

**Becker County Planning Commission**  
**April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2024**

**Members Present:** Chairman Dave Blomseth, Jeff Moritz, Tom Disse, County Commissioner Erica Jepson, Nick Bowers, Steve Lindow, Kim Mattson, Kohl Skalin, and Mary Seaberg Tommy Ailie, Commissioner John Okeson, Craig Hall, and Zoning Administrator Kyle Vareberg. **Members Absent:** Harvey Aho

Chairman Dave Blomseth called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Introductions were given. Becker County Zoning Technician Nicole Bradbury recorded the minutes.

Hall made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024, meeting. Ailie second. All members in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Dave Blomseth explained the protocol for the meeting and stated that the recommendations of the Planning Commission will be forwarded to the County Board of Commissioners for final action.

Vareberg asked that applicant three (3) be moved to the end of the meeting.

**Old Business:**

1. **APPLICANT: Jay Boeddeker Trust** 13816 N Sunflower Dr Fountain Hills, AZ 85268 **Project Location:** 13617 260<sup>th</sup> Ave Detroit Lakes, MN 56501 **LEGAL LAND DESCRIPTION:** Tax ID Number: **19.0309.000** Section 15 Township 138 Range 041; 15-138-041 PT GOVT LOTS 3, 5, 6: COMM NE COR GOVT LOT 6 W 1026.16' TO POB; E 1026.16', S 1363.46', W 1378.01', NW 823.17', SWLY 408.16', WLY 258.75' TO CTR LN 260TH AVE, NLY 22.12', ELY 260.35', NELY 408.78', NWLY 470.87' TO GLAWE LK, SELY & NELY AL LK TO BOUND LN DOC 295144, SE 181.86' TO POB. LESS .1AC TO 19-304. **APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** Request a Conditional Use Permit for a shoreland Multi-Unit Development consisting of ten (10) units. This application was tabled from the March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024, hearing. **THIS APPLICATION WAS TABLED BEFORE THE HEARING.**

**New Business:**

1. **APPLICANT: 4 Suns LLLP** PO Box 9949 Fargo, ND 58106 **Project Location:** 24594 NE Rock Lake Rd Detroit Lakes, MN 56501 **LEGAL LAND DESCRIPTIONS:** Tax ID Numbers: **16.0139.000 & 16.0145.000** Sections 20 & 21 Township 140 Range 040; 21-140-40 PT SEC 20. PT GOVT LOT 5 SEC 20. PT GOVT LOT 2, 3 SEC 21: COMM W QTR COR SEC 21, E 1298.11', S 312.23' TO POB; NW 806.21' TO CTR RD, SLY AL RD 1150.57', W 1264.31' TO ROCK LK, SLY, NLY AND ELY AL LK 3813.25', N 1060.22 TO POB. TRACT C. & 21-140-

47 40 PT SEC 20. PT GOVT LOT 5 SEC 20. PT GOVT LOT 2, 3 SEC 21: COMM W  
48 QTR COR E 1298.11', S 312.23' TO CTR RD AND POB; SLY AL RD 1150.57', W  
49 1264.31' TO ROCK LK, NLY AL LK 1453.42', ELY 1146.79' TO POB. TRACT B.  
50 **APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** Request a Final Plat for  
51 ten (10) lots to be known as ROCK LAKE ESTATES.  
52  
53

54 Vareberg stated that the only change to the Plat was the name change from ROCK LAKE  
55 ESTATES to 4 SUNS ACRES. There were no other changes.  
56

57 Levi Arneson with 4 Suns presented the application.  
58

59 Blomseth asked if there were any other changes aside from what Vareberg already stated.  
60

61 Arenson said no.  
62

63 Trent Bartells, a neighboring property owner, asked for clarification on the acreage as the parcel  
64 used to be ninety-nine (99) acres.  
65

66 Vareberg explained that there had been a boundary line adjustment with the northerly portion  
67 being sold to an adjacent neighbor, but that that acreage was never included in the plat. Vareberg  
68 further explained that there is also additional acreage between the plat and that northerly portion  
69 that the applicant has retained. He explained that they are not developing all of the land they  
70 own.  
71

72 Kohl asked if all the lots proposed are legal conforming lots.  
73

74 Vareberg said yes.  
75

76 Letters received before the meeting are entered into the record below:  
77

4/22/24

Nicole Bradbury  
c/o Becker County Planning and Zoning Department  
915 Lake Avenue  
Detroit Lakes, MN 56501

Re: response for Public Hearing 4/24/24

To the members of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

We are writing today to express our objections to the proposed plan by 4 Suns LLP, to be known as Rock Lake Estates. This is our second letter. We have been residents with 2 properties on Rock Lake Road since 1997. We have deep concerns regarding public safety, the safety of pets, wildlife and even native plants should this project go through. There have been times where we have seen vehicles speeding through Rock Lake Road, narrowly missing pets, children and wildlife.

Rock Lake Road is narrow and winding, and adding 10 more homes, with a possibility of 2 vehicles per home could potentially lead to a marked increase in accidents, injuries, or even loss of life.

Sincerely,

Mike & Karla Krey  
64646 NE Rock Lake Rd  
24387 NE Rock Lake Rd  
Rochert, MN 56578

78  
79

**To Becker County Planning and Zoning Commission**

**Re: Final Plat for Rock Lake Estates, 2459 NE Rock Lake Road**

I am writing today to speak against approval for RLE final plat based on concerns that have been raised previously but not adequately addressed.

The issue is the condition of the NE Rock Lake Road, particularly the portion adjacent to the lake. On the East end of this stretch, there is a ninety degree blind corner, to the north side of the road lie natural springs and to the south side is sensitive shore land thick with natural flora including many pink and white Lady Slippers, the Minnesota state flower.

Over the last many years this road has been "built up", "filled", "widened", "littered with culverts" and "sprayed with herbicides" to the demise of the ecology on both sides of the road. In spite of this work and money the road is still of comparatively low quality, narrow and often soft.

If only looking at the current proposed development the increase in traffic will likely be 20 or more vehicles. The increased traffic of this development will certainly increase those maintenance procedures. The increased maintenance will do more damage to the adjacent property and eco-systems. And we, including the township, will suffer increased costs and still be left with a substandard road.

If looking beyond this singular project, as we all should and the planning commission must, there are many undeveloped sites further down NE Rock Lake Road. When/If these are developed the strain on this road will become unsustainable. Also, safety concerns will increase as more vehicles must navigate the 90 degree blind corner.

We all know a road of this nature would never be permitted or built today.

It is time to study moving that section of road away from sensitive habitat and poor soils to a more stable, safer and easier to maintain location.

Thank you for your consideration. Jay W. Johnson and Anne McKay

80  
81 Skalin said they already approved this once.  
82  
83

84 **MOTION: Skalin motioned to approve the application as submitted. Ailie second.**  
85 **Roll Call; All in favor. Motion carried.**  
86

87  
88  
89       **2. APPLICANT: Soo Pass Ranch Inc** 900 Wayzata Blvd E Suite #130 Wayzata, MN  
90       55391 **Project Location:** 25526 Co Hwy 22 Detroit Lakes, MN 56501 **LEGAL**  
91       **LAND DESCRIPTIONS:** Tax ID Numbers: **19.0315.000 & 19.0316.000** Section 16  
92       Township 138 Range 041; 16-138-41 NE1/4 SW1/4. GOVT LOT 1, 2, 3 LESS: RR.  
93       LESS 20.7AC (19-152), LESS N 660' OF E 660', LESS 3.78AC (19-316-1) & N 32  
94       RDS OF LOT 2 SW OF RWY. **APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF**  
95       **PROJECT:** Request a Change of Zone from Agricultural to Commercial.  
96  
97

98       Mark Bjerke with Soo Pass presented the application. He explained that the change of zone is not  
99       for the entire property, but just for the area with the concert bowl.  
100

101       Hall asked if he is splitting off that portion.  
102

103       Vareberg said it will be subdivided.  
104

105       Skalin asked for clarification that a portion of both parcels was included in this change of zone.  
106

107       Bjerke said yes, a portion of both parcels is in their bowl area.  
108

109       Skalin asked if they will still have to obtain an annual Conditional Use Permit (CUP) if this is  
110       approved.  
111

112       Vareberg said yes.  
113

114       There were no letters received for this application.  
115

116       As there was no one to speak for or against the application, testimony closed.  
117

118       Hall said as long as it's just for the bowl area he has no objection.  
119

120       Skalin stated that the County will still have the ability to place restrictions with the annual CUP.  
121  
122

123       **MOTION: Ailie motioned to approve the application for a Change of Zone for the**  
124       **portion of the property requested. Moritz second. Roll Call; All in favor. Motion**  
125       **carried.**  
126  
127  
128

