for repair of county, state and township roads adjacent to the site due to damage hauling from the site. Roads to be restored to their original condition after the aggregate crushing operation ceases.
6. All access drives within the pit and to the paved area of Gates Ave shall be treated with a dust control product (such as calcium chloride), or shall have water applied. Treatments or applications for dust control shall be applied and maintained in a condition to prevent airborne dust, originating from the pit access drives, from leaving the property during times of mining or processing activities on the property.
7. Applicant to strictly adhere to all Rice County codes and ordinances.
8. "Trucks Hauling" signs with red flags are to be posted in locations to be determined by the County Highway Engineer when hauling from the site and to be removed when hauling is not taking place.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

PB - Have any of the conditions been changed from previous permits?

TM - I do not believe there were any changes to the conditions.

PB - Any issues with noncompliance?

TM - No, we have not received and calls or complaints related to this site.

The PC asked the applicant, Corey Kielmeyer (CK), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

CK - We want to set a crusher there to make some gravel.

PB - Are you aware of the 8 conditions?

CK - Yes, I have seen them and I agree with them.

Chair Bauer opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and no one spoke.

Chair Bauer closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

CP - It has been a pit for quite a while with no complaints. I will motion to refer this for approval with the 8 conditions.

JH - I will second

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by Peters, seconded by Hogan, and approved unanimously.

2. Temporary Equipment Placement Permit/Kielmeyer - Section 34, Webster Township

Corey Kielmeyer has applied for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a temporary equipment placement aggregate crushing operation from April to December of 2022. The property is described as: Part of the NW1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 34, Webster Township, Rice County, Minnesota. The property address is: 8127 Chester Ave, Northfield, MN 55057. PID#: 02.34.1.25.001. The property is Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Jill Ellingson, seconded by Charlie Peters, to table the Temporary Equipment Placement Permit for Corey Kielmeyer until May 5, 2022 to allow time for the development of a reclamation plan for the west portion of the pit area near Chester Avenue. The property is located in Section 34 of Webster Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

3. **Conditional Use Permit/County Line Aggregate (Christenson) - Section 1, Webster Township**
John Larson, of County Line Aggregate on behalf of landowner Delane Christenson, has applied for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an aggregate mining and crushing operation. The property is described as: Part of the S1/2 of the N1/2 of Section 1, Webster Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID# 02.01.4.25.002. The property is Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Jill Ellingson, seconded by Charlie Peters, to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit with the following conditions and findings for John Larson, of County Line Aggregate on behalf of landowner Delane Christenson. The property is located in Section 1 of Webster Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – County Line Aggregate (Christenson) –
Conditional Use Permit**

1. The permittee shall comply with all rules, regulations, requirements, or standards of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Army Corps of Engineers and other applicable federal, state or local agencies.
2. The Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is for a sand and gravel mining operation including gravel/aggregate material crushing.
3. The applicant or operator shall furnish a six (6) year \$100,000 bond for haul road repair and for site restoration. All bonds shall be reviewed and approved by the Rice County Attorney's office prior to any work on site.
4. Prior to mining the applicant shall meet with the Rice SWCD to confirm Wetland regulations are being complied with.
5. This conditional use permit shall be valid for a period of five (5) years from its issuance and must be renewed prior to that time or the site completely restored. Failure to renew the permit or to restore the site shall result in the County exercising the bond and using the proceeds to restore and properly close the site.
6. The mineral extraction mining operation shall be restricted to the area and depth shown on the applicant's approved site plan. Any work beyond the approved plan boundaries will require application for a new conditional use permit.
7. The hours of operation shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturdays.
8. A 20-foot setback shall be maintained between the operation and all property lines except the shared mining boundary on the north side. A 100-ft setback shall be maintained from all road right of way. 300-ft shall be maintained between mining and the protected stream near the center of the property. No mining or grading shall occur within these setback areas. All setbacks shall be marked prior to any work occurring on the site.
9. The banks shall be sloped at a minimum 4:1 (Horizontal: Vertical) and the operator shall be required to keep the pit or excavation in such conditions as not to be in danger of caving or sliding banks, to ensure stability.
10. Topsoil from the excavation site is to be stockpiled on the premises for use in restoration of the site. No topsoil is to be removed from the site.
11. The applicant is to follow the approved reclamation plan. Reclamation shall be ongoing so that previously mined land is reclaimed as new areas are opened to mineral extraction. The site is to be completely restored upon completion of permit.
12. The applicant is to be responsible for repair of county, state and township roads adjacent to the site due to damage hauling from the site. The roads are to be restored to their original condition after the gravel mining operation ceases.
13. All access drives within the site to the nearest paved road shall be treated with a dust control product (such as calcium chloride), or shall have water applied. Treatments or applications for dust control shall be applied and maintained in a condition to prevent airborne dust, originating

