



Discussion Point Item Summary
Meeting #5: Monday, April 26, 2021 3:30pm

Attendees:

Board of Commissioners

Commissioner Joe Perske, Commissioner Jeff Mergen, Commissioner Steve Notch, Commissioner Tarryl Clark, Commissioner Leigh Lenzmeier (joined shortly after the start of the meeting)

Planning Commission

Jason Weinermann, Jason Kron, Ken Massmann, Mike Proell, Rich Blenkush, Jeff Bertram, Shawn Blackburn (Joined shortly after the start of the meeting)

County Staff

Dr. Mike Williams, County Administrator, Chelle Benson, Environmental Services Director, Angie Berg, Environmental Services Supervisor, Jennifer Buckentine, Environmental Specialist

The meeting was called to order by Angie Berg, 3:31 p.m.

Ms. Berg stated this afternoon's discussion pertains to Recreational Vehicle Parks and Recreational Vehicles. The goal is to review the proposed standards and provide recommendations to the commissioners. The Public Hearing for these recommendations to the Ordinance is scheduled for June 1, 2021.

Roll call was conducted by Angie Berg of all members present.

RV Park – Docks – Jennifer Buckentine Presented

A review of the dock ordinance standards and how they relate to RV parks.

Issues – concerns relating to the number of docks allowed at a resort and development concerns of County's waterbodies was raised during a recent permit approved by the County.

Adopted in 2007, the ordinance allows continuous dock space and one mooring space per each dwelling unit or campsite. Area county information was shared with members.

Proposed Changes:

- Leaving the current ordinance language.

- Amend the Ordinance and revert back to the Shoreland Rules 6120 which states one mooring space for each site within Tier 1.
- Or a Tiered Option. (i.e., one mooring space for every two sites in Tier 2, one mooring space for every 3 sites in Tier 3, etc.)

Looking for a recommendation as to whether the language should be changed and if so, hold a hearing on June 1, 2021 in which we would seek input from the DNR and other interested parties.

Discussion Takeaways:

- The tiered system would add a higher level of complexity. The tier calculation still has to be completed because of the density calculations.
- Noted by members there is currently no rules or ordinances regarding a homeowner on lakeshore being limited to the number of items tied up to a dock and would also contribute to the amount of lake traffic on a body of water; that concern does not pertain strictly to a resort and the traffic from the resort.
- Mentioned two resorts are looking to expand and a property in the western part of the county has inquired about a new RV park.
- If an existing resort owner requested an expansion, and changes were to be recommended and approved at the June 1, 2021 hearing, the change would pertain only to the requested expansion. The existing docking would remain the same.
- The thought this evening is for members to decide if a change is warranted. Is allowing one mooring space per site an acceptable standard. What are the reasons we are changing this for? Is it for environmental reasons? Is it for aesthetics? Regulating a dock and the location makes more sense and would make a greater impact regarding the safety of the area and the amount of traffic. Leaving it as is makes more sense right now.
- When resorts are looking to expand, the County does look to the DNR for their feedback regarding the area, water depth, dock location, etc.
- Leaving it as is probably makes the most sense. If it was on a shoreline that's not really developed it may be ok. If it were on a narrow channel, highly developed area, it's probably needed to limit the dock size.
- Possibly adding to the ordinance each site could have only one watercraft. It wouldn't control who allows others to use their mooring site or having one renter only have one, rather than two or three. Also controlling this would become an issue, who would police this.
- Most sites add the docks when needed and not all at once. Most residents of resorts are not at the site all together at the same time.

- Are we trying to build something for the worst-case scenario? Might be overkill.

Recommendation:

Consensus of members is to stick with the Ordinance language we currently have and not to conduct a public hearing.

RV Single Lot

Rise in complaints within shoreland. Limited parking, transient activity is different from year-round activity, and noise levels.

Public Hearing was held in February 2021 with public comment and letters that were received included in the packet. A new County Board public hearing on this topic is scheduled for June 1, 2021.

County is required to regulate shoreland development including RV's. Mandated by the DNR to do so.

Current ordinance is more restrictive than the proposed ordinance.

Enforcement occurred on this issue until 2018 when it paused for the Comprehensive plan and relook at the issue.

Illegal nonconformities cannot be grandfathered in.

Current Rules:

- All RV's must meet setback requirements.
- Only one home or cabin or only one RV on a parcel. Can't have both right now.
- If it's there more than 30 days, you need a Construction Site Permit.
- Two or more citations would result in a criminal citation.
- Currently there are no provisions for temporary RV's.

The following recommendations were addressed at the Public Hearing in February:

- The number of RV's allowed on a parcel is based on size.
- Allowed up to four times a year.
- Allowed for a maximum of 30 days per year.

- Located outside of the ROW. Earlier correspondence was received from the DNR, but have changed their opinion. The next recommendation is to support 100' setback from the OHWL or Bluff zone.
- Provisional Use Registration would be required. There would be no fee, no septic certification, one-time registration with neighbor notification and plan showing parking, setbacks, sewer and water supply.

Other option to consider:

Revert back to the civil enforcement and eliminate the current proposal and eliminate the criminal language from the recommendations.

DNR Comments included OHWL and bluff setbacks must be met, parking should be screened from lake view, allowing up to four regardless of the size may put an extreme pressure on non-conforming lots of record.

Recreational Vehicle County Comparison was presented.

Discussion Takeaways:

- The County is required to administer and enforce the DNR shoreland rules.
- These requirements would not change a permanent RV on a lot. This would only apply to temporary use. A request to have a permanent RV on the lot would require a Construction site permit or a variance. Also, based on the proposed recommendations, if your lot is 20,000 and you have a residential dwelling unit on the lot, you would not be allowed a temporary RV on the parcel.
- Survey Results regarding Recreational Vehicles were reviewed with members.
- Setback limits regarding a RV's was reviewed.
- The number of complaints seem low for the number of years considering these folks are really close to each other.
- The previous suggestion of creating a "good neighbor" type document was mentioned on be helpful. Encouraging neighbors to talk with each other as well would help.
- These recommendations are not changing anything regarding buildability for legal non-conforming lots due to size.
- Checking with the DNR prior to the Public Hearing regarding the setback limit would be recommended.

- Current option of not having in person meetings - we do have options for folks to participate in the meeting verbally, written communication is weighed at the same strength as verbal, etc. We conduct test sessions with anyone who would like to participate and do everything we can to assist them.

Recommendation:

The consensus was to accept the recommendations of staff and to move forward with the Public Hearing on June 1, 2021.

- 1) Change enforcement from criminal to civil
- 2) Delay enforcement until 2022 to allow compliance
- 3) Accept DNR's approval
- 4) Adopt Ordinance on this year to allow property owners to apply for provisional use.

There are no additional meetings scheduled for Ordinance Review Committee.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:36 p.m.