

COMMITTEE MEETING

May 1, 2025

9:00 a.m.

Room #264, Grant County Board Room, Administration Building
Lancaster, Wisconsin

The Grant County Conservation, Sanitation & Zoning Committee meeting was called to order on May 1, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. by Joe Mumm, the Conservation, Sanitation, Zoning Committee Chairman in Room #264, County Board Room of the Administration Building.

Board members present in the County Board room #264: Joseph Mumm, Gary Northouse, Adam Day, Larry Jerrett, and Pat Schroeder. Brian Lucey was on Zoom. Mark Vosberg, Excused. Others present in the County Board room; Annette Lolwing, Robert Keeney, Lucas Finley, Adam Reed, Keith Lane, Brady Bartels, Nick Lange, Nate Dreckman, Jordan Fritche, Gary Schmidt, Deb Schmidt, and Ben Schroeder, Zoom: Robert Keeney, Shane Drinkwater, Wepking's, Tonya White, Nancy Sailer, Drew Frey, Kyle Vesperman, and 1-262-691-9327.

Certification of Open Meeting Law

Annette Lolwing sent the amended agenda to the County Clerk's office to post in the Administration Building, Courthouse, and on the County website. An amended agenda was also posted in front of the Ag Service Center Building. An amended agenda was also sent to Bob Middendorf, WGLR. Media notices were sent to the County Clerk's office, Herald Independent, Muscoda Progressive, Boscobel Dial, Fennimore Times, and Bob Middendorf.

Approval of May 1, 2025, Amended Agenda

Motion by Gary Northouse, seconded by Pat Schroeder to approve the amended agenda. Motion carried.

Approval of April 3, 2025, Minutes

Motion by Gary Northouse, seconded by Adam Day to approve April 3, 2025, minutes. Motion carried.

Review & Accept the April Bills

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

NRCS Report – Mike Adams

None to Report

FSA Report – Emily Schildgen

Emily Schildgen submitted a written report.

- 1) Crop Reporting – the office has begun mailing crop reporting maps to producers. We are hoping to have this done by the middle of May. The maps we are sending are for FSA crop reporting. If producers need maps for something else, please reach out to the office. We are asking that producers get their maps filled out once they are done planting and reach out to the office to set up an appointment to come in, have their maps loaded, and get their crop reports signed. Reminder that plant dates must be on the maps, and we cannot report the crops until after it is planted. The spring crop reporting deadline is July 15, but the office will be short-staffed through crop reporting. We are asking producers to please reach out once you are done planting to get your crops reported because as we get closer to the deadline, we could end up with longer wait times.
- 2) Emergency Crop Program (ECAP) – reminder that this program opened March 19 and is based on 2024 planted crops. Applications were mailed to producers. Producers are receiving 85% of the payments

now and if money remains after the deadline, an additional payment of up to the additional 15% payments could be released. The office has already completed about 75% of the expected applications. For anyone that hasn't signed up or received an application in the mail that thinks they should have, please reach out to the office and we can print your application and/or look into it for you. The deadline for this program is August 15, 2025.

- 3) As of April 21, 2025, we have not heard any news on a CRP sign up or re-enrollment options for those with contracts expiring on September 30, 2025. When we have information, I will be sure to share it.

Zoning/Sanitation Report

Keith presented the Zoning/Sanitation report.

Sanitation permits: There were 16 sanitary permits issued in April 2025 compared to 17 sanitary permits issued in April 2024.

Zoning permits: There were 31 zoning permits that were either completed or in process in April 2025, compared to the 52 zoning permits that were completed in April 2024.

Keith reported that there will be an archeological study done on 3 parcels owned by the Army Corps of Engineer will be completed next week for the septic systems that have been failing for 3 years.

There is a Board of Adjustments scheduled for May 20th @ 1:00 p.m.

Public Hearing for Rezones

Chairman Mumm opened the Public Hearing

RZ25-08 Frey Real Estate Holding LLC, Boscobel Twp. are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN:006-00287-0000, 006-0303-0000, 006-00304-0000(pt), 006-00266-0000(pt) +/- 28.00 ac. from A2 & C2 to R1 for a new proposed subdivision.