129       **4. APPLICANT: Lake Life Hospitality Consulting Inc** 1462 East Shore Dr Detroit Lakes,  
130       MN 56501 **Project Location:** 11284 Co Hwy 17 Detroit Lakes, MN 56501 **LEGAL LAND**  
131       **DESCRIPTION:** Tax ID Number: **19.1080.000** Section 28 Township 138 Range 041;  
132       DACOTA BEACH 138 41 Block 002 LOTS 8 & 24 LESS HWY, LOTS 9 & 23 & E 20'

133 OF LOT 22 & VAC RD. **APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** Request  
134 a Conditional Use Permit to construct a ten (10) foot fence.  
135  
136

137 Mike Lovelace with Lighthouse Construction presented the application and explained that they  
138 want to store company boats and docks on this property.  
139

140 Seaberg asked why they needed the extra four (4) feet.  
141

142 Lovelace said for security.  
143

144 Skalin referenced a letter received that suggested the property may be used for housing.  
145

146 Lovelace said not that he is aware of, but that rumors in that specific letter have been going  
147 around for years.  
148

149 Okeson asked what would run along the top of the fence.  
150

151 Lovelace said just a bar.  
152

153 Skalin said for security reasons they typically don't use bars as they are easier to get over.  
154

155 Josh Bright, a neighbor, spoke and asked how the property is zoned, if there had been any  
156 requests to change the zone, and if the liquor license was still attached to that property.  
157

158 Vareberg said it is zoned agricultural, there have not been any change of zone requests, and that  
159 he believes the liquor license would be through the state of Minnesota.  
160

161 Bright asked what the property owners' intentions are. If it is to store boats, he asked if it is  
162 outside storage and if people will be renting space from him.  
163

164 Skalin said it will be outside storage, but storage will be for company docks and lifts, not rentals.  
165

166 Bright asked if there was anywhere else in that area that has a ten (10) foot chain-link fence that  
167 has been approved.  
168

169 Blomseth said there have been some approved, but not in that area.  
170

171 Okeson said a liquor license hasn't been applied for in many years so it would be null and void.  
172

173 There was discussion and clarification as to whether or not it would be commercial use.  
174

175 Vareberg said that unless someone is paying to store their items there, then it is not commercial.  
176

177 Derek Gorder, adjacent property owner, spoke and shared his concerns about the height of the  
178 fence. He stated that he does not feel a ten (10) foot fence will be aesthetically pleasing for his  
179 business.

Letters received before the meeting are entered into record below:

Meeting to be on 4/24/24 at 6 PM

We received the above notification of the above request. We would NOT be in favor of a 10' high fence. Why does anyone need a fence that high? What are they hiding or trying to keep in or out? The word is that the Zorbaz Hanson's are building a structure to house the J1 Visa people that they bring in to work at their restaurants.. a 6' fence would be efficient, unless thy are making a commune or nudist colony! It is not aesthetic to neighbors or the area! Also, the people living inside that fence would feel like they are in prison! Would the Hanson's want a 10' high fence around something across the street from their house or sit outside and your view is blocked? Pretty sure they would not!! A 10' high fence is excessive! And not an 8'! A 6' okay. Please consider the neighbors and neighborhood!

Thank you,

Allen 'Gene' and June Lawrence

As there was noone else to speak for or against the application, testimony was closed.

Hall said he doesn't see a need for it. He thinks six (6) feet should be fine.

Skalin said there is storage across the road that isn't even fenced.

Mattson asked if the applicant would consider shortening the fence to six (6) feet.

Lovelace said if they don't get the Conditional Use Permit, then they have no choice.

Lindow asked if there would be lights in this area.

Lovelace said there is no electricity out there right now, and there hasn't been any discussion of adding lights.

Disse asked the reason for wanting ten (10) feet.

Lovelace said for security.

**MOTION: Seaberg motioned to deny the application. Hall second. Roll Call; All in favor. Motion carried.**

**3. APPLICANT: Robert J Olek & Bradley Olek** 4260 Scenic Ln Woodbury, MN 55129 **Project Location:** 17354 190<sup>th</sup> Ave Audubon, MN 56511 **LEGAL LAND DESCRIPTION:** Tax ID Number: **02.0241.000** Section 33 Township 139 Range 042; NW1/4 OF NE1/4 & LOT 2 LESS 6 RDS ON S SIDE. **APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** Request a Conditional Use Permit for a Commercial Planned Unit Development for forty-nine (49) units.

From this point forward the meeting minutes were transcribed using an AI website. The transcription has been edited to correct any errors that may have occurred with unclear audio.

**Vareberg:** Final applicant, Robert, and Bradley Olek, requesting a conditional use permit for a commercial planned unit development for forty-nine (49) units.

**Blomseth:** All right. Before we get started, I'm going to set a few rules. There's a lot of people here this evening. First off, I'm going to ask, how many in the general audience are planning to speak to this application? Please raise your hand. Now, I'm also going to tell you, if you submitted a letter, I would ask that you not step to the mic and read your letter to us. It's already in our packet. We have read them ahead of time, and they are already submitted as part of the record. Now, if you have something to add that you did not have in your letter, please feel free to step forward. And then also only step forward if you have some new testimony. We don't need to hear the same reason 15 times over again. So just to kind of keep this process moving. Now, I will let the applicant introduce their application. Then if there's somebody, obviously there's a lake association involved here. If you have a spokesperson, a head of your lake association would like to speak, I will give them sufficient time to speak. Or if they have legal counsel, I will give them sufficient time to speak. Everybody else, I will be limiting it to two and a half minutes. So, I ask you then to step forward. Only give information or testimony of something we have not already heard, just to keep this process moving. As I say, we don't need to hear the same thing multiple times, as we've read it multiple times in these letters. So, with that, I ask the applicant to please step forward. Thank you for your time.

**Olek:** My name is Bob Olek. I represent my brother, Brad, and myself for the conditional use permit for the RV Park on Little Cormorant Lake. We're asking for 49 campsites and 15 boat slips. We've engaged APEX Engineering. John is here tonight from APEX. He prepared the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) plan. We sent that in in the last few days. Also participated in the tech panel last week. I listened to lots of the commentary that was there, and our intention is to, if this is approved, to follow all the requested guidelines and rules and regulations that they need for such an RV park. I guess I would say that our stance on hoping for the approval of the permit is we believe that there's a sufficient demand for additional RV camping sites in the lake area. Almost every campsite you can check with has a waiting list. So, it's really difficult for people to obtain a camping use. I would also say that with the intention of a growing community, growing population, there's a lot of people who want to enjoy the lake country and enjoy the natural resources, and certainly not everybody is able to afford a lake home with today's valuations, so camping is a great alternative for those individuals that want to participate in lake country. From the tech panel last week, one of the things that I guess I heard is of the potential opportunities with this development land that currently is being used as farmland. Other potential opportunities would be the RV park that we're proposing and or single-family subdivision. From what I heard from the meeting from an environmental standpoint, the least intrusive impact environmentally would potentially be the RV park, and currently with farmland you have



the farmland chemical and soil erosion that exists today that was stated at that meeting that it's probably the worst impact on the lake environmentally, and a subdivision could also be more negatively construed than an RV park from a development standpoint. I guess the other benefits we believe this would be an increased tax base for the county, which is always an interest to lessen tax burden for everyone else if you can have appropriate development to increase the tax base for everybody.

And I guess the last thing we would state, certainly answering the questions you have, would be the lake area obviously being based on tourism, this would be another benefit to the county lake area for bringing people in from a tourism perspective for all the things that people use around the lake, the restaurants, the retail, the bait shops, everything that people bring their commerce into the lake area.

**Blomseth:** All right, any questions for Bob?

**Jepson:** Will you be running this campground?

**Olek:** Yes, we plan to have active management. I'm hoping that within a short period of time that I would be involved in that directly. In the short term, as we get through developing it, there will be other active management, but I would be very much involved with that.

**Craig Hall:** Which one of the three plans are you really trying to do.

**Vareberg:** Number two.

**Bob Olek:** Number two, yeah.

**Kohl Skalin:** Yeah, it said that the SWPPP was designed for number two. That was going to be my question. I see the tech panel asked, it said that it's an impaired water, so does your SWPPP meet those requirements of the impaired waters or is it a generic SWPPP?

**Olek:** I'm going to have to defer to John.

**John Olson:** No, that's fine. My name is John Olson with Apex Engineering Group here on behalf of the Oleks. We've been contracted to assist with the stormwater management plan, as well as creating a plan for development. Yes, the SWPPP will absolutely meet all MPCA requirements as it relates to impaired waters. Currently, the SWPPP notes that the impairments are non-construction related. I haven't done my final review on it, but certainly if it is a construction-related impairment, we'll make sure that those special requirements are included in the final plan before we sign it.

