



Le Sueur County, MN

Thursday, March 8, 2018

Regular session

Item 1

Approved March 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Staff Contact: Joshua Mankowski or Michelle R. Mettler

LE SUEUR COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
88 SOUTH PARK AVE.
LE CENTER, MINNESOTA 56057
3/8/18

MEMBERS PRESENT: Don Reak, Jeanne Doheny, Don Rynda, Shirley Katzenmeyer,
Doug Krenik, Al Gehrke, Pam Tietz, Commissioner King

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Joshua Mankowski, Michelle Mettler

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 by Chairperson, Jeanne Doheny.
2. Agenda. Motion to approve agenda, was made by Doug Krenik. Second by Don Reak. Approved.
3. Minutes from 02/08/2018 Meeting. Motion to approve minutes, was made by Al Gehrke. Second by Shirley Katzenmeyer. Approved.
4. Applications

ITEM #1: THE LAWN BARBER, LE SUEUR, MN, (APPLICANT); HARRY OLSON, DENVER, IA, (OWNER): Request that the County grant a Conditional Use Permit to allow grading, excavating, and filling of approximately 24 cubic yards of material within the shore impact zone for the repair and construction of a retaining wall within the shore impact zone in a Recreational Residential "RR" District, on a Recreational Development "RD" lake, Lake Tetonka. Property is located in the SW/NE, Section 28, Waterville Township.

Joshua Mankowski presented power point presentation. Dan Gross was present for the application.

TOWNSHIP: Notified. Response None.

DNR: Notified. Response None.

LETTERS: Joshua Mankowski regarding recommendation and condition for approval of the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

Discussion was held regarding: The project is to replace a failing, poorly constructed retaining wall with one that is designed to withstand high waters and temporary inundation. The wall will be constructed to allow it to flex and to allow water to drainage with sustaining damage. Don Reak discussed the possibility of implementing a shoreline restoration instead of installing retaining walls. This is a fairly level lot, is the retaining wall needed? It would be better for the lake and is the wall needed. Joshua Mankowski stated that, due to the growth of a few large cottonwood trees, there would still need to be retaining walls utilized in order to protect the root systems. Don Reak then discussed possibly planting native vegetation in front of the wall as screening. Due to the sandy soils and the bounce of the lake level, it would be difficult to establish and maintain plants in this area. Doug Krenik inquired about the walls ability to handle being inundated and the possibility of ice damage. Dan Gross replied that the wall is designed to handle the water and there is drain tile behind the wall help remove water. There has not been

issues with ice damage on this shoreline in the past and, because of the design, the wall will be able to flex if ice does push against it better withstand that force. Doug Krenik inquired about using silt fence in the lake and if it was appropriate. Joshua Mankowski responded that it is a common practice to place silt fence in a lake with withhold sediment. You can either use a floating silt fence or stack one in. Doug Krenik also asked if Dan Gross was confident in the materials used in the restoration. Dan Gross stated he was. Doug Krenik inquired about the length of time it takes for the coir logs to break down. Dan Gross answered that it takes about 3-5 years. Pam Tietz asked for clarification on the soils for the base of the retaining wall. In the application it was stated that the base material may need to be replaced once the block is removed. Will the amount of material movement being requested in this application be enough to complete the work? Dan Gross replied that there was.

Findings by majority roll call vote:

1. *The conditional use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminishes and impairs property values within the immediate vicinity.*
2. *The establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for uses predominant in the area.*
3. *Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other facilities have been or are being provided.*
4. *Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide sufficient off-street parking and loading space to serve the proposed use.*
5. *Adequate measures have been or will be taken to prevent and control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise and vibration, so that none of these will constitute a nuisance, and to control lighted signs and other lights in such a manner that no disturbance to neighboring properties will result.*
6. *Is the Conditional Use Permit consistent with and supported by the statement of purposes, policies, goals and objectives in the Ordinance?*
7. *Is the Conditional Use Permit consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan?*

Motion was made by Al Gehrke to approve the application.

Discussion was held regarding: The condition listed in the letter from Joshua Mankowski to add a buffer area behind the restoration with details to be handled through discussion with Environmental Services' staff.

Second by Don Rynda. Motion approved. Motion carried.

5. Discussion Items: A possible date and time of the next work session for ordinance revisions was discussed. Staff was directed to send out possible dates and times to try and determine a possible time next month to continue revision discussions.
6. Warrants/Claim-signatures.
7. Motion to adjourn meeting by Shirley Katzenmeyer. Second by Pam Teitz. Motion approved. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Joshua Mankowski

Approved April 12, 2018

***Tape of meeting is on file in the
Le Sueur County Environmental Services Office***