

# **GRANT COUNTY CONSERVATION, SANITATION, & ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING**

July 7, 2022

9:00 a.m.

Room #264, County Board Room, Administration Building and Via Zoom Meeting  
Lancaster, Wisconsin

The Grant County Conservation, Sanitation & Zoning Committee meeting was called to order on July 7, 2022, at 9:01 a.m. by Gary Northouse, the Conservation, Sanitation, Zoning Committee Chairman in Room #264, County Board Room of the Administration Building and via Zoom meeting.

Board members present in the County Board room: Porter Wagner, Gary Northouse, Adam Day, Pat Schroeder, and Joe Mumm. Brian Lucey Excused. Others present in the County Board room; Erik Heagle, Annette Lolwing, Robert Keeney, Shane Drinkwater, Justin Johnson, Steve and Rebecca Bailie, Joseph & Antionette Stoikes, Paul Halberg, Mathew Filenius, Christopher Kidd, Cindy Olsen, Dale Kovars, and Tom Mercer, via Zoom: Erik Heagle, Shane Drinkwater, Robert Keeney, Bob Servias, Toughbook1, Board Room, EHeagle, and Alder.

## **Certification of Open Meeting Law**

Annette Lolwing sent the agenda to Tonya White and Karla Schwantes to post in the Courthouse, in the Administration Building, and on the website. An agenda was sent to Bob Middendorf. An agenda was also posted in front of the Ag Service Center Building. Media notices were sent to Tonya White, Karla Schwantes, Herald Independent, Platteville Journal, Muscoda Progressive, Boscobel Dial, Fennimore Times, and Bob Middendorf.

## **Approval of July 7, 2022, Agenda**

Motion by Pat Schroeder, seconded by Porter Wagner to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

## **Approval of the June 2, 2022, Minutes**

Motion by Joe Mumm, seconded by Porter Wagner to approve the June 2, 2022, minutes. Motion carried.

## **Review & Accept the Bills**

Motion by Pat Schroeder, seconded by Adam Day to accept the June bills. Motion carried.

## **Public Hearing for Rezones**

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#RZ22-12 – Matthew Filenius, Lima Twp., is requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN:030-00266-0010 of +/-2.0 ac. from FP to A-2 to allow for the use of a nonfarm residence.

In Favor: Lima Twp. approved on May 11, 2022. Matthew Filenius.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: None

Committee Discussion: None

Chairman Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Porter Wagner that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Pat Schroeder.

Motion carried. See Attachment A Worksheet

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#RZ22-13 – Joseph & Antoinette Stoikes, Mt. Hope Twp., are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 038-00046-0010 of +/- 27.85 ac. from FP to A-2 to allow for the use of a nonfarm residence.

In Favor: Mt. Hope Twp. approved on June 8, 2022. Joseph & Antoinette Stoikes.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: Justin reported that the mapped waterway on the map was determined to be non-navigable so no shoreland zoning would apply in this rezone.

Committee Discussion: Bob Keeney asked if there is an existing home on the property? No, there is no existing home. Bob also asked if there is an easement to get to the property? Yes, there has been an easement established since Joseph and Antionette have owned the property. They do meet the minimum frontage requirement of 40' along Hwy 133.

Chairman Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Adam Day that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Joe Mumm.

Motion carried. See Attachment B Worksheet.

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#RZ22-14 – Dale & Dianne Kovars, Fennimore Twp., are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 016-00113-000 of +/- 3.0 ac. from FP to A-2 to allow for the use of a nonfarm residence.

In Favor: Fennimore Twp. approved on June 6, 2022. Dale Kovars.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: This nonfarm residence meets all property and road setbacks along with the vision corner setbacks.

Committee Discussion: Gary Northouse asked if the driveway will be coming off Robin Lane or on Hwy 61. It will be coming off Robin Lane.

Chairman Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Adam Day that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Porter Wagner.

Motion carried. See Attachment C Worksheet.

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#RZ22-15 – Steven & Rebecca Bailie, Ellenboro Twp., are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 014-00113-0000 and 014-00114-0000 of +/-5.95 ac. from A-1 & FP to A-2 to allow for the use of a nonfarm residence and proposed shed.