**Oleson:** I have one question. Have you met with the township to see how you're going to handle additional traffic on that road on 190th?

**Olek:** I don't believe that meeting has happened yet, but it's being planned, I believe, in the coming weeks.

**Vareberg:** Yeah, Commissioner Okeson, it'll be Monday, May 6th, the day before your meeting.

**Okeson:** That is a concern I've gotten from the Audubon township supervisors. The road itself is in pretty rough shape already, and I travel that frequently over to the Bird Dog area.

**Blomseth:** Any other questions for the applicants? All right, thank you. All right, anybody else to speak to this application? Please step forward. And please state your name, but also who you are representing.

**Dylan Ramstad Skoyles:** Sounds good. My name is Dylan Ramstad Skoyles. I represent the Lake Association. Hopefully I can make my comments pretty quick, and we'll maybe get some people who will not talk about that. So I just would like to—we wrote a letter. I submitted that letter earlier this morning. I would just like to make a quick correction to my letter.

The letter states in the first opening paragraph that we didn't receive a SWPPP. We received that at about 4 o'clock yesterday. I was unaware when I submitted the letter.

So just making sure that we all know that. I'd just like to kind of highlight some of the points that the letter brings out. The Lake Association, and I believe some of the homeowners around the lake, are really concerned about the boat access on Little Cormorant.

Currently, as you saw in that letter, the boat access is relatively small. And they will have 15 slips at the campground. They will have 49 units.

That means that there are 34 people who would theoretically become day users of Little Cormorant Lake. That is going to overwhelm an already taxed boat access, and the association is just concerned about where those people will be parked, how they're going to handle that, if there's any plans for the additional use. We recognize that the DNR really has control over that, but we don't feel that it's appropriate for this plan to be approved without any idea about how that access would accommodate those users.

There's also some concern about the channel. There's a very narrow channel that would be the only way for somebody to get from the access to this property. And currently, as it sits, it is a one-way. It's only wide enough for one boat at a time. That could cause some congestion on the lake in that area for the property owners around the lake to use the lake as this plan sits. So basically, the Lake Association just wants some additional plans, little notes on how those things are going to happen. I would like to also point out that a wetland delineation was recommended before the Planning Commission approved or denied this request. As of right now, I have not seen that, and I don't believe we have received one. I think that that is pretty important.

I know that the applicant just said that they are moving forward with design number two, but according to that meeting, design number three might have a road or would have a road going through a potential wetland. I think that having the idea that they don't necessarily know where the wetlands are as it relates to their plans is a concerning nature. And so, again, the Lake Association just wants more information. Basically, it's our position that the applicant does not have some of the information required or has not provided the information that was

recommended by the tech panel, and we should wait until we get that information. I will take any questions if you have any. Other than that, I will thank you for your time.

**Dave Blomseth:** Dylan, that narrow channel, is that a no-wake zone area? How is that marked?

**Skoyles:** I believe it's a no-wake zone, and it is marked by some buoys. I did in the letter, there were some pictures of the channel. The Lake Association currently goes out and marks the channel. It's apparently very hard to navigate.

In full disclosure, I've never been on the channel, so I'm going from what my clients tell me. And just the use of that channel, while obviously public water, it's concerning with the increase in boat traffic and the necessity to use it from the access to the proposed project.

**Blomseth:** Thank you, Dylan. Any other questions for Dillon?

**Lindow:** On that channel, the day I was out there watching, there was a boat that went through there, and it's quite long, they have to go through pretty slow. And I understand it's like a turn, every other turn, every other direction. Each time somebody wants to go, they have to switch it off. That takes a long time to get through there. These other 34 boats you're talking about, do you expect them to come up to the campground then?

**Skoyles:** Well, given the fact that, excuse me, I don't know what 34 people are going to do, right? But there is the potential for 34 people who would want to use the lake, who would need to take their boats on the trailers, drive it over to the public access, and then either, depending on how crowded the access is, somebody might have to take the boat and trailer back. Theoretically, that person would want to be on the lake. The boat user would have to drive through the channel. Or somebody who just doesn't want to put their boat in and out all day, they want to have access to the boat throughout the day, so they bring their boat through the channel to the property. And you'd have to use the channel to get to and from the lake, to and from the access from the property. And obviously, the 15 people who are lucky enough to get a boat, to use a boat slip, would also theoretically have to use the channel at some point.

**Lindow:** So, for you then, the idea of 15 slips, it's really, you know, that 15 plus another possibly 30 boats of people who don't have a slip that would be using that part of the lake and accessing the campground.

**Skoyles:** There is the potential for that. I would imagine somebody who uses one of these units on a lake, such as Little Cormorant, would want to use a boat. But they're not necessarily one of the 15. Again, we don't have any plans, so we don't know if they're only going to limit the boats to 15 people who rent a unit. You know, I guess that's just one of the kind of questions that we have. But the potential currently is for somebody to be a day user, 34 people to be a day user.

**Blomseth:** Any other questions for Dylan?

**Skoyles:** I would just like to add that, again, just at this meeting, we learned that there's a meeting regarding a road that's happening after approval. I think that, again, that just shows that we're having a little bit of a cart before the horse.

**Blomseth:** And we are a board of recommendation, the county commissioners, obviously, as you know get the final say.

**Skoyles:** Yep. I'm aware. I just want to make sure that I get my two cents in on that as well.

**Blomseth:** I appreciate that, Dylan. All right. Thank you. Is there anybody else in the general audience representing a group of people? All right. Please step forward.

**Kevin Vander:** My name is Kevin Vander. Our cabin is at 16131 Sugar Island Road. We're the house directly opposite from the channel. My dad and I and my brother dug their channel out back in '73. I do know from seeing boats every day that I figure that the extra boats on a busy day, there's going to be lines in both directions. Only one boat can get through there at a time. It's a quagmire. It would be a quagmire right there. We can't offset anything with the surroundings there. The other thing I'm really concerned with, and I'll finish, is the landing. There's just not enough room there for people to park that landing. Thank you.

**Blomseth:** So, do you live there year-round?

**Vander:** No, I don't. We've had the property since '73. Okay. My folks passed away 11 years ago.

**Blomseth:** So, in the summertime, do you generally see, is there a line of boats trying to get back and forth through there now?

**Vander:** Yes, and it's going to get worse. I just can't imagine another 15, 20 boats on that lake. And I know they'll want to go through the channel because they'll want to go to the big part of the lake. We're on the other side, the smaller part, so it'll be a quagmire. And there's nothing we can do with that.

**Blomseth:** All right. Any other questions for Kevin? All right. Thank you. Have a seat. Anybody else to speak to this application?

**Rob Jackson:** So, my name is Rob Jackson. I live at 16473 Sugar Island Road, and we're very near to the development, actually nearly across from it. And everything that's been said about the channel is true. That's a very congested area. But there's an area leading up to the channel that would be very impacted. We're on the shoreline, and it's a pretty steep shoreline, on the other side of the lake from the development. And that boat traffic that would be congesting coming up to the channel would also be parted out in our home area and would impact our shore erosion. So, there would need to be a study done on impact assessment for the shoreline on both sides leading up to that development.

**Blomseth:** Any questions for him? All right. You may sit down. All right.

**Fred Wright:** My name is Fred Wright. I'm from Detroit Lakes and Oregon. My wife, Alma, and I own a small cabin on Little Cormorant Lake. You should be in possession of a letter and an e-mail that we've already sent into the committee. I'd like to expand on one thing that's mentioned in there briefly. I also should mention that I'm the director of the Lakes Association, so that's why I tried to get up here before. Little Cormorant, the Cormorant area out there is in the southwest corner of Becker County. That area currently in your current Becker County comprehensive plan that you're working under, that you're living under right now, is designated as a natural resource priority area. I don't know how many of you are familiar with the comprehensive plan. It's pretty thick because it's old. I understand that you're thinking about updating this as we're going on. But as of right now, this is what should be guiding you. On page 83 of the Becker County comprehensive plan, it specifies, it arrows, here's the portion of the map that includes Cormorant, Little Cormorant, Maud, Eunice, that part of the county. It specifies that the lake carrying capacity throughout the county and protect against overdevelopment. This is what they've designated this part of the county for. Along those lines, on page 110 of your current comprehensive plan, it also makes mention of strategies for development or usage going forward. And the very top priority in this part of the county reads as follows. Lake and watershed carrying capacity. Create a process for designating lake and watershed carrying capacities in regard to different types of land use. And then it goes on from there. So, this is something I think that you should give very, very serious thought to. In addition to that, I'm sure all of you are familiar with that part of the county. There are currently already three campgrounds or RV parks there. There's one on Cormorant. And there's two on Leaf. We bought our cabin in 07. I wasn't there, but in 03, 04, 05, somewhere two or three years before we bought ours, there was an application, I understand, that went in for a campground on the north end of Little Cormorant that was denied. Here we are 15, 18 years later. People are coming forth requesting the same thing. The priority hasn't changed. The comprehensive plan hasn't changed. What has changed on Cormorant, it's more developed now than it was then, but it's been developed in an orderly way. 150, it's a recreational development lake, 150-foot frontage, one dock. There're people on that lake that bought properties years ago. People that bought property on that lake years ago maybe put a trailer or a motorhome on there. And over the years, they've paid for it. They own the land now. They're more successful in their business, their job. They've built a seasonal or perhaps a year-round retirement home. That's what we've seen out there progressing. This would run counter to all of that. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to.

