

PLANNING, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING

October 26, 2009
County Board Room – Administrative Center
6:00 p.m. 6:55 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob Keil, Dennis Manthei, Tina Wehrs, Marilyn Pedretti, Beverly Mach,
Donald Bina
MEMBERS EXCUSED: Don Meyer
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
OTHERS PRESENT: Jeff Bluske; Bryan Meyer; Mike Weibel (Recorder); Nathan Sampson;
Charlie Handy

CALL TO ORDER

The Recessed Meeting and Public Hearing of the Planning, Resources and Development Committee was called to order by Vice Chair, Marilyn Pedretti at 6:00 p.m. Let the record show that this meeting is called in full compliance with the requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

The procedures for tonight's meeting were explained to those gathered. This meeting is being recorded.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 803 Steven J & Rita A Simon, N6782 County Road M, Holmen, WI 54636. Petitions to operate a part-time silk screening business out of an existing detached garage, business to be known as 4S Simon Silk-Screening on 3.0 acres of land zoned Agriculture District "A" and described as: Lot 2 of Certified Survey Map No. 25 in Volume 8. Town of Onalaska.

Appearing in favor: Steven Simon, N6782 County Rd "M", Holmen, WI 54636.

Would like to start a small business out of my home at this address, actually live on 4.5 acres, 3.0 on one side of the creek and 1.5 acres on other side. A house and a 1-car garage located on the property. The garage would be used for the business, the garage is 14-ft X 20-ft, there is a shed behind it but that will be used for garden and lawn equipment. The business is being purchased from a business located in the City of Onalaska. I will be the third person to own the business in the last 24 years. The first owners ran the part-time business out of their home in Onalaska. The last owner is in the process of selling the business and retiring. The business equipment consists of a small 4 color manual silk screen machine, electric dryer and a light box. The product is clothing, that will be silk screened with a non-toxic paste. The business will have one employee, myself and occasional help from my daughter and son. There is no outside lighting or signage. Only thing I will have, business called 4-S Silk Screening, that will be added to my mail box. No walk-in business or hours of operation open to the public. Most sales will be delivered or taken to UPS to be sent. Business will be mainly through the internet and by phone. Will be deliveries to site by UPS during daylight hours about 3-4 per month. UPS already delivers out there due to our mail order medications. Everything is manual in the process of silk screening, no outside noise. The paste used in the silk screening process is non-toxic which limits any health issues. I have letters I have submitted from both neighbors that live on the same road that I do, the Klins and the Xiong's. We've had a lot of discussions about this and they have to problems with me starting this business.

QUESTION Bluske: Steve, you talked about the non-toxic paste the silk screen machine itself probably has to be cleaned, what do you use for that?

ANSWER Simon: What it is, the screen is basically 12-inches X 24-inches and from what the owner has showed me, he takes a rag, does have a solvent and cleans off that silk screen and so he has that rag that is probably 4-inches X 4-inches, he uses 2 of them and that's the extent of cleaning off the silk screen. He puts that into a plastic bag and throws it away.

OPPOSED: None

Correspondence: None

QUESTION Bluske: Have you attended a Town Meeting yet?

ANSWER Simon: Actually attended at the Town Hall twice – First, on the 26th for the Zoning & Conditional Use Permit. But they only had one motion go through so ended up coming back on this last Monday and it was approved to go forward to the board.

QUESTION Pedretti: It was approved at the Plan Commission?

ANSWER Simon: Yes

QUESTION Pedretti: The full board meets tomorrow night?

ANSWER Simon: That's correct.

Department Recommends: Approve subject to 8 conditions:

1. This permit is granted to operate a part-time silk screening business out of an existing detached garage; no other buildings can be used.
2. Family members will be the only employees.
3. No signage allowed. Small lettering can be attached to the mailbox.
4. No outside storage of any kind.
5. Pick up and deliveries shall be made directly from the garage.
6. No paints or chemicals shall be dumped on the ground.
7. A commercial dumpster is required if more than 1 cu. ft. of waste is generated from the business.
8. This permit is non-transferable.

REMARKS Steve Simon: Amount of waste generated by this business is very small

REMARKS Dave Harter, W5726 Koss Rd, Onalaska, WI 54650. Plan Commission Member – Plan Commission placed a condition on the request that the business could only be operated out of the existing garage building.