In Favor: Ellenboro Twp. approved on May 4, 2022. Steven and Rebecca Bailie.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: The small piece of property was purchased from the Vesperman's.

Committee Discussion: Porter Wagner asked if there is an existing shed on the property. The existing shed on the property is a small, detached garage.

Chairman Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Pat Schroeder that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Porter Wagner.

Motion carried. See Attachment D Worksheet.

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#RZ22-16 – Olsen Revocable Trust, Platteville Twp., is requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 050-00515-0000 of +/- 8.955 ac. from FP to A-2 to allow for the use of a nonfarm residence.

In Favor: Platteville Twp. approved on June 13, 2022. Paul Halberg & Cindy Olsen.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: This is the 3<sup>rd</sup> home to be constructed off this easement.

Committee Discussion: None

Chairman Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Joe Mumm that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Pat Schroeder.

Motion carried. See Attachment E Worksheet.

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#RZ22-17 – Hi-View Shorthorns Inc., South Lancaster Twp., is requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN:056-00619-0000 of +/- 1.0 ac. from FP to A-2 to allow for the use of a nonfarm residence.

In Favor: South Lancaster Twp. approved on May 11, 2022.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: They do have the 66' wide access easement to the site.

Committee Discussion: Gary Northouse asked why the survey line is cutting through the shed. Justin informed the seller that if the line stays in that location that he would not be able to issue any zoning permits for the nonconforming structure.

Chairman Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Pat Schroeder that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Adam Day. Motion carried. See Attachment F Worksheet.

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#RZ22-18 – Brian Kieler, Jamestown Twp., is requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 026-01316-0000 of +/-3.024 ac. from A-2 to C-1 to allow for the use of a medical clinic.

In Favor: Jamestown Twp. approved on June 7, 2022. Christopher Kidd.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: Justin and Christopher have been discussing the property line and road setbacks, and the access requirement through the Township and the D.O.T. A medical clinic is a permitted use for C-2 and will not need a Conditional Use Permit.

Committee Discussion: Porter Wagner asked about the access to the clinic. Access will be off Badger Road.

Chairman Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Porter Wagner to recommend approval of the rezone request for Brian Kieler to the full County Board, seconded by Joe Mumm. Motion carried.

### **Public Hearing for Conditional Use Permits**

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

#CUP 22-012 Mathy Construction Company, Jamestown Twp., are requesting a Conditional Use Permit on PIN: 026-01131-0000 & 026-01132-0000 of +/- 25.705 ac. to allow for the use of nonmetallic mining under Section 3.05 E (3) of the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

In Favor: Jamestown Twp. approved on May 10, 2022. Tom Mercer and Bob Servias.

In Opposition: Per a phone conversation with Erik, Laura Miller has concerns with the blasting, and with water table concerns with her well.

Rebuttal from Laura Miller's concerns were addressed by Bob Servias. Bob stated that the water flow to this site is to the South which flows away from the neighboring homes. The wells are deeper than the quarry floor and would not be drained. They do not expect any adverse effects to the surrounding wells. Bob stated that they are willing to have a discussion with Ms. Miller about her concerns.

In Interest: The Township did not place any conditions on #CUP 22-012. The operation complies with chapter 295, Chapter 180 of the nonmetallic mining reclamation ordinance and any applicable requirements of the WI D.O.T. The Southwest Wisconsin Regional Planning has informed us that the reclamation plan has been reviewed. In 2021, the CSZC committee approved the quarry Conditional Use Permit CUP#21-006. This area was an oversight. It was suggested to Bob Servias that when that the previous #CUP21-006 comes up for renewal, to renew this #CUP22-012 at the same time. Bob mentioned that the stockpile area will consist of roughly 2 acres of the #CUP22-012 parcels. Tom mentioned the extraction of limestone is permitted under #CUP21-006. There will be no extraction operations; no mining or blasting on this CUP, used strictly for stockpiling.

Committee Discussion: Bob Keeney asked if there is already an existing CUP on this property? Yes, there is a CUP existing on the property. Can the committee limit the number of years of #CUP22-012 to coincide with #CUP21-006 so both come due at the same time? Yes. Bob and Tom both concurred that that would be acceptable.