**Blomseth:** Any questions for Fred? All right, thank you, Fred. Anybody else to speak to this application? All right, please step forward.

**Dennis Erdle:** Hi, Dennis Erdle, and I have a quick question. It's not directly to the campground area, but the east side of this property is adjacent to the property I own to the south, and so I'm

477 curious on what the plans are for that property. You know, is that an expansion to what's going  
478 on there, or is it?

479

480 **Blomseth:** It's not part of this application. Honestly, we can't address it because it's their  
481 property. It's not part of this application.

482

483 **Erdle:** So, it's not plotted out to do anything beyond that driveway?

484

485 **Blomseth:** The only information we have is what they've plotted here for this property, I mean  
486 this chunk of it.

487

488 **Erdle:** On number two?

489

490 **Blomseth:** Yes, on number two.

491

492 **Erdle:** Okay, that's all I needed.

493

494 **Jason Breslin:** Jason Breslin, 16515 Bird Dock Road, full-time resident. Just wanted to illustrate  
495 on the point, there's 150 feet of frontage. That box is actually a perfect example of what our  
496 lake is. Our lake has more mileage of shoreline than any lake in probably Minnesota, compared  
497 to the acreage of water, right, because of the shape and everything.

498 If you measure that lot, you'll come up to about 1,800 feet of frontage. If you measure the  
499 width of that lot or that parcel, you're 1,200. So, you would have 850-foot lots that could go in  
500 there based on the width of the parcel.

501 Based on the contour, you'll get 1,800. So, then you can do your math and come up to a higher  
502 number of slips, right? So, which is the right math to use?

503 I don't know. Just want to illustrate the point, because when we talked about the species and  
504 everything that are in that lake, DNR has a small island right out in the middle, right directly in  
505 front there that belongs to DNR, so they should know that area very well. They do studies from  
506 there. It's a question worth asking. And then also, when the delineation is done, we'll find that  
507 about half of that frontage is wetland. I'm confident, but I don't do delineation.

508 So, when the delineation is done, that can, again, change the calculations. I do think that we're  
509 a little in front of ourselves until that data is there. And then also, I didn't hear anything as to  
510 whether or not it was their intent to put a private landing in where they're going to have that.  
511 So that would be just a curiosity.

512

513 **Blomseth:** Thank you. Any questions for Jason? Thank you. You may have a seat.

514

515 **O'Mara Dunnigan:** My name is O'Mara Dunnigan. I'm at 16519 Bird Dog Road. Just wanted to  
516 point out a few of the things when I was looking through the zoning ordinance. I'm not a  
517 lawyer. I'm just looking through it as a resident full-time. We are directly – not directly, but we  
518 are across. We would see the campground. Some of the things that stood out to me when  
519 you're applying for this use permit is that the effect on the surrounding property, the  
520 conditional will not harm the use or enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for

the purpose already permitted, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the immediate vicinity. I think this application was put in in a vacuum, saying this isn't going to affect anyone because they own the property on each side, and that's just not true. They obviously have waterfront access that's going to impact everyone in this room and beyond. So I think that it's very small-minded and short-sighted to think of that as anything else. As far as property values, don't think – I'm a real estate agent, but I think anyone can say that putting small – these temporary homes, whether they're nicer than \$100,000 or something other than, is negatively going to affect the development that we've seen of the lake and the property values as they stand. Effect on orderly, consistent development is the second item under F. Again, that goes on to say that we are in a recreational lake, 150-foot frontage. It's already been stated. We'll try not to do that again. Not a nuisance is another item that needs to be met, and it is not. Obviously, with all of the additional boats that are being discussed, there's absolutely no way that it would not be a nuisance to have that many more, not away in the channel, but it's a small part of the lake back there. It is somewhat private, and having that many more boats, I'm not sure if that's double or triple what's there now, but it would be substantial, and it would significantly impact the noise in the area as well as the shoreline. There are other things here under six additional criteria for shoreland areas, including pollution and view from public waters. I don't think that should be skipped over as well. It's going to significantly impact, and we know that development is going to happen. Nobody likes this idea. Everybody wants it to stay, but development is part of where we live, and that's okay, but it needs to be in a way that the lake can maintain as well as the people, and so I think the proposal is really quite ridiculous without looking at the impact of these things, and it goes right into the ordinance by the county. So, then there's the watercraft area as well. So those are just the things that I pulled out looking at this application and going, this isn't going to work. That's all. All right. Any questions?

**Wayne McDunn:** My name is Wayne McDunn. I live at 15401 Maple Ridge West. I have lived at this location for really close to 40 years. I've seen the lake go through this before with a potential campground, as was spoken of earlier. My view on it is if you look at Little Corman as a whole, there's a lot of property that's yet to be developed, just like this one. They're kind of peppered around the lake. There's multiple places like that. If they all get developed and they get their 150-foot shore and they all put a home on it or a cabin or whatever they're going to do, that lake is going to be so busy in the future without multi-dwelling, multi-purpose use places such as this. I think to consider this is wrong for that reason.

I live on a point where the lake narrows slightly. It sits between two larger bodies. And on, like, the Fourth of July weekend or some of the busier weekends, there's going to be an accident. It is so busy now with boat traffic, jet skis, tubers, big boats. You could just sit out there and go, ooh, and live all day, ooh. It's getting busier and busier. Now, if we fill in all the vacant property that's up there and they all follow the rule that already exists, we make this busier. The channel is one thing. It's busy. You go over there; you've got to go take a turn. But when all the property gets developed, skipping things such as this, that lake has got 17 miles of shoreline. It does not have acreage. It doesn't have water acreage. So, you put all these people on the lake, and then you take all the water acreage. A lot of it isn't really deemed accessible for boating, tubing, skiing. It's too shallow. It's set back. So, there's these pockets that are arranged on the lake that

565 everybody plays in. And it's getting dangerous. I think this is a safety issue. I ask this board to  
566 turn this application down on that issue alone. I see it every weekend on a busy weekend. And  
567 it's a matter of time. It's getting busy. And if everybody fills in the vacant land that's already  
568 there, it's going to get busier. And that's their right to do so. But to allow permits for multi-use,  
569 I think you're asking for trouble.

570  
571 **Blomseth:** Any questions for Wayne?

572  
573 **Skalin:** I do. So, you're talking about if everybody gets their 150 feet, right? How many boat lifts  
574 and docks can you put in that 150 feet?

575  
576 **McDunn:** Well, let's say each one has one or two.

577  
578 **Skalin:** Three or four.

579  
580 **McDunn:** Exactly. Each one.

581  
582 **Skalin:** So, this limits the 50?

583  
584 **McDunn:** I get that.

585  
586 **Skalin:** Okay. So, I'm just saying on those eight, by Jason's comment,

587  
588 **McDunn:** You're saying we're asking for eight people to the lake. I don't think so.

589  
590 **Skalin:** I'm not saying we're asking for 50. We're talking boats and your channel and your usage.  
591 No different than a lake house has seven cars from all over.

592  
593 **McDunn:** How many properties do you mean? You're asking for 49 now?

594  
595 **Skalin:** 49 small structures. Not eight or ten large structures.

596  
597 **McDunn:** So, we put 50 people in what's designated for, like the gentleman said, maybe eight.  
598 That's what we're doing. So, let's say you pass this. And this goes through. It's all good. What  
599 are we going to do with the next one? There's another development. It says you passed one.  
600 Why can't you turn these out? And what happens to the next one? This is a condensed lake.  
601 And that's my concern. That's all I really have.

602  
603 **Skalin:** I'm just stating the fact on the docks that you're here, you're getting 15. If we put eight  
604 or 10 on, you could have 20, 30. That's up to whoever.