In Favor: Boscobel Twp., approved on March 4, 2025. Drew Frey.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: None

Committee Discussion: Pat Schroeder asked what was the issue with this that it didn't go through last month?

Lucas stated that it was the easement.

Chairman Mumm closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Pat Schroeder, to recommend approval of the rezone request to the full County Board, seconded by Gary Northouse. Motion carried.

Public Hearing for Conditional Use Permits

Chairman Mumm opened the Public Hearing

#CUP 25-006 Michael Voss, South Lancaster Twp. is requesting a Conditional Use Permit on PIN:056-00591-0000 +/- 40.0 ac. to allow for the continued use of nonmetallic mining under Chapter 315 Subsection 3.05 E (3) of the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

In Favor: South Lancaster Twp. approved on March 12, 2025. Ben Schroeder from Bard.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: This CUP will be for the continued use of nonmetallic mining for the next 5 years. Ben is requesting for the committee to give approval of the CUP pending the signature of the landowner signing the CUP when he returns from the South.

Committee Discussion: Robert Keeney mentioned that the Findings of Fact stated that the CUP expired on August 1, 2024. So, the 5-year renewal is from when? Keith stated that this CUP will be from the date of expiration.

Chairman Mumm closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Adam Day to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit that will expire August 1, 2029, with the condition of the signature of Mr. Voss. seconded by Gary Northouse.
Motion carried. See Attachment A Worksheet.

Variance Requirement for Non-Conforming Parcels – Jordan Fritche

Adam Reed gave a brief background of information regarding this parcel for Jordan Fritche. Jordan contacted the CSZD around a month ago looking for a zoning permit to put up a 20' x 22' detached garage on his parcel. He is currently zoned in an A2 zoning district. The lot is non-conforming, the county put him in the A2 zoning district back in the 70's. The A2 has a minimum of a 1-acre requirement, and currently he sits at 0.72 acres. Also, they have a minimum requirement of 200'. As shown on the map there is 127'. He is in a country setting. In order to issue the zoning permit. Jordan is looking at a rezone to R3 or apply for a variance. He does not want to rezone to the R3 zoning district as he is in a rural setting. Down the road he would like to add a backyard chicken coop. Adam asked who is liable for the payment to rezone? The landowner stated that he doesn't feel that he should be responsible for the rezone fee or the variance fee. Jordan has a down payment on a garage and would like to improve his property. He is hoping that the requirements for A2 will change in the future. Jordan mentioned that he could rezone to R3 for \$400.00 then once the CSZD changes the description for A2 in the near future then rezone back to A2 at a cost of \$400.00. The cost would be the same as a variance of \$800.00. Jordan asked if he would pay for the rezone fee to R3 and once the new A2 description has been changed would the \$400.00 rezone fee to come into the A2 zoning district be waived? Consensus of the committee was "No" the rezone fee would not be waived.

Discuss the Order for Correction of a New Shed – Gary Schmidt

Gary Schmidt received an Order for Correction because he failed to get a zoning permit for a shed. He didn't know that he needed a permit. He thought that someone should have contacted him to let him know that he needed a zoning permit. Violation was reported on 3-5-2025. The construction of the shed was started on 3-7-2025. The concrete walls were poured on 3-5-2025. Gary stated that after the fire he put up the same size building. Roy Quick done the concrete work. Gary stated that the township should have contacted him to let him know that he needed a permit. Gary doesn't feel that he should have to pay the \$500.00 after-the-fact permit fee. The \$500.00 after-the-fact fee will stay at the \$500.00 fee.

Discussion of Raising Citation Dollar Cap

Keith stated that this is for mostly the repeat offenders. As of now we are capped as \$1,000.00. We have already mailed out citations to 19 repeat offenders, the most Keith could issue is \$1,000.00 per citation. Keith would like the cap raised to \$2,000.00. The \$1,000.00 doesn't even come close to the time, money and effort that it takes to enforce these citations. This citation level for the \$2,000.00 will apply for the 3rd 4th, 5th, 6th citation level. Otherwise, the citation starts at \$250.00 then raises \$250.00 each increment. The county may get 20% through the judicial system. Motion by Gary Northouse to raise the citation cap to \$2,000.00, seconded by Adam Day to approve the citation cap increase. Motion carried.

