

**Becker County Planning Commission
Special Meeting
April 29, 2004**

Present: Ken Christianson, Harry Johnston, Jeff Moritz, Waldo Johnson, Larry Knutson, Ray Thorkildson, John McGovern, Jim Bruflodt, Don Skarie, Commissioner Dave Seaberg, Administrator Patricia Johnson and Greg Nelson. Patricia Johnson recorded the minutes.

Discussion was held regarding the variance approved by Cormorant Township for the docking with 28 slips. The Planning Commission has concerns about the number of slips. Miller questioned who would control that each unit would have a slip and that no one would get more than one slip. Moritz stated that this would be enforced either by the Watershed or the homeowner's association.

Discussion was held regarding the third tier. W. Johnson agrees with the project except for the third tier development.

Discussion was held regarding the septic system. A letter from Brad Grant, SWCD, requests a copy of retention pond plans and design to determine if treated water will be allowed to re-enter the wetlands after treatment so it will not adversely affect the wetland.

Moritz had the following questions:

- *How would the extra water be handled in the watershed?
- *What measure will be taken to make sure the wetlands will be maintained?
- *What type of long term monitoring will be done of the wetland's water quality?
- *Have the neighbor's agreed to the wetland discharge?
- *What provisions have been made for high water conditions?
- *What provisions have been made for Lot 21 during high water conditions?

Greg Nelson stated, in his opinion, Lot 21 should be shifted away from the wetland and that he has enhanced the wetland between Lot 4 & 5.

Discussion was held regarding the 50 ft buffer zone and leaving it natural. Land suitability was discussed, as outlined in the Subdivision Ordinance.

Moritz had the following questions:

- *How much earth would be moved and/or sloped to make building sites?
- *Would the fill be removed from the site or stored on the site?
- *The developer should be allowed to look at the PUD and land suitability in relation to the building placement.
- *What is buildable on each site in relation to covenants?
- *What restrictions are on the units regarding impervious surface coverage?
- *What provisions have been made for the overhang, if the unit is covering the 100ft x 100 ft?

Bruflodt felt that 3000 sq ft unit areas were undesirable. Bruflodt had the following question:

*Cover types – estimate before and after development? EAW Question #10 Estimate the acreage of the site with each of the following cover types before and after development:

	Before	After		Before	After
Types 1-8 wetlands	_____	_____	Lawn/landscaping	_____	_____
Wooded/forest	_____	_____	Impervious surfaces	_____	_____
Brush/grassland	_____	_____	Other(describe)	_____	_____
Cropland	_____	_____	TOTAL	_____	_____

Christianson questioned if there were other projects in the area similar to this. There are similar projects in the Alexandria area and Walker area.

Further discussion was held regarding placing the restrictions on the plat; having pre-planning meetings on plats and PUDs; having the units staked out and numbered; and having the centerline of the road staked out.

P. Johnson stated that she would check on the variance issued on the docking with no comments by the DNR.

The following questions arose:

- *How will the shore impact zone, ice ridge and steep slopes be protected?
- *On Lots 1, 2, 3, & 4, how will the steep slope and shore impact zone be protected?
- *What provisions will be made for pruning and dead material removal in the shore impact zone?
- *What is the size of the swimming pool, gazebo, and parking areas? What is the setback from the OHW?
- *What vegetation will be used to obstruct view from the lake?
- *What improvements will be needed to access docks and swimming area?
- *What is the developer's intent on the protection zone? Will it be a conservation easement for the shore impact zone?

The consensus of the group is that the following questions need to be answered:

- *How would the extra water be handled in the watershed?
- *What measure will be taken to make sure the wetlands will be maintained?
- *What type of long term monitoring will be done of the wetland's water quality?
- *Have the neighbor's agreed to the wetland discharge?
- *What provisions have been made for high water conditions?
- *What provisions have been made for Lot 21 during high water conditions?
- *How much earth would be moved and/or sloped to make building sites?
- *Would the fill be removed from the site or stored on the site?
- *The developer should be allowed to look at the PUD and land suitability in relation to the building placement.
- *What is buildable on each site in relation to covenants?
- *What restrictions are on the units regarding impervious surface coverage?

*What provisions have been made for the overhang, if the unit is covering the 100ft x 100 ft?

*Cover types – estimate before and after development? EAW Question #10 Estimate the acreage of the site with each of the following cover types before and after development:

	Before	After		Before	After
Types 1-8 wetlands	_____	_____	Lawn/landscaping	_____	_____
Wooded/forest	_____	_____	Impervious surfaces	_____	_____
Brush/grassland	_____	_____	Other(describe)	_____	_____
Cropland	_____	_____	TOTAL	_____	_____

*How will the shore impact zone, ice ridge and steep slopes be protected?

*On Lots 1, 2, 3, & 4, how will the steep slope and shore impact zone be protected?

*What provisions will be made for pruning and dead material removal in the shore impact zone?

*What is the size of the swimming pool, gazebo, and parking areas? What is the setback from the OHW?

*What vegetation will be used to obstruct view from the lake?

*What improvements will be needed to access docks and swimming area?

*What is the developer's intent on the protection zone? Will it be a conservation easement for the shore impact zone?

These questions will be forwarded to the developer to have answered by the next meeting. It was a suggestion of the Planning Commission that they would like to have this information by the next informational meeting, which is Thursday, May 13, 2004.

Since there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

Jim Bruflo, Vice Chairman

ATTEST

Jeff Moritz, Secretary

Patricia Johnson, Administrator