



REDWOOD COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICE

*Planning & Zoning • Parks & Trails • GIS
Aquatic Invasive Species • Septic Inspector
Drainage Inspector • Agricultural Inspector*

PO BOX 130
REDWOOD FALLS
MINNESOTA 56283
PH: 507-637-4023

REDWOOD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Meeting Date: April 6, 2020

A meeting of the Redwood County Planning Commission convened on Monday, the 6th day of April, 2020, via telephone.

Due to Governor Walz's emergency declaration, in connection with the spread of the COVID-19 virus, the Redwood County Government Center was closed to the public on March 19, 2020. Consequently, the meeting was held via telephone using Zoom web conferencing software. All callers were provided with the telephone number and meeting ID number. This information was also available to all members of the public that asked for it. The public notices and mailed notices for the meeting directed interested parties to contact the Environmental Office for the call-in numbers.

The following members of the Redwood County Planning Commission were present: Mike Scheffler, Mark Madsen, Mike Kaufenberg, Jeff Huseby, DeVonna Zeug, and Commissioner Dave Forkrud. Also present were the following individuals: Craig Johanneck, Steve Tisue, Al Panitzke, Steve Panitzke, Royce Heffelfinger, Dennis Rothmeier, Environmental Director Scott Wold, and Land Use & Zoning Supervisor Nick Brozek.

At 1:00 p.m. the regularly scheduled April 6th, 2020 Redwood County Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Chair Scheffler.

Chair Scheffler took roll-call attendance of the Planning Commissioners. All stated they were present. Chair Scheffler then asked the members of the public present on the call to state their names. Wold, who was running the meeting on Zoom, stated the software showed 14 callers in attendance.

At 1:09 p.m. Chair Scheffler called to order a public hearing on Conditional Use Permit #4-20, submitted by Alan Panitzke.

Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission members were provided an informational packet, which included the following information regarding the matter:

1. Mr. Panitzke wishes to permit for gravel mining 18 acres of his property, located in the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (NW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 21, Swedes Forest Township.
2. If approved, the gravel pit will be a continuation of the existing pit previously permitted on the property next door to the east, owned by Craig Johanneck (formerly owned by Scott and Darcee Pederson. The existing pit is about 10 acres in area.
3. The land to be mined is currently a tilled agricultural field. The plan is to remove the 1 to 3 feet of overburden (topsoil) and stockpile it on the north (along 430th Street right-of-way), west (along

Grandview Avenue right-of-way), and south sides of the pit, to be used later for reclamation of the pit. Approximately 8 to 13 feet of gravel will then be removed, down to a clay layer. When the mining is complete, or the term of the permit runs, the pit sides will be graded and sloped at no steeper than 3 to 1 slope, the overburden will be spread over the site, and it will be returned to farmland. Some of the site in the southeast corner may be incorporated into an existing pond, which is an old disused gravel pit.

4. Craig Johanneck will be the operator of the pit.
5. 430th Street will be used to access the pit. From there, the gravel will need to be hauled either one mile west, to CSAH 7, or one mile south on Grand Avenue, to County Hwy 58 (unpaved).
6. The three closest dwellings to the proposed pit are as follows: Jamie & Jennifer Parker, 100 feet north of the pit; Craig Johanneck, 480 feet east of the pit; and Johnathan & Laura Rigge, 730 feet south of the pit. The Rigge site is also the site of the Grandview Valley Winery.
7. There is no public drainage tile or open ditch near the project site.
8. An unnamed intermittent stream, which is listed on the DNR Protected Waters Inventory, is located about 300 feet southwest of the site.
9. A copy of the Conditional Use Permit application, maps, plans, and proposed permit conditions are enclosed.

Craig Johanneck was present at the meeting to explain the project. Johanneck made the following statements to the Commission:

- The permit is to expand Johanneck's existing gravel pit. The same gravel vein extends to the west of the current pit.
- Johanneck will start on his own side and extend the excavation west onto Panitzke's property.

Chair Scheffler asked each Planning Commissioner if they had any questions or comments. None did.

Chair Scheffler asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in support of the project. No one spoke up.

Chair Scheffler asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in opposition to the project. No one spoke up.

Chair Scheffler closed the public hearing at 1:15 p.m.

At Chair Scheffler's direction, Brozek read out the Findings of Fact factors. After each factor, Chair Scheffler asked each Commissioner for their response, individually. The Findings of Fact factors, and the Commissioners' responses, are as follows:

- 1) What potential health safety and welfare impacts were raised at the hearing and why will they, or why won't they, impact the neighboring residents?

Madsen – There will be no impact.

Kaufenberg – It's adjacent to the existing pit, so there will be no impact.

Huseby – No impact – it's next to the other operation.

Zeug – Agrees with what the other Commissioners have said.

Forkrud – No impact.

Scheffler – Johanneck has had a nice operation at this pit for quite a few years and there hasn't been any complaints.

- 2) What potential impacts on area property uses were raised at the hearing and why will they, or why won't they, impact the property uses in the area?

Madsen – The site is already used for this purpose and there is no public opposition.

Kaufenberg – There were no objections raised and he sees no impact.

Huseby – No impact.

Zeug – Agrees with what the other Commissioners have said, no impact.

Forkrud – No impact.

Scheffler – Agrees with what the other Commissioners have said.

- 3) What potential impacts on property values or future development were raised at the hearing, and why will they, or why won't they, impact the neighboring properties?

Madsen – Nothing was raised, there should be none.

Kaufenberg – Doesn't see any effect.

Huseby – No impact.

Zeug – No impact.

Forkrud – No impact.

Scheffler – The neighboring uses are agricultural and gravel extraction, so there should be no impact.

- 4) What infrastructure is needed to support the proposed use and how will it be provided?