Final Vote on 225-8-225-22 Amendment – POWTS Emergency Repair Permit

Keith mentioned that we did not have a POWTS Emergency repair permit fee listed. Motion by Adam Day, seconded by Pat Schroeder to approve the \$100.00 POWTS Emergency repair permit fee. Motion carried.

Final Vote on 315-3.05 Amendment – FP Acreage Requirement

Keith mentioned that this is for the FP acreage requirement of setting the acreage at 3.0 acres. Nick Lange thought that this FP acreage requirement should have been sent out to the townships for their input. Motion by Pat Schroder, seconded by Gary Northouse to approve the FP acreage to be set at 3.0 acres. Motion carried.

Discussion of Greenhouse Definitions for Farm vs. Business Applications

Keith reported that we are getting a lot of greenhouses being put up in the middle of fields. We do not have a definition of what constitutes a green house. Individuals will be putting up wind tunnels which are 3-4' tall

hoop with plastic running down the hoop. These are just temporary. Lucas stated that per our local ordinance – the definition of a structure is anything that is constructed used temporary or permanent having a roof or other covering and designed or used for the shelter or enclosure of any person, animal, machinery material or property of any kind. Keith would like to establish a minimum size for greenhouses. Will bring this to the June meeting to review suggestions for size of structure.

Approval of Small Solar Ordinance Development

Keith pulled together the small solar ordinance from Columbia County. He cut out all the pieces that did not pertain to us. They had a much more involved zoning ordinance. The small solar ordinance is a much more involved ordinance than the large solar ordinance. What we would be looking at in the large solar ordinance would already be addressed by the PSC (power supplier controller). If you would approve the small solar ordinance Keith would get this to Ben Wood, corporation counsel, to put it in ordinance form. We then can get it back and put it out for public review. Adam Day read it over and the only thing that we are going to put somewhere in here is that anything existing does not have to meet the requirements. Keith stated that the issue is already known by the PSC and we don't need that as part of our ordinance. The PSC will supersede the county solar ordinance. Motion by Adam Day, seconded by Pat Schroder to approve the small solar ordinance and to move it forward. Motion carried.

Approval of Large Solar Ordinance Development

Keith reported that the Large Solar Ordinance will be sent to the committee members via email after the meeting. The large solar ordinance is in the same format as the small solar ordinance. Motion by Pat Schroeder, seconded by Adam Day to also pass the large solar ordinance on to Ben Wood. Motion carried.

Cost Sharing: Beginning Balance \$24,171.00/Ending Balance \$22,291.00

Brady presented tentative approval request for county cost sharing for a well decommissioning for Mitchell & Kay Iverson, Platteville Twp., \$880.00 & Aaron & Kim Maag, Marion Twp. \$1,000.00. Motion by Gary Northouse, seconded by Adam Day to approve the Iverson and Maag well decommissioning requests. Motion carried.

2025 DATCP Cost Sharing Requests: Beginning Balance \$59,842.61/Ending Balance \$55,819.01

Brady presented tentative approval request for 2025 DATCP cost sharing for grassed waterways for Patrick Yelinek, Clifton Twp., \$4,023.60. Motion by Adam Day, seconded by Pat Schroeder to approve Yelinek's request. Motion carried.

There was a 2024 DATCP contract that had deferred money to 2025, the landowner has now backed out of the contract due to the feasibility of the project. These funds were already set aside for them. These funds that were deferred can only be used on a 2024 existing contract. Steve & Karen Wiencek, who were previously approved, for 2024 DATCP funds did not meet the 70% cost share rate so Brady moved some of those funds to the Wiencek project. This project exceeded \$13,500.00. Any cost sharing that exceeds \$13,500.00 needs to be recorded on their deed.

Brady presented a culvert crossing for Nick Leibfried. This is a very large-scale project. Their culvert crossing is currently failing. Brady is asking the committee for additional funding for this project. Currently they will be receiving 24% cost sharing. Brady does not have any other projects on the books as of now for spending the DATCP cost sharing. Brady will offer Nick Leibfried an additional \$7,000.00 to see if he is still interested in completing the culvert crossing. This would be giving him \$20,500.00 in DATCP Cost sharing.