605  
606 **McDunn:** Each property owner will have his own business. But you add them up. There's a lot  
607 of property that still is in development. You put them in to play. This is going to be a busy little  
608 lake.

609



610 **Blomseth:** Any other questions for Wayne? All right. Thank you for your time.

611

612 **McDunn:** Thank you for the opportunity.

613

614 My name is Dale Hogie. I'm at 16519 Sugar Island Road. My wife and I did submit a letter  
615 previously that you should have in your packet. I just want to follow up statistically with some  
616 information that's just been shared. When I did some search, I found that the shoreline mileage  
617 of Big Horn up was 18.7 miles. I looked to find what Little Cormorant was.

618 I couldn't find it. But Wayne says that it was 17. And I heard from behind me it's 19.

619 So, if you think of Little Cormorant and Big Cormorant and look at the shoreline, they're almost  
620 identical within a mile. Then as you look at the surface area, Big Cormorant has 3,657 acres. I  
621 found that in multiple sources. For Little Cormorant, it's 924 to 1,067, and one source listed 600  
622 acres of surface area. So now you're looking at the same shoreline, but you have a third of the  
623 acreage or a half of the acreage, depending on which one that is. So now when we've talked  
624 about the busyness of the channel and the lake, this statistically shows a comparison of a  
625 neighboring lake. The Little Cormorant Lake, with all of its shoreline and future development,  
626 will really be stressed for space. If we put in something that has 48 sites or 49 sites, 15 slips, put  
627 those people in the water, and then if all the other shoreline is developed at 150-foot segments  
628 and puts in one or two or three docks or three boats, it really places the impact on an already  
629 stressed lake. Thank you.

630

631 **Blomseth:** Any questions for Dan? Thank you, Dan. Anybody else to speak to this application?

632

633 **Kimmy Dunnigan:** I'm Kimmy Dunnigan. I live at 16509 Bird Dog Road. And I know if there are  
634 many more boats on Little Cormorant Lake, it will affect us as people and also the local wildlife.  
635 Also, I'm specifically worried about our environment, and this will extremely impact our lives in  
636 a negative way. Yeah, I just don't think that there should be more boats because it will be too  
637 crowded.

638

639 **Blomseth:** Great. Any questions for her? Thank you very much.

640

641 **Karen Herdegen:** Hi. I'm Karen Herdegen, and I'm at 15805 Maple Ridge Road. Sorry, I'm  
642 nervous. I'm right across from the public access where people come in, and I would just like to  
643 say all the locals already use that lake. So, there's all these people, and then all the locals, too.  
644 So, I'm really concerned about it. It's busy on that bay right there. It's super busy already, so I  
645 just can't imagine that it wouldn't work. And they're going to have to go through the channel to  
646 get to the slips on the other side. And I'm also really worried about the loons because we have a  
647 lot of loons. And I just, already the ski boats on there, it's hard for the loons already.

648

649 **Blomseth:** Any questions for Karen? Thank you very much.

650

651 **Robin Steenson:** I'm Robin Steenson, 19475 Sherman Shorts Lane. I wasn't planning on  
652 speaking, but just sitting here, I think that something's being overlooked. When you rent a car,  
653 that car can go twice as fast in reverse. It can break faster than our own cars. We have to realize

that these people are renting these spots. I have pride in my property. I'm a Minnesota lake owner. I pay tax. And I care about the land. I care about my lot. I care about the water. Are people who are renting these slips going to put care in the lake, protect our lake, protect the land, like us as taxpayers and landowners do? That's what I have to say.

**Blomseth:** Any questions for Robin? Thank you. Have a seat. Anybody else to speak to this application?

**Robert Zahorski:** Hello. My name is Robert Zahorski. I live on 190th Avenue. My wife and I are the property adjacent to this proposed development. And I'm not going to go through my letter because I sent it to you. And I appreciate you being here and going through all this with us. But I want to address a couple things that I don't think everybody here is quite aware of. It's the surface area of this lake where all these people are talking about traffic. And the real issue here is there are so many bays in that lake that become unusable. So everybody is funneled to literally strips of water. And that's why it becomes so dangerous. These bays, I'm right next door to this property. I've got a 50-foot dock that gets me to the edge of the cattails because we have so many cattails down there. I put a tape measure in the water this morning, two feet deep. That's at my dock. These people are going to be in water that same. What happens is these bays get covered. We get all these surface weeds that come up. And the bay is beautiful. It's crystal clear. Because the cattails and these weeds keep the environment so well. But also, you can't boat back there. You can't run your speedboat. You can't run your jet ski. Because you go 10 feet, everything's plugged. You've torn up the lake. So, what happens is we've got a little channel that gets us out of here. Everybody uses it. And you go into the main lake. And that's exactly what's going to happen with these people. Everybody, and it's dangerous right now. You can see a lot of people here that live. And I used to live on that part of the lake. It's getting really dangerous. And then you add these people into those little... Because that's where the jet skis are. That's where the speedboats are going. So, it's extremely dangerous. Our property, we're going to see this. The view, the hill. Because it's on a hill, I went out today in the lake. There's nothing hiding this. I know that's in your ordinances I went through. They're missing so much stuff in these ordinances. They're missing so much stuff that you require to approve this. And I can go through this. Again, I sent you a letter, so I'm not going to bore you. But they are missing so many details in here. And to your point on the docks, yeah, you can put more than one dock. You've got a family. You can put more than one dock on your lot. You have a family there. These people, there's 49 units. So, they're going to fill that up, and then they're going to go, how are they going to get in? Are they going to stick another dock or access? You don't know. Their plans that they proposed, they're missing so much information. Again, I'm not going to go through it. But our property, we're 575 feet away from where this is being built. We'll be able to see everything. It's going to affect us. It's going to affect our property values. One last thing, and I'll leave. All I'm going to say is this. There's nobody in this room, I don't think, that would look at a property next to an RV park and not give it a second thought. Because that's what's happening to our home that we spent our money and built.

**Blomseth:** Any questions for Robert? Thank you. Anybody else to speak to this application?

698  
699 **Kendra Heuring:** Hello. My name is Kendra Heuring, and I live at 16312 Sugar Island Road. I  
700 think my only question, I guess maybe to your question is a private residence if seven or eight  
701 cars come is there any Cap to visitors that can come into the campground. Let's someone that  
702 has their camper at the campground what's Preventing them from having friends comes visit  
703 their camper for the day bring additional boats so that's just my Question as far as the cap on  
704 other visitors coming into the campground as well, um and just a My testimony because we our  
705 house is right in the bay of the channel so right out Our dock is a line of boats waiting to cross  
706 through and it's Getting longer and longer and just for me with my three young boys out there  
707 obviously we wanna Enjoy the lake and it's becoming harder to do that Seeing a line of boats  
708 right out front of our dock.

709  
710 **Blomseth:** All right, any questions.

711  
712 **Lindow:** Yeah, I've got a question You live right where that channel is Just kind of an estimate  
713 how many docks or how many boats do you see you lined up? Waiting to go through the  
714 channel is it five at a time is there five there or ten or more.

715  
716 **Heuring:** Oh, I would say around like five on my side. I don't see What's waiting on the other  
717 side on a busy weekend. And it's a lot of times then you just have yeah five boats out there in  
718 our little bay Waiting to take their turn and so then it affects us to leave like to kayak around  
719 there paddleboard, and it's just coming hard to Hard to do that.

720  
721 **Blomseth:** All right any other questions Anybody else to speak to this application.

722  
723 **Brad Hanson:** Brad Hanson 17892 198<sup>th</sup> Oleks are gonna operate Why is it up for sale.

724  
725 **Blomseth:** Any questions all right anybody else to speak to this application.

726  
727 **Luke Langerud:** Luke Langerud, Chairman of Audubon Township. I Listen to everyone here  
728 today, and there's one issue that no one has brought up to my knowledge It might be in the  
729 plans that have been discussed but 190th Avenue is already a very well-traveled gravel road  
730 and when you put 49 more units on there there's gonna need to be an additional Maintenance  
731 plan for that and as a township. How are we going to? Absorb that cost or what is the  
732 maintenance plan or is there pavement plans for that? You know we've gone through  
733 developments and maintenance, or pavement plans for them, so I guess I'd just be looking for  
734 Conversation with the township as to What's the plan for 190th for access to this? Because we  
735 already have a very highly traveled road, one of the more highly traveled roads.

736  
737 **Blomseth:** All right, well it sounds like they're coming to your meeting here coming up So yeah,  
738 and they're sitting here, so I'm assuming they will address that at that time so any questions for  
739 Luke. Thank you, all right, anybody else to speak to this application Anybody else speak to this  
740 application? All right with that and we have the right to recall you so aside from on the letters

we have received is there any other ones that we've received that we need to add to the record.