from the pit access drive from reaching nearby homes during mining or hauling activities on or from the property.

14. Solid waste shall not be placed in the gravel pit; illegally dumped material shall be immediately removed by the applicant.
15. The site is to be cleaned of all debris and equipment after closure of the pit.
16. "Trucks Hauling" signs with red flags are to be posted in locations to be determined by the County Highway Engineer when hauling from the site and to be removed when hauling is not taking place.
17. The site shall be secured at access points.
18. Failure to comply with conditions may result in revocation of the conditional use permit.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

TM - added condition #4 to address SWCD comment/concern.

CP - Was the previous mining just small farming operations or commercial mining?

TM - It was commercial and the last permit expired in 2016, so the previous mining permit ran from 2011-2016.

JH - Have there been any complaints from the neighbors?

TM - We have not received any new comments, but I do believe there was a discussion, with the last mining operation, that a small area was fairly close to the one neighbor.

PB - Per the Staff Report, the most recent permit expired in 2016 and the site has been reclaimed.

The PC asked the applicant, John Larson (JL), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

JL - We have managed the mining immediately to the north for approximately 20 years. We just renewed that permit last year and it went through pretty easily. The landowner of this site came to us and asked us to mine it for him. He was not happy with the amount of material extracted from the site. Not much has been removed from the site the past 12-13 years. He asked us to take the site on. We are aware of all the conditions and are fine with them. They are similar to the ones for the site to the north. The site to the north is slowly being extracted and there isn't much left. It is beneficial to us and to the County to have access to this site. It has been used for a number of the roads in both Rice and Dakota County. We see a lot of need for the material in the next 5-10 years.

PB - Are you familiar with the 18 conditions?

JL - Yes.

Chair Bauer opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and no one spoke.

Chair Bauer closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

JE - I think the request is straight forward. It has been mined in the past and since there is no comment from the closest neighbor, I will motion to refer this for approval with the conditions as written.

CP - I will second with the protected waters being addressed.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by Ellingson, seconded by Peters, and approved unanimously.

4. **Preliminary Plat/Petelinsek - Section 21 Forest Township**

Craig Clarkson, of ISG Inc. on behalf of landowner Dale Petelinsek, has applied for a preliminary plat to create three building lots. The property is described as: Part of Government Lot 5 in the SE1/4 of Section 21, Forest Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID#: 06.21.4.00.001. The property is Zoned RDS, Recreational Development Shoreland.

Motion by Charlie Peters, seconded by Jill Ellingson, to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat with the following conditions and findings for Craig Clarkson, of ISG Inc. on behalf of

landowner Dale Petelinsek. The property is located in Section 21 of Forest Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – Clarkson (Petelinsek) – Preliminary Plat

1. Final plat shall be submitted for approval within six months of preliminary plat approval.
2. Preliminary plat approval is subject to approval of a variance for road location.
3. The roadway will be adjusted to better align the road intersections at right angles.
4. The area of Lot 3 not meeting the minimum lot width will be separated into an outlot.
5. Full engineering design for the proposed roadway and a developer's agreement addressing the road construction shall be submitted with the final plat application.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC). PB - With Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) we always have the Park Dedication Fee and I don't see that as a condition with this one?