Gary Northouse closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Porter Wagner to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit with the condition that the expiration date coincides with #CUP21-006's expiration date, seconded by Joe Mumm. Motion carried.  
See Attachment G Worksheet

### **Public Hearing for Ordinance Amendment**

Chairman Northouse opened the Public Hearing

Petition #22-02 Ordinance Amendment request to Chapter 315 Sections 3.05 B & 3.27 (4) (a) of the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance to clarify Farmland Preservation District setbacks and to clarify Farmland Preservation district setbacks.

B. GENERAL LAND USE IN FARMLAND PRESERVATION ZONING DISTRICT Only the following land uses are allowed in a farmland preservation zoning district:

- (1) Uses allowed under Section C without a conditional use permit.
- (2) Uses allowed under Section D with a conditional use permit
- (3) Prior nonconforming uses, subject to [choose s. 59.69(10), 60.61(5), or 62.23(7) (h), Wis. Stats. As applicable]

(4) Farmland Preservation District Zoning must follow setbacks prescribed under A1 and A2 Zoning.

(5) Non-Metallic Mineral Extraction must follow setbacks prescribed under section 3.04, General Setbacks and Dimensional Requirements.

### **(4) ZONING PERMITS AND CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.**

(a) Zoning Permit: No structure or any part thereof shall hereafter be located, installed, erected, constructed, reconstructed, extended, enlarged, converted, structurally altered or placed on a lot or parcel of land within the area subject to the provisions of this ordinance until a zoning permit has been applied for in writing and obtained from the Zoning Administrator. Such permit shall be posted in a prominent place on the premises prior to and during the period of construction, alteration or installation. The Zoning Administrator shall keep a record of all permits issued. Any zoning permit issued in conflict with the provisions of the Ordinance shall be null and void. All permits shall expire twelve (12) months after the date of issuance unless the Zoning Administrator approves an extension of time in writing upon assurance that reasonable progress is being made toward the completion of the permitted work.

1. Zoning permits may be extended up to one time for 1 additional concurrent year from the original permit expiration date.

Porter Wagner asked who checks the setbacks out at the site? Justin, Erik, and whoever is available to go out to the site and check. Each site is checked for setbacks.

Motion by Porter Wagner to recommend approval of the Ordinance Amendment request and to present it to the full County Board, seconded by Joe Mumm. Motion carried.

### **Zoning/Sanitation Report**

Erik reported that the next sanitation court hearing is on July 11<sup>th</sup>. There are 5 active court cases. The Order for Correction list for 2021; there are 20 miscellaneous and 49 maintenance forms. We typically give 1 year to correct the issue. Active citations for 2020; there are 52 total, 41 failing sanitary systems and 11 failure to complete 3-year maintenance. Active citations for 2021; there are 62 total, 36 failing sanitary systems and 20 failure to complete maintenance, and 6 failure to complete holding tank maintenance. For a total of 2020 and 2021 we are at 114 active citations. Zoning permits through the 1<sup>st</sup> of July; in 2021 there were 94 permits issued

and in 2022 there were 136 permits issued. There is an upcoming court date scheduled for July 13, 2022, this is a continuation from a court date in April and from June. Defendant plead not guilty to apply for a variance. The variance application has still not been submitted. Erik issued 13 more citations for the end of August. On the Zoning Sanitation Report we have an increase of \$33,375 more than last year on collected fees. There are currently 29 active Orders for Corrections for zoning. The deadline for the 3-year maintenance is August 31<sup>st</sup> before the \$100.00 late fee is activated. We are down 267 3-year maintenance forms as we were last year.

There is a Board of Adjustment meeting scheduled for July 18th at 8 a.m. on 2 site proposals.

### **Jeep Repair Approval**

Erik reported that there is a wheel bearing going bad in the back of the jeep. The estimated cost for replacing the wheel bearing \$419.28. The committee agreed that if there is money in the budget for vehicle repairs, there is no reason to bring it before the committee for approval.

### **County Cost Sharing:** Beginning Balance \$25045.72/Ending Balance \$24,283.94

Erik presented tentative approval request for county cost sharing on a Well Decommissioning for Eagle Valley-Kohler Co., Glen Haven Twp., \$960.00. Motion by Adam Day, seconded by Pat Schroeder to approve Eagle Valley-Kohler Co. cost sharing request. Motion carried.