**Vareberg:** No, sir

**All letters received are on record with the Becker County Planning and Zoning office.**

**Blomseth:** All right before we close testimony I'd like to recall the applicant to ask some questions all right, please step forward.

**Moritz:** As far as other access Are there other docks planned for, I mean it's my understanding that I think there was probably not going to be a lot of support for a private access there.

**Olek:** So we were not planning on that The lake so As far as the beach area goes again I think there are limitations with that property line about what that would look like considering the conditions, so I Guess I would say in relation to the swimming You know area and a lot of the other concerns that are being you know aired with the whole boat It seemed like everything is centered on the excess amount of boating I would just I guess Kind of respond to that that I don't think that there's an assumption you can make that in every camper Is out to do the same thing like there's not a one-size-fits-all for camping and what people want to do with that I don't necessarily believe people that would come to this campsite would be probably the type of people that say hey I want to bring my hundred thousand dollar weight boat and go boating on Little Cormorant Most likely they're going to go to Pelican or Big Cormorant or a lake that would substantiate I mean again if you have a significant weight at a channel I Mean people self-select in all forms of their life, right would you would you say this is the lake? I'm gonna go and wait for an hour to want to get through the channel I would suggest that the 15 boats that are on the slip that we're proposing would Likely be the amount of people that want boats out of the campsite the other people with low recreational boating at other lakes that are geared more Towards recreation Why would you put yourself through that sort of frustration you wouldn't do that likely so you know as far as the beachfront again It's not a conducive waterfront to have this massive sandy beach We would put You know a beach that's allowable via the DNR and everything in inside the waterway And that's what people would have to use you know you can't have something you can't have

**Moritz:** So as far as individuals that would choose to use the public access would your expectation be that they would take their boat to the access Try and park it there or drop the boat off and come around and park back it at the resort Or I realize I'm kind of speculating here, but then what happens to their boat when they have to come in? Would you have a bathroom facility down somewhere close to lake when they came in to dock their boat to use whatever? You know some ice for their cooler or whatever Go up their camper would that be a day? Would there be any day or temporary docking so they could get into their units? Is that something that's been thought to? Otherwise, you end up with It just seems like it's not a plan and it seems like there could be more problems with moving stuff Moving boats and vehicles.

785 **Olek:** Well, I think with the you know the 15 boat slips that would be allowed for approval  
786 those would be you know Rented or you know taken by whoever was giving them and other  
787 people would have to follow the rules We would you know plan out that they couldn't pull into  
788 someone else's slip to do that So if they were bringing their boat go to the public access My  
789 understanding is there's not parking there So you can't park where you can't park they would  
790 have to find a way to put the boat in if they chose to boat On Little Cormorant and bring their  
791 boat and trailer to a place that was you know They'd park and how they manage themselves on  
792 the boat what they do You know, I think that with anybody voting you would have to make your  
793 own adult plans on that

794  
795 **Moritz:** I just wasn't sure aware of you had some plans that are now in the planning stage You  
796 don't have all the details quite yet but if that's something that those things you're looking at to  
797 connect the lakes to the event or something else.

798  
799 **Olek:** I don't have any need more detailed plans on whether there would be something for  
800 them. They again would have to Use the docks as they are assigned.

801  
802 **Skalin:** I guess the way I read it is that they produced a docking plan The way it looks to me is  
803 that there is one temporary docking site Because you have an odd number of sites and you  
804 can't delete the number of sites Versus actually having a temporary site that would house one  
805 of the boats temporarily I see it's not numbered, you only get 15 slips, but the way you have to  
806 design an odd number of slips You're always going to have a little extra docking

807  
808 **Olek:** We will certainly follow whatever You know the recommendation or guideline would be if  
809 there's not an intention to have some kind of temporary docking there Because that's a you  
810 know not what people want Then we would fall in line with that and make sure the campers  
811 know that that is not It's not it's not part of the options they have available to them.

812  
813 **Blomseth:** Alright, any other questions for Bob?

814  
815 **Lindow:** Going with this docking again On your application That we got It would have been nice  
816 to see the dock information There so we could have had a chance Maybe to go out and look  
817 And instead we got it today And so I guess from the discussion At the technical committee that  
818 we had At the meeting It was described that Shoreland area where the docks were going in Is  
819 cattails and it's muck Somebody said you sink into your knees And so as far as A place for boats  
820 to land You know maybe Possibly at one site there might be a spot For a boat to come in and let  
821 people off And so forth But any given weekend Or even during the week You're going to have a  
822 number of boats possibly You're going to have to deal with And they can't even get to shore  
823 there You know there's cattails They can't get out of their boat Because they're sinking in the  
824 muck That dock Without A place for other boats to land Is a major problem For anybody coming  
825 into that area Or leaving From the campground Being picked up That's a major problem That  
826 you're going to have to figure out how to solve And it's not solved yet So I guess How are you  
827 going to handle it?

829 **Skalin:** Steve I have a temporary site The docking plan they have a temporary site.

830

831 **Lindow:** Yeah, one Which I mentioned but when you're talking about a whole bunch of boats  
832 Extra than the nine Possibly let's say Out of the 34 let's say maybe half of them show up, you're  
833 talking 17 boats Coming and going at that landing That extra dock and that's not That's not  
834 going to work.

835

836 **Olek:** I mean I think Again the assumption is All of these people are going to have boats And  
837 they're all going to expect to come to the docking area And that would be made clear That that  
838 is not part of their arrangement They don't have a slip They don't have dock access So if they  
839 choose to bring a boat on that water Which anybody can do in the public They don't have  
840 access To this boating docking slip They're not part of the 15 So they would be in violation of  
841 the rules That we would have And if they had a complaint with that Then they would have to  
842 not bring a boat

843

844 **Lindow:** Can they park their boat at their RV campsite If they have an RV there, they have space  
845 for one more spot Evidently Up in the campsite area They can park their boat at the campsite.

846

847 **Olek:** Yes. We would have available parking for them as an option for their boat.

848

849 **Lindow:** So that's legal So they're still going to be moving boats into that access on the highway  
850 Trying to get up across Through that channel to the dock to maybe pick up somebody or pick up  
851 equipment or whatever they're picking up This dock that you've got there Is not going to work.

852

853 **Olek:** Again, I think the assumption Is you're saying that they're going to do that and come back  
854 with a boat slip but all I'm saying is They don't have a boat slip So that is not an option for them  
855 by the rules So what they choose to do If that's going to be a problem for them Then they won't  
856 have to not bring a boat.

857

858 **Lindow:** You're going to have people coming There to that dock to pick people up No matter  
859 what you say about the rules So in other words Those 34 people Who may have boats Parked at  
860 the campsite You aren't going to let them Come to shore After they drop their boat Is that what  
861 you're saying?

862

863 **Olek:** I'm saying if it becomes a problem for them to get there Because of the number of boats  
864 that are there Then they don't have first priority to be there because they don't have a slip.

865

866 **Disse:** I have a question I've camped for 30 years, And I've never had a boat Not everybody is  
867 going to bring a boat.

868

869 **Olek:** And that's kind of what I thought I mentioned earlier It's an assumption that everybody  
870 that wants to do this Has to have a boat in tow And has to get on the water And I don't know  
871 that you can assume All of that worst case scenario from happening If this isn't the most  
872 desirable place For people to participate in that Then this could be an attraction place For

873 people that want to camp and be outdoors But not be recreational boating They would do that  
874 where that's more Enjoyable

875

876 **Blomseth:** Alright, any other questions for Bob?

877

878 **Ailie:** Are these going to be seasonal sites?

879

880 **Olek:** Yes

881

882 **Blomseth:** Any other questions for Bob?

883

884 **Jepson:** One thing that was mentioned was a storm shelter or something that could possibly be  
885 Required for a resort Have you looked into that at all.

886

887 **Olek:** Haven't gotten to the level of detail On that I think we want to make sure If there's a  
888 permit approved That we would want to make sure That it falls in line with whatever Is either  
889 needed Or requested And make the property Safe for the participants That are there And have  
890 that type of Storm shelter if that's what the recommendation is But would we need to know  
891 Where the storm shelter might be?

892

893 **Vareberg:** No, basically the CUP Would be like a prerequisite to a resort License through the  
894 state.

895

896 **Skalin:** The state regulates the storm shelter.

897

898 **Blomseth:** Alright, any other questions for Bob? Thank you, Bob. Alright with that Testimony is  
899 closed We'll open it up for board discussion ...

900

901 Skalin commented that the elbow lake park has eight (8) slips and the same number of units  
902 and they do fine with it.