TM - This is not a TDR or WOP. This is a Preliminary Plat. Any Park Dedication requirements would come with the Final Plat. This is before you as a Preliminary Plat to hear if you recommend any changes. The applicant will come back with a final plat for you to hear at a later date and that is where the park fees would be included, which is typically \$500 per building lot.

The PC asked the applicant, Dale Petelinsek (DP), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

DP - If we had gone with the 10 units, it would have been a PUD. We ended up going with a simple land split. This is not on a private road, it is a public platted road?

CP - Yep.

DP - Ok, I just wanted to make sure. We have been working with Randy Timm and Paul Reiland. We are trying to do this in the best way possible and are working with, in my opinion, the most reputable organizations.

PB - Are you aware of the 5 conditions?

DP read through the conditions. I do not understand #4.

TM - The area where the roadway becomes a cul-de-sac, west of the ravine, the land south of that has a strip that does not meet the minimum lot width requirements. Right now it is attached to one of the other lots, but it will need to be separated as an outlot. The person with the connecting lot can own both but it will need to be a separate parcel.

DP - So we will end up with 4 lots?

TM - You will have 3 lots and an outlet that is non-buildable.

DP - We are fine with that. CC (*engineer on zoom*) stated understanding as well.

JH - In the summary from ISG, it stated no construction will be conducted in the Tier 1 level shoreland but looking at the density calculation, two of the proposed homes are within that Tier 1.

TM - The density calculations for development are done based on tiers that are a certain distance back from the water. These home sites are outside of that first tier for that calculation. They are riparian lots though, because they connect to the water. The homes are considered in the second tier based on the density calculations. There is a little different terminology there.

Chair Bauer opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and the following spoke:
Denise Klokow - *read remaining comments from the 4/7/2022 email submitted:*

1. (*comment #2 in email*) The proposed subcatchment 4S is shown to direct water to the area near the North Crossing on the south side of Cyrus Trail. Calculations provided show an increase in the runoff by 520% and nearly 2 fold increase in velocity compared to existing. Currently, the majority of the water from 4S flows naturally overland which provides filtering before entering a natural north/south drainage-way that ultimately feeds Circle Lake. The existing area along Cyrus Trail currently carries very minimal water from sub-catchment 3S which feeds a smaller East-West natural drainage-way which connects to the main North-south drainage-way feeding

- Circle Lake. What measures would be taken to manage the over 5X additional water and 2X increased water velocity from the re-routing of subcatchment 4S to Cyrus Trail such that it is naturally filtered before entering Circle Lake? What measures are being taken to slow down the water to prevent erosion along the newly projected path? There is some natural erosion with the existing water flow along Cyrus Trail and large elevation changes in this area, increasing the water flow by over 5X would likely require additional measures which are not addressed in the proposal. Did the developer consider a retention area for this development to better manage the runoff and the rate of delivery of this water to Circle Lake as opposed to the re-routing proposal?
2. *(comment #3 in email)* The proposed culvert for the North Crossing is shown to be 3 feet deeper than the existing road surface, this will dictate significant changes to the exiting ditch and roadway on both sides of the proposed culvert along Cyrus Trail. The Erosion control and grading plan does not include any elevation or grading information in regards to this area, and the projected path along the existing roadway. Similarly, the site and removal plan doesn't highlight any tree impact or removals, is this the case? Can the details of the design along Cyrus Trail roadway be provided so we can better understand how this may impact the current roadway situation? How will this new water way affect the safety of the current road? Width, depth and expected side slope? any need for guard rail? Proximity to existing road surface?
 3. *(comment #4 in email)* The existing ravine that flows north which carries the water on this property to Circle Lake is extremely large and has the ability to create erosion and silt going into Circle Lake. How can it be ensured that this development project with three single family homes, adding impervious surfaces to the area, does not exacerbate this issue? The proposal seemed to largely assume 0% impervious, would any special restrictions be needed on maximum permissible impervious surfaces?
 4. *(comment #5 in email)* Cyrus Trail is maintained by the property owners that live on this road. There is a concern that heavy road construction equipment traffic could cause damage to Cyrus Trail. What can be done to ensure the Cyrus Trail property owners are not responsible for the costs to repair any possible damage to Cyrus Trail caused by the construction of this new road? Or this development in general?