Erik presented final approval request for county cost sharing on a Well Decommissioning for William Schier, West Glen Haven Twp., \$1,000.00. Motion by Porter Wagner, seconded by Joe Mumm to approve payment. Roll Call: 5 Yes, 0 No, 1 Excused. Motion carried.

Erik presented final approval request for county cost sharing on a Well Decommissioning for Todd & Julie Fischer, East Bloomington Twp., \$465.78. Motion by Joe Mumm, seconded by Porter Wagner to approve payment. Roll Call: 5 Yes, 0 No, 1 Excused. Motion carried.

### **SWRM Cost Sharing:**

#### **2021 DATCP Cost Sharing:** Beginning Balance/Ending Balance \$18,585.33

None to report.

#### **2022 DATCP Cost Sharing:** Beginning Balance \$34,259.33/Ending Balance \$4,509.33

Erik presented tentative approval request for 2022 DATCP cost sharing on a Grade Stabilization Structure for Tom Majerus, Paris Twp., \$10,500.00. Motion by Porter Wagner, seconded by Adam Day to approve Tom's cost sharing request. Motion carried.

Erik presented tentative approval request for 2022 DATCP cost sharing on another Grade Stabilization Structure for Tom Majerus, Paris Twp., \$10,500.00. Motion by Pat Schroeder, seconded by Adam Day to approve Tom's cost sharing request. Motion carried.

Erik presented tentative approval request for 2022 DATCP cost sharing on a Streambank Protection project for Ann Kemink, Clifton Twp., \$8,750.00. Motion by Porter Wagner, seconded by Pat Schroeder to approve Ann's cost sharing request. Motion carried.

#### **2021 MDV Cost Sharing:** Beginning Balance \$53,359.58/Ending Balance \$44,024.09

Erik presented final approval request for MDV cost sharing on a Grade Stabilization Structure for Duane Haas, Cassville, Twp., \$9,335.49. Motion by Adam Day, seconded by Joe Mumm to approve payment 5 Yes, 0 No, 1 Excused. Motion carried.

### **WI Land + Water Video**

A 20-minute video was recorded by Matt Krueger, Executive Director, of the WI Land + Water. His presentation was to welcome the new LCC members along with our existing LCC members. In his presentation he mentioned

that Conservation is Critical, County Conservation is Complex, and that you are part of a community of conservation.

### **Storage Permit Approval**

Erik reported that there are 2 permits in the works. The committee gave approval to Erik to go ahead and approve a permit prior to bringing it to the monthly committee meeting.

### **Farmland Preservation Program**

Erik reported that John & Elaine Droessler closed a manure storage facility without following the 151 standards. The Droessler's are now out of compliance with the Farmland Preservation Program. Dietzel Ridge Acre Inc., Steve & Mary Lou Dietzel, and Dietzel Revocable Trust have signed the Voluntary Notice of Noncompliance to opt out of the Farmland Preservation Program.

### **CSZD Administrator Report**

- \* Erik had a WL+W tech meeting on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. Erik is now the alternate for NRCS's state technical committee.  
The next WL+W tech meeting is on August 18<sup>th</sup>.
- \* BOA meeting on June 9<sup>th</sup>, both proposals were denied.
- \* Farmland Preservation Plan & Zoning Update meeting with Justin and SWWRPC on June 15<sup>th</sup>.
- \* NWQI meeting with NRCS staff on June 16<sup>th</sup> and July 8<sup>th</sup>.
- \* SWIGG meeting on Thursday, June 16<sup>th</sup>.
- \* First Amendment Auditors webinar on June 27<sup>th</sup> from WCA
- \* SWIGG & Clean Sweep meeting on June 29<sup>th</sup>, Clean Sweep meeting on July 8<sup>th</sup>.
- \* Looking at reviewing County Storage Ordinance, Cooperator Cost Share Rates, Cost Share Priorities, adding 2 new rates for zoning and sanitation (in house at grade plan approval and navigability determination fees in the future).
- \* The NWQI Draft was sent to NRCS 2 weeks ago. We are trying to push it into next year for Implementation due to the amount of staff turnover and figuring out obligations between entities. Looking at trying to change their numbers and rates to be more realistic with the area. Looks like there may be a Spring sign up for 2023 and a fall 2024 and a fall 2025 sign up.
- \* Katie Abbott (Iowa County) and Erica Sauer (Lafayette County) are waiting to hear more of their committee's thoughts on where they would like to go and what would they like to do next with the SWIGG study? They are working on educational items, mostly with wells and septic at this time.
- \* The Land and Water Resource Management Plan (LWRM) 5-year update is set for April 2023.
- \* The Clean Sweep is tentatively set for September 23<sup>rd</sup> & 24<sup>th</sup>, 2-6 and 8-12 at the fairgrounds.