QUESTION Pedretti: Town can add there own conditions or should we add this tonight?

ANSWER Bluske: Rather than waiting on this for another 30-days I think we should add this condition tonight.

QUESTION Pedretti: So, add a 9th condition

ANSWER Bluske: I think we could include this under number one, include town's condition no other buildings could be used.

REMARKS Handy: Could use a minimum of 1-cu. ft. per month to address concerns about volume of waste and dumpster requirement.

REMARKS Bluske: Ok, we can add that, if more than 1-cu. ft. of waste is generated.

Motion Bina/Manthei to approve with the 8 conditions as stated.

6 – Aye, 0 – No, 1 Excused (Meyer)

ZONING PETITION NO. 1825 Mark R Mattison & Michelle C Powell, W5835 County Road V, Holmen, WI 54636; acting in behalf of Steven L & Betty R Sacia, W5735 County Road V, Holmen, WI 54636. Petitions to rezone from the Exclusive Agriculture District to Agriculture District "A" for two parcels totaling 16.37 acres for two single family residences: Parcel A being the existing (original farm homestead) being part of the NW-SE of Section 15, T18N, R7W commencing at the S ¼ corner of Section 15; thence N10°08'06"E 1676.73' to the southeasterly right-of-way line of County Road "V" and the POB: thence along said southeasterly line, N44°38'02"E 374.39'; thence S45°21'58"E 236.00'; thence S44°37'58"W 364.61'; thence N47°44'24"W 236.21' to POB; AND, Parcel B with the existing barn and 14.37 acres described in tax parcel number 5-1521-5. All in the Town of Farmington.

Appearing in favor: Mark Mattison, W5835 County Road V, Holmen, WI 54636.

I purchased the house back in 2004 and wanted to refinance the house in December of 2008, once I got that done I got a letter from the Zoning Administrator saying I had two zoning violations. The first

violation stated that tax parcel 5-1521-5 is currently zoned Exclusive Agriculture District, this parcel was created by Warranty Deed in 2004. The parcel created does not meet the minimum lot size of 35 acres for a property zoned Exclusive Agriculture District in order to remedy the violation you must purchase additional acreage or rezone this parcel to a different zoning district. That parcel being 14.37 acres. My remedy for that would be to rezone it, I filed the rezone application and paid the fees to switch this from Exclusive to Ag "A". The second violation states that the La Crosse County Subdivision Ordinance requires those property splits of less than 5 acres be performed using a Certified Survey Map. In order to remedy this violation a Certified Survey Map will need to be filed with the La Crosse County Register of Deeds for this parcel. That would be the parcel the house is on right now. That was originally the 1.1 acre lot. To remedy this I hired Coulee Region Land Surveyors to create a Certified Map. Then what really complicated things here was, I met with the Town of Farmington in May of 2009 to discuss the requirements to sell the parcel that the house is on now, and then to build a new house on the other 14.37 acres. At that meeting they would approve that as long as the existing house was on 2.0 acres minimum. Then Coulee Region Land Surveyors also pointed out that the 2 acres had to be a minimum of 200-ft deep from a County Road. So, I guess that's a County rule. So, I met with the owners to the Southeast to purchase the additional .9 acres and then that would meet both requirements of being 2 acres plus 200-ft from the road. In conclusion, I think I've done everything to fix the violations along with being able to sell the existing house and being able to build another.

QUESTION Bina: Not sure if I followed you totally, when did you buy the small lot where you have the house now? How long ago?

ANSWER Mattison: As of right now I just got approval from Betty & Steve Sacia to purchase that land, they submitted an e-mail to the County saying they approved the purchase of that land to meet the 2 acre minimum.

QUESTION Bina: On the other side of the road, from where your house is? This piece here? (indicates on map)

ANSWER Mattison: Yes.

QUESTION Bina: Oh, I see, you're just moving into there now?

ANSWER Mattison: No, that's where the existing house is now, but to sell that property it has to be 2 acres, so eventually when I want to sell it that has to be 2 acres, then I want to build a house on the other side.

QUESTION Bina: They wouldn't give you any more land under the existing house then? To make the lot comply? On this side of the road? (indicates on map) They wouldn't sell you any land over there? I'm not quite following how you got...you moved out there and are living in this house now?