Chair Bauer closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

Called applicant back up.

Craig Clarkson (CC) - *ISG engineer* - Those calculations were provided with the sole purpose of sizing the culverts to ensure the one already installed and the new one to be installed were of adequate size. To do that we use very conservative runoff numbers. with much more impervious surface than is proposed. Those numbers are not the actual numbers. They are much higher then what would ever be there. We calculated it based on 100% impervious surface of the lot and all the area tributary to the larger culvert. Those numbers can only be taken into context when sizing the culvert and do not represent the accurate runoff numbers that the 3 lots will produce.

CP - It does need to be platted as a public roadway, but that does not mean that the Township is taking it over. I think Soil & Water should be consulted to review the engineering and ensure it meets the County standard prior to condition #5 being met.

PB - There will be a developers agreement to meet condition #5.

JD - CP are you asking for another condition?

CP - I think with condition #5, a fully engineered design of the proposed roadway, as long as Soil & Water is involved to verify ISG's engineering.

JH - A Final Plat still has to come forward with the construction plan that will be sent to Soil & Water for them to review as well.

TM - I have drafted a proposed 6th condition if you want to add it.

PB - Is it necessary with this having to come back to us for review as a Final Plat?

CP - I don't think it would hurt to have another condition.

JR - A developers' agreement and final plat will address this. Full construction documents will need to be submitted and a third party engineer will also need to review and approve of the plan at the developers' expense.

CP - I will motion for approval to move this on to the County board.

JE - I will second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by Peters, seconded by Ellingson, and approved unanimously.

5. **Waiver of Plat/Shambour - Section 11, Wheatland Township**

Michael Shambour has applied for a Waiver of Plat to create one building lot through the use of a Transfer Development Right (TDR). The property is described as: Part of the W1/2 of the NW1/4 of Section 11, Wheatland Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID# 01.11.2.50.001. The property is Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Charlie Peters, seconded by Julia Hogan, to recommend approval of the Waiver of Plat with the following conditions and findings for Micheal Shamour. The property is located in Section 11 of Wheatland Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – Shambour – Waiver of Plat

1. The new 2.5-acre Transfer Development Right (TDR) receiving parcel shall contain one single family dwelling.
2. Any new construction on the parcels is to adhere to all Rice County codes and ordinances.
3. The remaining parcel and TDR receiving parcel shall not be further subdivided or combined with other land(s) unless approved under the Rice County subdivision regulations.
4. The conservation easement for the TDR sending area shall be recorded at the same time or before the new parcel is recorded.
5. Prior to recording of the receiving parcel information from Wheatland Township will need to be submitted to the Rice County Environmental Services Department showing that Holt Ave does directly connect with the receiving property.
6. Within one year of this approval the applicant shall record a new deed, at the Rice County Records Office, containing just the TDR receiving parcel.
7. In-lieu park dedication fee of \$500 shall be paid prior to recording of the new parcel.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

The PC asked the applicant, Michael Shambour (MiS), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

MiS - TM explained it. Just trying to keep the larger piece of land together. The 2.5 acre piece is for my daughter and son-in-law, so they can build out there.

PB - Are you aware of the 7 conditions?

MiS - Yes.

Chair Bauer opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and no one spoke.

Chair Bauer closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

CP - Pretty straight forward. I will make a motion that we approve the Waiver of Plat and move it forward to the Commissioners.