### **Continuous Improvement Update**

- \* Working on trainings with Bailey.
- \* Erik is not planning on going to County Con meeting, going to WCCA meeting instead.
- \* Erik is trying to make time to get his continuous compliance/credits for his engineering certifications along with POWTS and soil testers license.

### **NRCS Report:**

Erik presented the NRCS Report for Andy Walsh. Their Resource Conservationist position has been reposted and is now open.

### **FSA Report**

- 1) Spring Crop Reporting deadline is Friday, July 15. Producers need to get in and get their crops reported by 4:30 that day. If producers do not get it done by that day and report their crop late, they will be subject to a \$46 per farm late filing fee for the spot check the office has to perform on late filed crop reports.

- 2) It is County Committee (COC) election time at FSA. Nominations are currently open until August 1. Local Administrative Authority (LAA) #1 is up for election in 2022 which includes the townships of Woodman, Mount Hope, Little Grant, Beetown, South Lancaster, Potosi, Waterloo, Cassville, Glen Haven, Bloomington, Wyalusing, Patch Grove, and Millville. Producers who are actively participating with FSA and/or own land in those townships and are listed as eligible voters within those townships are eligible to be nominated and run for COC. The COC members serve a 3-year term. Please reach out to the office if you would like to self-nominate or nominate someone else. Ballots will be mailed to eligible voters the beginning of November.
- 3) Emergency Relief Program – Phase 1. Applications were mailed by the national office to producers who had a loss listed with their crop insurance for 2020 and/or 2021. Producers need to check with their crop insurance agent to see if the loss they experienced was due to an eligible cause of loss for the program as listed on the application form. Producers need to check with their crop insurance agent to see if the loss they experienced was due to an eligible cause of loss for the program as listed on the application form.  
Producers need to certify that they did have a qualifying loss. Spot checks will be done at a later time. If it is found during the spot check process that the producer was not eligible, they will be required to pay back whatever was received. Please note that while drought is listed as a qualifying event on the application form, it comes with a note that the county had to have had a D2 level drought for 8 consecutive weeks according to the US Drought monitor which Grant County did not. There could be other loss reasons listed on Crop insurance's loss adjustment paperwork which may be eligible, such as frost or excessive wind, which is why producers need to check with their crop insurance agent.

Motion by Joe Mumm, seconded by Porter Wagner to adjourn and set the next meeting date to Thursday, August 4, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted by Annette Lolwing for Porter Wagner

## Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 7/7/22 Landowner: Matthew Filenius

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

No prime farmland soil present

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes

or

No

or

N/A

Explain: Per Township Form on 5/11/22

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

5.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Remaining ± 48 ac will still be used as a farm

5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes ☐ No

2.0 ac would be split from the existing farm

5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Majority of property will still have a farm use. Property under Bierer.

5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Not a platted subdivision

5.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

No ag-related development proposed

- 6 The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain: Development proposed on non-prime farm ground soil

- 7 The CSZC recommends/does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors

(Circle one)

Porter (Pct)



# ATTACHMENT B WORKSHEET

## Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 7/7/02 Landowner: Joseph + Antoinette Stoikes

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

No prime farmland soil present

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes

or

No

or

N/A

Explain:

Per Township form on 6/8/22

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

5.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes ☐ No

No prime farmland present in proposed development area

5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes ☐ No

No ag/farm operations present

5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Remaining ± 43 ac. would remain zoned FP

5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A

Not a platted subd.

5.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A

No ag-related development is proposed

- 6 The rezoning will not substantially impair or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

No primeland soil present

- 7 The CSZC ☒ recommends/does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors

(Circle one)

Adam / Joe

# ATTACHMENT C WORKSHEET

## Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 7/7/22 Landowner: Dale + Dianne Kovars

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

No prime farmground soil present in proposed developed area

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes

or

No

or

N/A

Explain: Per Township Farm on 6/6/22

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

- 5.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Proposed development on 3 ac on non prime farmground soil.