903

904 Bowers asked if Elbow Lake had places to park for daily boat use.

905

906 **Jepson:** So, I think part of the concern is that even though they're only gonna have 15, that's  
907 there, but it's the rest of the lake that they could, there is also parking. But that's not really. It's  
908 not a complete speculation.

909

910 **Moritz:** I mean, I think one of the limitations, too, is when people have boats in the  
911 campgrounds, that they might, but you go to the little cormorant four, maybe five boats in that  
912 particular area, and you put trailers on there, probably four parking spots, and then if you go  
913 out on the township road, you can park on it, but it's somewhat difficult to find a spot to turn  
914 around to come back and get your boat picked up. Plus, you're walking away, so I think that  
915 would probably have some limiting effect on who would go and when they would go.

916 Obviously, a weekend like the 4th of July, I think it's limited by first come, first serve, and  
917 people would come quite early to that.

918  
919 **Skalin:** But only a few people do, so. There's a channel, I have a boat on it, I wait there. Right  
920 here, right in front of the person's house. The channel was designed to transport boats. Wait in  
921 line, take the county tram, a little bit of campground in the south of town, it's got E-slips in the  
922 tram open area, and they all wait in the river for hours on a busy weekend. Oh, I've been there,  
923 to me it wasn't desirable that I ever go back, absolutely not, but some people love it.  
924 So, I mean, the wait, that's not for us to determine. If they wanna wait, they wanna wait if they  
925 don't wanna wait, they don't wanna wait. That's not our policy.  
926  
927 **Jepson:** I think the one thing that I think about, and will think about, is what the gentleman  
928 proposed about what our current comp plan says about this area and this lake. So that's  
929 something I think we need to remember as we make a decision.  
930  
931 **Skalin:** Well, I think the comp plan, well, I mean, the lakeshore's pretty different, too. I mean,  
932 you go off the lake, you need two and a half acres. You can put them next to the lake, condense  
933 them, shrink them up, pile them in, and get on there. So, I mean, the comp plan doesn't even  
934 address that, because you just go, if this were to be flooded off, it'd be two and a half acres,  
935 unless they did a subdivision and went through the planning process. You know what I'm  
936 saying? So, I mean, the plan already says that this area should be condensed.  
937 I mean, yes, it says protect natural resources, but not, I mean, you say it, but not along the lake,  
938 because of the way that the development is, 150 feet, yeah. I mean, I think there's an argument  
939 between the eight and 10, which could determine some documents, and I don't really know  
940 what they have. I mean, I can't argue. It's not surveyed. I don't see it. Should it be eight, should  
941 it be 10? That's kind of a, that's the one thing I wanna talk about.  
942  
943 **Jepson:** For the dock slips?  
944  
945 **Skalin:** Yeah, well, eight or 10, because if you're measuring it from outside the cattails, or you're  
946 measuring it from the green tree line.  
947  
948 **Jepson:** Doesn't the DNR determine where it's at?  
949  
950 **Vareberg:** Well, it's from the Ordinary High, but Meadowland Survey did determine how many  
951 lots they could have there.  
952  
953 **Skalin:** And they based that on the county because I think the question, well, is it a straight line,  
954 or do you take your shoreline?  
955  
956 **Vareberg:** It would be how many lots would be allowed to be created there. Correct, but in  
957 that- So you have to measure a, you have to have 150 at the shoreline, and you have to have  
958 150 at 100 feet back.  
959  
960 **Skalin:** Correct. Yep, so Meadowland- Well, it depends, they, I mean- That's the question.  
961



962 **Vareberg:** But I mean, but Meadowland has the ability on their caveat to say 150 feet of width,  
 963 150 feet back, 150 feet of width, and they determine that. I mean, I specifically asked them to  
 964 do that, because I knew that would be a hang-up, right? But I don't know who else to better  
 965 resolve that than a surveying company, if that makes sense. I did wanna point out one thing-  
 966

967 **Skalin:** I don't disagree, it has to be the curves versus straight line. I mean, that is a, that's  
 968 different.

969

970 **Vareberg:** No, but I'm just saying, Meadowland determined how many single-family residential  
 971 lots could be on this property, and that number is 10.

972

973 **Skalin:** And that's what, he's using his license, he's stamping it, saying, I'm a licenser in the state  
 974 of Minnesota, and then stamp it, by the rules, right? That's what you're saying, kind of, correct?  
 975

976 **Vareberg:** Well, I asked them to-

977

978 **Skalin:** Because you're in speculation between eight and 10, and it's something you gotta say.

979

980 **Vareberg:** I asked them to complete that, and that's what they came up with, was 10, so I  
 981 mean.

982

983 **Skalin:** Okay, yep, that's a professional- So it's next to the baseline,  
 984

985 **Jepson:** so- Developed, they could have 10 houses.

986

987 **Vareberg:** Right.

988

989 **Jepson:** Without having to come to the board for approval.

990

991 **Vareberg:** No, they would have to plot it to have 10. They could create four every three years,  
 992 otherwise, by meets and bounds, but.

993

994 **Lindow:** So, if there was 10 that could go in there, that would be, basically, 10 at the, probably,  
 995 maybe, I'm gonna say, average 10 boats. Some people might have two, some people might not  
 996 have any. So, let's say there's 10 boats there, which, what we're looking at now, with this  
 997 application, is 15 possible boats, for sure. With another, if people have boats, or if they are just  
 998 gonna come and camp, and not have a boat, you're looking at maybe another 17. So, you're  
 999 looking at, you know, 30 boats, probably, that would be extra, that you're throwing onto the  
 1000 lake, if we grant this thing, as compared to, probably, 10, if it were to be built up into homes.  
 1001 And I know the comment was made about the idea of the RVs is maybe less of a problem, as  
 1002 compared to the farmland, with the runoff, and so forth. But you're kind of forgetting about the  
 1003 impact of all the extra boats on the lake, and on the water. And when you're putting that many  
 1004 more boats in a small area, you're stirring up the bottom, you are putting more phosphorus,  
 1005 bringing that back up, which is gonna grow more algae, which is gonna make the water less  
 1006 clear. That's kind of what happens when you have boats going through a shallow area.

1007 And so, the RV, to me, I think the RV impact, with the number of votes going onto the lake, is a  
1008 huge more impact to the lake, itself. And it's a negative impact. Affecting a resource that a  
1009 whole lot of people, on this particular type of lake. It's kind of special, it's not shaped like any  
1010 other normal lake. Maybe we should have some consideration for the water here, and what  
1011 that's gonna do to the lake, as far as impacting it, and not just the number of homes, not just  
1012 the number of RV sites, it's a water impact. And all these people out here, if you read through  
1013 all those 75 or so emails, they're concerned with the water quality, the impact, the safety of  
1014 people on the water, the safety of people parking their boats, and so forth, or boat trailers  
1015 along that highway, when they're trying to get into the access. There's a lot of concerns, that  
1016 given the lake the way it is, these people should be heard, and listened to, and yeah, I'll just  
1017 leave it at that. Thank you.

1018  
1019 **Blomseth:** Thank you. Anyone else? Is that it, or do you have any other questions?

1020  
1021 Seaberg commented on a mud on Maud that ended up being split as lots, because the lake  
1022 couldn't handle the amount. She said sometimes it has to be denied.

1023  
1024 **Vareberg:** Mr. Chair, in all fairness to both the people here, but also the applicant, because they  
1025 do have the same right. Page 89 of the comprehensive plan defines this as policy district 3.  
1026 It is an economic and population center of the county. It has significant resort and tourist-  
1027 oriented development. And most of the county's developed lakeshore. The final selected policy  
1028 in the comp plan for this district is to promote the district's tourist and recreational assets and  
1029 locally owned resort properties. So that comp plan does contradict itself. Just to be aware. I  
1030 think you mentioned 83. That's page 89. But you have to consider both of those when, you  
1031 know.

1032  
1033 **Lindow:** But as far as the recreational piece of that, what you're talking about, there gets to be  
1034 a point where the recreational carrying capacity, somebody mentioned, of the lake gets to be  
1035 detrimental and harmful to the lake.

1036  
1037 **Vareberg:** Yeah, and I would give significant. I don't remember the gal who spoke. But, I mean,  
1038 she went through the criteria that you're considering. That's what you should stick to. It's the  
1039 criteria that she found in our zoning ordinance. I mean, we get this way or that way. But you  
1040 should stick to that. And whether it's this way or that way, you have to identify how this is going  
1041 to harm the use and enjoyment of these neighboring properties or something of that. I mean,  
1042 we could spend all day talking about algae and things of that nature. But you really need to  
1043 stick to the criteria in there.