JH - I'll second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by Peters, seconded by Hogan, and approved unanimously.

6. **Zoning Map Amendment to Rezone property - Sections 29, 31 and 32 Bridgewater Township**
Bridgewater Township, on behalf of landowners, has applied for rezoning of properties from A, Agricultural to RI, Rural Industrial. A total of approximately 311-acres of land is proposed for the rezoning. The property is described as: Part of the S1/2 of Section 29 and Part of the E1/4 of Section 31 and Part of the W1/2 of Section 32, all in Bridgewater Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID#s: all of 07.29.3.50.002, 07.29.3.50.004, 07.29.3.50.005, 07.29.3.75.003, 07.29.4.00.002, 07.29.4.00.003, 07.31.1.00.001, 07.32.2.50.001, 07.32.3.25.001 and parts of 07.31.1.25.002, 07.31.4.00.001, and 07.32.2.25.003. Properties are currently Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Charlie Peters, seconded by Preston Bauer, to recommend approval of the Zoning Map Amendment request for Bridgewater Township. The properties are located in Section 29, 31 and 32 of Bridgewater Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Preston Bauer, Charlie Peters, Jill Ellingson, Julia Hogan, NAYS: None

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

PB - Can you give us a background on the creation of the Rural Industrial district?

TM gave a brief background on the creation of the new Rural Residential district.

PB - Is it traditional for the Township to request the rezone for the landowners? Or is it normally the landowners?

TM - In Rice County, we only have one Township that does its own zoning. Their regulations are required to be as restrictive as the County's or more so. The County does still maintain the Zoning Map for that area. For Bridgewater to do any rezoning through their process, it needs to match up with the County Zoning map. That is why this is before you, otherwise you normally would not see the Township requesting to rezone.

The PC asked the applicant, Glen Castore (GC) of Bridgewater Township, to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

GC - *Bridgewater Supervisor* - The Landowners requested the Township to act as their agent on behalf of this rezone request. I will explain a little how this came about. The land is right along the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and periodically, going back 10 years, we have had a number of companies who have been interested in that rail access. We currently have 2 companies that are actively talking with landowners in the area. That is what led to this request. In 2019, we had a series of Township meetings on land use in the Township, attended by 20 to 60 people each. The consensus was that these agricultural areas in the southwest portion of the Township, we should consider industrial development there for the purpose of improving our tax base and because the land is really marginal agricultural land. We could get a better use out of it. Plus, the fact that these people are getting dinged ever few years when someone expresses interest but want to use it for a non-agricultural related use. That led us to working with the County to create the Rural Industrial district and now this rezoning request. There are a couple of landowners that are choosing to rezone their entire property with their residential home site to Rural Industrial. That is their choice. I also want to point out that Merlu Blue LLC, 20.5 acres, includes what is known by the MPCA as the Hoover Dump. Rezoning this area industrial makes us eligible for Brown Field cleanup funds from the Department of Economic Development, so that is an incentive for a number of people within the Township to encourage the Board to move in this direction.

PB - I am on Cannon City Township just to the south and we understand the interest in access to the railway.

GC - All of the companies that have approached the landowners or the Township to this point, have all been what I would call distribution companies. No manufacturing companies have approached us so far. The thought is to bring items in by rail and then transfer them to a truck and move them out, or to store onsite for a short time and then move them up into the cities.

Chair Bauer opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and the following spoke:

Larry Conrad - If you look at the map where the gravel wash plant was. Just south of there, I own that land. At one point, they had my land included in this plan until I started asking questions and now my property has been removed. It seems to me that there are road lines that could be used as boundaries, but instead it looks like they are going by various property lines. Why is everything only east of the railroad tracks? Are there not two sides to every track? My concern is what it will do to residential property values. I know of 2 brand new homes that are right on the outer edge of this, not in it. I am concerned

what it will do to the values of those homes in the future.

