

Becker County Zoning Ordinance Review Committee
August 13, 2015

Present: Harry Johnston, John Postovit, Scott Walz, Roy Smith, Julene Hodgson, Eric Evenson-Marden, Debi Moltzan and Peter Mead.

Chairman Johnston called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. The agenda was considered and considering a definition of expansion was added to the end of the agenda.

Minutes: The minutes from the July 9th meeting were discussed. Smith felt that the motion made by Knopf for M4, should be included in the proposal sent to the County Board. Knopf made this a motion and Walz second. All in favor. Motion carried.

Knopf stated that in the section with the limitation for certificates of survey, there was no second to the Motion. After review of the notes from the last meeting, it was found that Walz had made the second and it was inadvertently left out of the minutes.

Knopf made a motion to approve the amended minutes. Walz second. All in favor. Motion carried.

Evenson-Marden explained that the ordinance changes presented to the Planning Commission were approved with some minor changes. The recommendations would be presented to the County Board on the 18th.

Unfinished Business

Lot frontage on natural environment lakes.

Smith explained his concept on categorizing natural environment lakes. Smith took seven (7) areas of concern – size, depth, shape (lakeshore to size ratio), watershed area, ag-forest, river-stream, % of potential development and soil type. Each area is then given a range of numbers from 1 – 5 (1 being least important and 5 being most important). Each lake would be rated with this system. Once each lake is rated, then the final ratings would be given a range and these ranges would determine the amount of lakeshore frontage for a lot on that lake.

Discussion included: this may be a good way to re-evaluate the lakes; there are more tools available today to help accomplish this; possibly lakes under 10 acres in size and those in the Refuge would not have to be rated; if the County Board should be asked if they want to change NE lake frontages before the committee spends too much time on it; buffers along the lakeshore; and if a simple exercise should be done to ‘test’ this concept.

41
42 Knopf made a motion to have Smith create a simple exercise in which four (4) lakes could be
43 rated by the group to ‘test’ the concept. Walz second. All in favor. Motion carried.

44
45 **Setback Average plus 20 feet**

46
47 Discussion was held as to whether or not there should be more discussion on changing this.
48 Knopf stated that he liked the graduating scale, which didn’t pass, but maybe if the plus 20 ft
49 would have been changed to plus 10 ft, it would have passed. Johnston stated that the options
50 seem to be either the plus 20 ft is left alone, it gets changed to plus 10 ft or go back to the old
51 string line. Smith questioned if the group wants the setback changed or if the County Board
52 wants it changed and felt that the group should have directive from the Board.

53
54 Further discussion included the history of the setback average plus 20 ft; if the setback was in
55 conflict with state statutes; and whether or not the committee should still work on the issue.

56
57 Consensus was to get directive from the County Board and bring it back to the next meeting.

58
59 The discussion then turned to the State statute that allows structures to be replaced in the same
60 location, the same size, with no expansion and whether there needs to be a definition of what
61 expansion is or could expansion be allowed. This issue will be researched more.

62
63 The discussion then turned to whether or not the committee should be coming up with issues that
64 need to be changed in the Ordinance or if the committee should be taking directive from the
65 County Board and letting the County Board tell the committee what to work on. By the
66 committee working on issues, anyone could come in with a proposal to change a regulation that
67 would be a personal goal and not a county-wide issue. Smith stated that if we are looking at
68 changing something that is already regulation, the direction should come from the Board. Knopf
69 agreed and stated that the committee is there to help the Zoning Office, but Evenson-Marden
70 should go to the County Board with issues and come back to the committee if the Board wants
71 things changed.

72
73 Knopf made a motion that Evenson-Marden should go to the County Board with issues and come
74 back to the committee if the Board wants things changed so changes cannot be personal agendas.
75 Walz second. All in favor. Motion carried.

76
77 Evenson-Marden explained the need to amend the gravel mining section of the ordinance and
78 explained interim use permits and when interim use permits should be used instead of
79 conditional use permits. Both items will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

80

81 At this time, Walz made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Knopf second. All in favor. Motion
82 carried.

83

84 Respectfully submitted,

85

86 Debi Moltzan

87

88

89