- 5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes ☐ No

proposed development would be on 3 ac out of the 10 ac

- 5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes ☐ No

7 ac. would remain under the current owner

- 5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A

Not a platted subd

- 5.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A

No ag-related develop. being proposed

- 6 The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

No prime farmground soil present in development area.

- 7 The CSZC recommends/does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors

(Circle one)

Adam / Porter



# ATTACHMENT D WORKSHEET

## Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 7/7/22 Landowner: Steven & Rebecca Bailie

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

No prime farm ground soil present in proposed development area

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes

or

No

or

N/A

Explain: Per Township Form on 5/4/22

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

5.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Development (shed) would occur on non prime farmland

5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes ☐ No

± .95 ac being proposed to be taken out of FP

5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Remaining ground on PSD M-113 to remain as ag use

5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ N/A

Not a platted subdivision

5.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ N/A

No ag-related development being proposed

- 6 The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

No prime farmland soil present.

- 7 The CSZC recommends/does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors

(Circle one)

Pat Porter

## Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 7/7/22 landowner: Olsen Revocable Trust

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

Prime farmland soil not present where the home is proposed

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes

or

No

or

N/A

Explain:

Per Township Participation Form 6/13/22

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

- 5.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Home is being proposed on non-prime farmland soil.

- 5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes ☐ No

No farm operations present where development is proposed. Also outside

- 5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Southern half of property would remain if approved flood plain & shoreland

- 5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Not a platted subd.

- 5.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

No ag related development being proposed

- 6 The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain:

Prime Farmland soil not present in area where

- 7 The CSZC recommends/does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors

(Circle one)

Joe/pat

home is proposed

# ATTACHMENT F WORKSHEET

## Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 7/7/22 Landowner: Hi-View Shorthorns Inc

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes or ☐ No Explain:

Development / residence is existing -> located on non prime farmland soil

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes or ☐ No or ☐ N/A

Explain: Per Township Form on 5/11/22

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

5.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Non-farm development existing. No development proposed.

5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes ☐ No

1 ac out of 900 ac from the farm would be split

5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Remainder of property will remain in farmland

5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ N/A

Not a platted subd.

5.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ N/A

No development being proposed

6. The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes or ☐ No

Explain: No prime farmland soil present in developed area

7. The CSZC recommends / does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors  
(Circle one)

pat/Adam



## ATTACHMENT G WORKSHEET

## Conditional Use Permit for Non Metallic Mining in Farmland Preservation

Date: 7/7/22 Landowner: Matly Construction Co

The Grant County Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee may issue a conditional use permit for a proposed land use as they determine in writing that the proposed use meets applicable conditions under this section. The CSZC may issue the permit subject to any additional conditions which the CSZC deems necessary to carry out the purpose of this ordinance.

1. The operation complies with all of the following: ☒ YES ☐ NO
  - a. Subchapter I of ch. 295, Wis. Stats., and rules promulgated under that subchapter.
  - b. Applicable provisions of Chapter 180, the Non-Metallic Mining Reclamation Ordinance
  - c. Any applicable requirements of the WI Dept. of Trans. concerning the restoration of non-metallic mineral extraction sites.
2. The operation and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are consistent with the purposes of the farmland preservation zoning district. ☒ YES ☐ NO
3. The operation and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are reasonable and appropriate, considering alternative locations outside the farmland preservation zoning district, or are specifically approved under state or federal law. ☒ YES ☐ NO
4. The operation is reasonably designed to minimize the conversion of land around the extraction site from agricultural use or open space use. ☒ YES ☐ NO
5. The operation does not substantially impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland. ☒ YES ☐ NO

The CSZC ☒ approves / ☐ does not approve the Conditional Use Permit with the following conditions if applicable. Circle one Porter/Joel

1. The conditional use permit requires the landowner to restore the affected land after the non-metallic mineral extraction operation is completed. The permit shall require the landowner to restore the land to a condition suitable for agricultural use, according to a written restoration plan included with the permit. Note: see s. 91.46 (6), Wis. Stats.
- 2.