Ben Martig - *Northfield City Administrator - Read from letter submitted to Staff after the meeting.*

Northfield opposes any rezoning that cannot support itself with its existing infrastructure.

Chair Bauer closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

CP - I am a part of the Joint Powers of Forest Township. I would like to mimic what GC stated. We are not aggressively seeking development, development is aggressively seeking us. That is why we are trying to do the joint-powers agreement to get ahead of it in a constructive manner. We have spoken to the 3 municipalities about taking us in but they all have their own ordinances and such.

JD - There are multiple subjects to consider, such as this and the I35 corridor. We are not talking about a hotel or anything where the water requirements would be huge. A distribution center doesn't use as much water. Everyone seems to want to revive the railroad spur there. Here you have an opportunity to use the spur. I'm not sure exactly what will be there. It may not be something you don't want right next to town.

The applicant came back up.

GC - I can comment on the utilities and the public infrastructure. We had an engineering firm study converting 140th Street to a paved 10-ton road which would connect us to the surrounding main roads. We had that done and are looking at cost estimates and funds to do that. With sewer & water, we also had an engineering firm look at soil types and what is most practical. We have talked with the City of Faribault. They, like Northfield, said they are not interested in providing services past County Road 9 at this point. The engineering firm says we can provide waste water treatment and have given us specifications for what kind of water we can handle with either a spray field or a system that pushes the water back down into the aquifer. Those are limitations that we are very clear about when companies approach us. If the company is a food processing plant that is going to put out a lot of biological material, we tell them this isn't the location for that even if they want access to the rail line. The water requirements are minimal for what we are talking about. The largest distribution center that is looking at this area right now has 50 employees. We are looking at wastewater from hand washing and toilets essentially. We have engineering firms look at what we can reasonably provide for utilities here and if someone comes in that needs more, we tell them to go elsewhere. The attraction is most of these companies require a fair amount of land but the minimal acreage we have talked about is 20 acres with the max being 170 acres. There are very few places where you can find that acreage with access to a transportation system.

PB - Did Bridgewater Township query the landowners with 20-acres or more?

GC - No, of the companies that have approached us, the smallest amount of area they were looking for was 20-acres.

PB - How did Bridgewater come up with the list of properties?

GC - Several of the landowners approached the Township board stating that companies had contacted them and were interested in the area. This was over a year ago. At that time, the County did not have a Rural Industrial zone, and the zoning that was available seemed inappropriate in various ways. So we worked with the County to create the Rural Industrial zone and that process went pretty smoothly. We sent letters to all of the landowners in the area and had several meetings. Not every landowner in the area volunteered to sign up, which is fine with us. If someone had questions or reservations about this, they were expressed to us and we explained that if they did not want their property in an industrial district, to not apply to rezone. On the west side of the tracks, the situation has changed. There is an easement owned by the State for a bicycle trail which limits access to the railway from the west side, which is why we are mainly on the east side.

JD questioned an area on the map.

GC - On the north side of this where it touches County Road 3, that is roughly where the Hoover Dump is. One of those three homes is an unoccupied home.

CP - I don't have anything to do with Bridgewater other than working together on the joint-powers agreement for sewer and water to the interstate, but I think the rail spur is important. There has obviously been interest in it over the years. I have no issues with it if the landowners signed up on their own.

PB - The Rural Industrial is limited based on what is allowed in it.

CP - I motion we move this on to the Commissioner for approval.

JH - Bridgewater did originally come to us with this idea for this area to be changed to Rural Industrial and it has been a topic of discussion for the past 6-7 months with the County. Other municipalities have

been made aware and allowed time to give comments.
PB - I will second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by Peters, seconded by Bauer, and approved unanimously.

III. Adjournment

Hearing no other items before the PC, a motion was made by Hogan, second by Ellingson, to adjourn the meeting at 8:03 pm. Motion carried 4-0.

Respectfully Submitted



Anna Aguilar
Administrative Coordinator

Planning Commission


Charlie Peters, Vice Chair