1044  
1045 **Blomseth:** Our five points for approval or denial are what we have to call it. We don't have in  
1046 that what we speculate for water quality. That's not part of it. All right. Any further discussion?

1047  
1048 **Lindow:** I would have one suggestion based on what we've been talking about here. And the  
1049 comp plan that we have and the idea of putting RV sites on a lakeshore, a mud, or a pud or  
1050 whatever they're called. I think that's something that in our new comp plan, we should talk  
1051 about that and have some kind of a look at the ordinance around that.

1052  
1053 Blomseth: Steve, and that's fine, but we're not here to discuss the new comp plan.  
1054  
1055 **Lindow:** No, that's not what I'm asking. I'm just saying that in the future, we should have a  
1056 discussion in our new comp plan about this topic. That's all I'm saying.  
1057  
1058 **Blomseth:** And you're correct, but like I say, that's not for this evening's discussion.  
1059  
1060 **Hall:** Mr. Chair, only one thing I'd like to add. You know, several people talked here about the  
1061 number of boats. Like Kohl is saying, all of this land is going to get developed someday. It is  
1062 going to happen. There's going to be more boats. The thing that I'm struggling with in the one  
1063 gentleman that's had the property, I think it's to the north, whatever direction that is, but off  
1064 on the other side of 190. As I walked across that field and looked to where, you know, this  
1065 development is going to be, it is definitely going to be a detriment to them, to me, and maybe  
1066 to their property value because that is what they're going to see is I don't see how you're going  
1067 to hide it. They're going to be looking at 49 campers.  
1068  
1069 **Blomseth:** All right. Any further discussion? Any further discussion?  
1070  
1071 **Ailie:** It's tough because I do think it's a need as well, too, as far as more open sites. Like you  
1072 said, there's a waiting list. You go to other places and the prices of land and property and  
1073 everything. I think it makes it a very distant reach for some of the people trying to grab ahold of  
1074 this. I mean, it's sort of a dream summer of even just a little slice for your camper, so that part  
1075 is tough.  
1076  
1077 **Skalin:** Correct me if I'm wrong, but I completely agree with that person on property. They own  
1078 a big home. I mean, look at me. I think about Long Lake. They've piled a million-dollar home all  
1079 over it. They've got two huge resorts. Well, not a one-stop resort. It's a common interest  
1080 community or whatever. But long lake campground. And there's two monster houses right next  
1081 to each side, and they both built after that campground was there because the Wolds built that  
1082 80 years ago. So someone told us that a campground is not that bad of a neighbor. And I'm just  
1083 throwing that out there because that's just one example. Yes, visually, completely. I completely  
1084 get the visual aspect of it. It's on a side hill. You know? They've got a lake tucked in the back of  
1085 the trees, but they don't have that piece here, right?  
1086  
1087 **Jepson:** I think the difference there is those people chose to build next to a campground. This is  
1088 a campground coming in next to homes.  
1089  
1090 **Hall:** Yeah, and when you read, you know, and again, when you look at number one and  
1091 number five, when they start talking in there, is what is this going to do to the neighboring  
1092 property? Will it potentially impair property values? In this situation, I'm saying, for that one  
1093 individual anyway, it probably will. But that's my one thought.  
1094  
1095 **Disse:** I live on Little Detroit Lake, and there's houses every 50, 100 feet, every 100 feet on  
1096 Detroit Lake. And I don't see any boats on the weekends. Very few.

1097  
1098 **Blomseth:** All right, any further discussion?  
1099  
1100 **Lindow:** Yeah, I got one thing else to say here. Becker County is rich in water resources and  
1101 overloading the use of lakes to the point of where it's detrimental to the water quality, to  
1102 safety, it gets to a point where our lakes, we may have them, but they aren't going to be  
1103 enjoyable to be on. People won't want to be out there.  
1104  
1105 **Blomseth:** Steve, I'm going to stop you right there, because that's not one of our criteria. I  
1106 understand your passion for that, but that is not, I mean, we have nothing in our ordinance that  
1107 allows us to speculate on water quality.  
1108  
1109 **Lindow:** I understand.  
1110  
1111 **Blomseth:** All right, any further discussion?  
1112  
1113 **Seaberg:** One more thing. How can you do the five points that we consider? Craig pointed out  
1114 one. Can you tell us?  
1115  
1116 **Vareberg:** They're right in your packet, Mary, if you pull up the application, the questions.  
1117  
1118 **Hall:** They're listed right in order, one through five.  
1119  
1120 **Vareberg:** Well, there's some additional... Yeah, there's some additional questions there. And I  
1121 would advise, whether you choose to approve or deny, that we set a special meeting to  
1122 consider, like if, Craig, to your point, if you're going to base that on a property value, then we're  
1123 going to need evidence supporting that, so we're going to need to hire an appraiser, because  
1124 we can't...I get that. For the sake of everybody, we just can't speculate. We'd have to...Right.  
1125 We need a fact, so we'd need some time to develop that.  
1126  
1127 **Skalin:** A question on the vehicles that I thought got brought up, but never got addressed.  
1128 A campground campsite is designed for two vehicles plus a camper. That's the spatial design. Is  
1129 that true?  
1130  
1131 **Vareberg:** It's 2,500 square feet. Yeah, I mean, normally two parking spaces.  
1132  
1133 **Skalin:** But they could have a backlot parking.  
1134  
1135 **Vareberg:** Right.  
1136  
1137 **Seaberg:** And is that in here, on that plan? I vote for that.  
1138  
1139 **Skalin:** Well, Kyle's saying that they're both... There's a parking area for overflow traffic and the  
1140 road trailers in that.  
1141

1142 Olek: I don't know if it's on that actual number 2 drawing you have, but in the permit proposal,  
1143 it's indicated there'd be parking overflow to the east of the campsites.  
1144

1145 **Mattson:** Yeah. I have a question. Is there a possibility of tabling this so we can find out some of  
1146 the information about the road, 190th Street Road? That's a concern. There are more questions  
1147 to ask. Rather than trying to do a vote without having those answers.  
1148

1149 **Vareberg:** No, you certainly have the right to table.  
1150

1151 **Blomseth:** And the applicant has the right as well. Any further discussion? If not, I would  
1152 entertain a motion. We have three options. Motion to approve, motion to deny, or a motion to  
1153 table.  
1154

1155 **MOTION: Lindow motioned to deny the application.**  
1156 **Motion died due to lack of second.**  
1157

1158  
1159  
1160 **MOTION: Seaberg motioned to table the application in order to get township input**  
1161 **and more information. Moritz second. Roll Call; All in favor. Motion carried.**  
1162

1163  
1164  
1165 **Blomseth:** All right, just for clarification, this has been tabled. This will not be going to the  
1166 county commissioners on May 7th. I also would just like to thank everybody who came here  
1167 tonight for, one, being courteous. I know this is a very big issue for the people out in that area,  
1168 and I appreciate you taking the time to be here as well.  
1169

1170 **Lindow:** So, what does that mean that it's tabled? So, what happens now? I don't know.  
1171

1172 **Blomseth:** So, it will show up for us in the old business at our next meeting?  
1173

1174 **Vareberg:** Well, not necessarily, Mr. Chair. Depending on how long the applicant takes to  
1175 develop that stuff with the township, but the most important thing is before you act on this,  
1176 everybody that got a notification the first time will get one again. But I don't want you to  
1177 assume that it will be next month because it may be longer.  
1178

1179 **Lindow:** Thank you.  
1180

1181 **Seaberg:** So, when will it come to our next meeting?  
1182

1183 **Vareberg:** It doesn't necessarily need to be the next meeting, no.  
1184

1185 **Seaberg:** No, but I was thinking it wouldn't be a special meeting.  
1186

1187 **Vareberg:** No.

**Blomseth:** Yes, so just for clarification, everybody who received notification on this application, which was within the specific distance, what's sent out is what's required.

**Skalin:** Do you want to explain the requirements, so we understand.

**Blomseth:** Kyle, do you want to explain the requirements of who received the notification?

**Vareberg:** everybody within a quarter mile. So, everybody within a quarter mile has received the notification. So, there will be notifications sent out, and it will be part of the meeting for the upcoming meeting. Whenever that is, it will be posted.

**Blomseth:** All right, with that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

**Other Business:**

I) **Tentative Date for Next Informational Meeting: June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2024; 8:00 am; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**  
Meeting Room in the Becker County Courthouse, Detroit Lakes, MN.

**Since there was no further business to come before the Board, Seaberg made a motion to adjourn. Ailie second. All in favor. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm.**

---

**David Blomseth, Chairman**

---

**Jeff Moritz, Secretary**

ATTEST

---

Kyle Vareberg, Zoning Administrator