

Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Review Committee  
February 27, 2014

Present: Harry Johnston, Ray Vlasak, Jerome Flottemesch, Dave Knopf, Don Lefebvre, Roy Smith, John Postovit, Ed Clem, Marsha Watland, Peter Mead, Barry Nelson, John Staldine, Patty Swenson and Debi Moltzan.

Introductions were made. The committee's role was reviewed. All members participate in the discussion and bring forth ideas. The five (5) members from the Commissioner's Districts have final vote on issues to recommend to the Planning Commission. These members are: District 1 – Ray Vlasak; District 2 – Harry Johnston; District 3 – Dave Knopf; District 4 – Don Lefebvre; and District 5 – Jerome Flottemesch. Discussion was held as to whether or not Harry Johnston was officially appointed to fill the District 2 position. The election of the Chairman and Vice-chairman will be held at the next meeting in order to verify Johnston's position.

The agenda was considered with the following items added to the agenda: lot sizes on natural environment lakes and acreage across the road not being used in calculating lot area.

First Item of Discussion: Mitigation

This was placed on the agenda to discuss the process and find either an easier way to streamline the process and make more mitigation options available. The mitigation process is a very lengthy process and there is much opposition to the vegetative buffer. Some options would be to reduce building percentages, giving a partial reduction for pervious pavers, allowing berms to replace vegetative buffers, adding language to allow the County to install and assess back the mitigation installation if not installed, requiring certificates of completion. Consensus of the group was to tweak the wording, but not eliminate the point system or mitigation.

SWCD is looking at education for the contractors involved with mitigation and requiring a license for the contractors. Another suggestion was to add a mitigation surcharge in addition to the permit fee.

Final consensus of the group is to allow the Zoning Office to tweak the language and bring back to the committee for further discussion.

Second Item of Discussion: Setback Average plus 20 feet

Consensus of the public is that this regulation is unfair and no one likes it. In some cases, being pushed back the additional 20 feet places the structure in a hallway view. In some cases, pushing the house back brings up the safety issue from the road. Ideas included having a setback average

plus 20 ft; base the amount of additional setback (10 ft minimum and 20 ft maximum) based on a percentage of the lot width; or up to 50 ft of lot width, 10 ft back; 51 to 75 ft of lot width – 15 ft back and 75 to 100 ft in width – 20 ft back from setback average.

Discussion was held regarding past variances granted and denied since the setback average plus 20 ft replaced the string line and whether the decisions were based on what could be allowed on the lot or what the owner wanted.

The next meeting date is scheduled for Friday, March 7, 2014 at 8:30 am to continue the agenda presented at this meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Debi Moltzan