Madsen – The site has an access road and is already being mined on the side already permitted. Johanneck has used dust control.

Kaufenberg – Infrastructure is already taken care of.

Huseby – The infrastructure is there. Johanneck maintains the roads he uses.

Zeug – Agrees with the previous statements of the Commissioners [above].

Forkrud – Agrees with the previous statements of the Commissioners [above].

Scheffler – Agrees with the previous statements of the Commissioners [above]. Dust control is already happening.

- 5) How do the goals, purpose and policies of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan apply to the proposed project?

Zeug explained that the Ordinance and Comp Plan hold aggregate mining to be a beneficial use in Redwood County, and the process being followed is designed to determine the suitability of the specific proposed location.

Zeug made a motion to recommend approval of permit #4-20, subject to the conditions recommended by staff.

Forkrud seconded the motion.

Chair Scheffler called for a roll call vote on the motion. Each Commissioner stated their vote, in turn, as follows (“aye” if in favor):

Madsen: Aye

Kaufenberg: Aye

Huseby: Aye
Zeug: Aye
Forkrud: Aye
Scheffler: Aye

The motion was approved.

At 1:22 p.m. Chair Scheffler called to order a public hearing on Rezoning Permit #1-20R, submitted by Steve Tisue and James Tisue.

Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission members were provided an informational packet, which included the following information regarding the matter:

1. Steven Tisue and James Tisue own adjoining rural dwelling lots on River Road, just across from the Central Bi-products site. Over the past several months, the Environmental Office has received two anonymous complaints about old junk cars being stored on the properties. The request to rezone the properties is a response to that situation.
2. The addresses of the two sites are 33281 and 33263 River Road, Redwood Falls. The Tisues reside at their respective sites, with their families,
3. The Tisues wish to rezone their properties from Agricultural District, to the I-1 Industry District. This will allow them to operate a vehicle impound lot for a towing company and local law enforcement impounding.
4. The parcels to be rezoned are adjacent to the Central Bi-products site, which is already zoned I-1 Industry, so rezoning the Tisue properties will fit in with the current zoning in the area. The property surrounding the Tisues' property on the west, north, and east, is owned by the DNR. The eastern portion of the DNR property is located in the Scenic River District.
5. The nearest dwelling to the properties, other than the dwellings located on the properties, is a rural dwelling site owned by James and Amber Tisue, about 2250 feet west of the site. The closest dwelling site owned by a third party is that of Zachary Lundberg, located 3000 feet northwest of the properties.
6. There is no public drainage tile or open ditch located near the properties. Part of the eastern end of Steven Tisue's property is located in the Minnesota River flood plain. Storage of vehicles and other materials is prohibited in the floodplain.

Steve Tisue was present at the meeting to explain the project. Johanneck made the following statements to the Commission:

- Steve wants to start and operate a towing company on his property.
- He also operates a vehicle impound lot, for local law enforcement.
- Steve needs to zone the property I-1 Industry in order to conduct these uses.
- I-1 is the same zoning as Central Bi-products, which is next door.

The Planning Commissioners had the following comments and questions for the applicant:

- The Tisue's property is next to a scenic river area. Will there be any fencing or screening of the impound lot?
- The aerial imagery of the site was taken when there were no leaves, minimal natural cover.

Tisue made the following responses to the Commissioners' questions and statements:

- The impound lot will be located behind the existing buildings and will not be visible from the public road.
- The site is surrounded on three sides by land owned by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.
- Steve was encouraged by local law enforcement to start a second towing company in the area.
- The State of Minnesota does not require fencing or screening of impound lots, but he does have to indicate which zoning district he is located in.

Chair Scheffler closed the public hearing at 1:30 p.m.

Brozek stated that since this is a rezoning permit, the Conditional and Interim Use Permit factors do not apply.

Forkrud made a motion to recommend approval of rezoning permit #1-20R.

Zeug seconded the motion.

Chair Scheffler called for a roll call vote on the motion. Each Commissioner stated their vote, in turn, as follows (“aye” if in favor):

Madsen: Aye
Kaufenberg: Aye
Huseby: Aye
Zeug: Aye
Forkrud: Aye
Scheffler: Aye

The motion was approved.

Wold stated that the Planning Commission’s recommendation would be taken to the County Board of Commissioners on April 7, 2020.

The Commissioners reviewed and discussed the minutes from the February 24, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Forkrud made a motion to approve the February 24, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented.

Madsen seconded the motion.

Chair Scheffler called for a roll call vote on the motion. Each Commissioner stated their vote, in turn, as follows (“aye” if in favor):

Madsen: Aye
Kaufenberg: Aye
Huseby: Aye
Zeug: Aye
Forkrud: Aye
Scheffler: Aye

The Commissioners reviewed and discussed the minutes from the March 26, 2020 special Planning Commission meeting.

Madsen made a motion to approve the March 26, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented.

Huseby seconded the motion.

Chair Scheffler called for a roll call vote on the motion. Each Commissioner stated their vote, in turn, as follows (“aye” if in favor):

Madsen: Aye
Kaufenberg: Aye
Huseby: Aye
Zeug: Aye
Forkrud: Aye
Scheffler: Aye

Kaufenberg made a motion to adjourn. Zeug seconded the motion.

Chair Scheffler called for a roll call vote on the motion. Each Commissioner stated their vote, in turn, as follows (“aye” if in favor):

Madsen: Aye
Kaufenberg: Aye
Huseby: Aye
Zeug: Aye
Forkrud: Aye
Scheffler: Aye

The meeting was adjourned at 1:36 p.m.



Nick Brozek
Land Use & Zoning Supervisor
Redwood County Environmental Office



Mike Scheffler, Chair
Redwood County Planning Commission