FPP Report – Brady Bartels

Brady reported that Steve Smith has been working on getting everyone's certificate of compliance updated.

Storage Permit Approval – Brady Bartels

Brady stated that there is going to be 1 manure structure construction will be starting soon

To Review Section 3.02 Site Requirements: How Many Parcels Should be Created Off Single Access Easement

Keith reported that we discussed this a couple of months ago, regarding the site requirements of a recorded access off of a private road, no more than 4 single family dwellings could be developed. We will be having the official vote on this at the June CSZD committee meeting. Lucas read the ordinance: If the recorded access is a private road, it shall serve no more than four (4) single family dwellings. If a recorded access is a private road and already serves four (4) single family dwellings, no zoning permits shall be granted for construction of an additional single-family dwelling or dwellings until the private road has been converted to a public road pursuant to procedures set forth in the Wisconsin Statutes. A private road shall not serve a multiple family dwelling or dwellings or 5 commercial or industrial structures. All lots or parcels on which a multiple family dwelling, commercial structure, or industrial structure is built or is to be built shall abut upon a public road, street or highway and shall have a frontage of not less than forty (40) feet. Keith would like committee members to work with him to revamp the comprehensive zoning ordinance.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 5, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in the County Board room.

Motion by Gary Northouse, seconded by Adam Day to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted by Annette Lolwing for Mark Vosberg

BEFORE GRANT COUNTY
CONSERVATION, SANITATION AND ZONING DEPARTMENT

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
FOR Michael Voss
5618 W Airport Rd, South Lancaster TOWNSHIP, GRANT COUNTY, WI

FINDINGS OF FACT

The agency finds that:

1. Michael Voss owns property located within the SW ¼ of the SW ¼, of Section 26, Township 4 North, Range 3 West, South Lancaster Township, Grant County, WI. Such property consists of tax parcel number PIN:056-00591-0000.
2. On October 21st, 2024, the CSZD office spoke to Bard Materials about the active CUP expiring on 8/1/24.
3. On March 12th, 2025, the South Lancaster Township Town Board approved the request for the conditional use permit, 3 voting in-favor, 0 opposed. There were no conditions placed on the permit by the Town Board.
4. On March 14th, 2025, the CSZD office received the completed application.
5. On May 1st, 2025, the CSZC reviewed the CUP request through a public hearing and determined the findings of fact to **approve** or **deny** the CUP application.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION

1. The CSZC (hereinafter referred to as the agency) has the authority pursuant to the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Ch. 315 Subsection 3.27 (5) to issue or deny conditional use permits. Prior to granting or denying a conditional use, the agency shall make a findings of fact based on evidence presented, issue a determination whether the standards of the ordinance are met, and require additional conditions, as needed. Based upon the above findings and information provided at the public hearing, the CSZD finds that the conditional use **does** or **does not** meet the following criteria:

2. The agency under Ch. 315 Subsection 3.27 (5) (c) shall consider the following criteria:

- (1) That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare;
- (2) That 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 diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood;
- (3) That the establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district;
- (4) That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided;
- (5) That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets;
- (6) That adequate prevention and control of water pollution including sedimentation are being provided;
- (7) That adequate measures will be taken to sustain existing topographic and drainage features and vegetation cover on the site;
- (8) That adequate location of the site with respect to flood plains and floodways of bodies of water;
- (9) That adequate consideration of erosion potential of the site based upon degree and direction of slope, soil type and vegetation cover;
- (10) That location factors are considered which address:
 - (a) Domestic uses shall be generally preferred;
 - (b) Uses not inherently a source of pollution within an area shall be preferred over uses that are or may be a pollution source; and
 - (c) Use locations within an area tending to minimize the possibility of pollution shall be preferred over use locations tending to increase the possibility.
- (11) That the conditional use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Conservation, Sanitation & Zoning Committee; and
- (12) In the case of nonmetallic mining, the Conservation, Sanitation, & Zoning Committee shall also consider any reclamation plan submitted for the property and the reclamation plan's provisions for maintaining lateral support and for depth of the quarry pursuant to the standards set forth in Wisconsin Administration code Chapter NR 136.