ANSWER Mattison: in 2004, correct

QUESTION Bina: But you want to build a new one over here? (indicates on map)

ANSWER Mattison: Correct.

QUESTION Bina: Ok, who was living in there prior to you getting there?

ANSWER Mattison: Steve & Betty Sacia lived there.

QUESTION Bina: That was the farm house?

ANSWER Mattison: Yes.

QUESTION Bina: Oh, I was wondering, did you purchase this here then? From them?

ANSWER Mattison: I got approval from them to purchase that land.

QUESTION Bina: But, you didn't pay for it yet? Ok, and now you find out the lot is too small and ok, I thought there was somebody living there prior to you moving out there, that wasn't the farmer, that's what I thought.

ANSWER Mattison: No, originally Steve & Betty owned the whole property, was like 200 some acres.

Bina: Then I don't have any problem with it.

QUESTION Bluske: Mark could you indicate on the aerial photo on the northwest side of the road, tell them what the lay of the land is, that 14 acres?

QUESTION Mattison: So, you just want a description of what that type of property?

QUESTION Bluske: Yes, we were out on the site last Wednesday, kind of hard to see the whole thing from the road though, and where you might plan on building a house?

ANSWER Mattison: As of right now I haven't even decided where I would want it, I just wanted to get approval; I didn't want to get my own hopes up of building something. But what I have is, right here is a field (indicates on map) I rent out to a farmer, and then there is a creek, South Creek comes in through the woods here, so it's all a valley goes down hill on both sides from the field that way (indicates on map) and also down hill over there (indicates on map) everything is pretty much woods here, here and there (on map) and then there is another small flat piece of land right here that was originally used for, I believe, beef cattle or grazing there many years ago. We have some structures, real nice old barn, right there (indicates on map) along with a pole shed and another out building.

QUESTION Bluske: Do you have a stream crossing or would you have to build a crossing?

ANSWER Mattison: I figured with DNR regulations, getting a bridge that was not going to even attempt putting a house on this side of the creek. I would do something on this side (indicates on map) and possibly use the driveway that exists right here to the barn or there is another driveway for a tractor access about right there (on map).

QUESTION Pedretti: The land looked pretty steep is that buildable?

ANSWER Mattison: Yes, everything probably from here is flat until you get to this woods right here (indicates on map) then it goes down to the creek probably only drops off 40-ft from the top to the creek bottom.

QUESTION Pedretti: What is that little part above that house in the Northeast corner, that little strip, is that for a right-of-way? Is that for an easement Jeff? Do you know?

ANSWER Bluske: That dent in the road there?

QUESTION Pedretti: No, further north up there?

ANSWER Mattison: Never could figure out why the land was the way it was but basically my land surrounds this person's house.

QUESTION Pedretti: Right, but is it big enough for access, is that what it is for?

ANSWER Mattison: No, the land there is on the side of a hill.

QUESTION Pedretti: So, you wouldn't be accessing it?

ANSWER Mattison: No.

REMARKS Bluske: It kind of looks like when that house was parceled off the intent might have been to go to the forty line but didn't quite make it.

QUESTION Bina: Wasn't there always a 75-ft setback from the road I always thought that's what we worked with for years and years?

ANSWER Bluske: The 75-ft setback is from the ordinary high of the creek, from a County Road or State Road it's 50-ft from the right-of-way.

QUESTION Bina: But you're saying to him he as to be back 200-ft? 200-ft is going to put him out in the creek somewhere?

ANSWER Bluske: Maybe Bryan (Meyer) could answer that, it comes from the Subdivision Ordinance.

ANSWER B. Meyer: The 200-ft is the required lot depth.

QUESTION Mach: I just wonder if you think there is room for a home?

ANSWER Bluske: We didn't analyze the site, we let them present that, if it's rezoned he would have to pick the site, what happens the well the septic everything that's pertinent to the single family usage is

going to get their spot first and then if there's anything left over you can build a house on that. So, first he's got to get an approved soil test, a well permit.

QUESTION Pedretti: But that's his responsibility if it gets approved?

ANSWER Bluske: His responsibility, yes.

OPPOSED: None

Correspondence: Do have correspondence from Town of Farmington, came in two different parts: First part came May 11 before the application was even made, came from Betty Sacia – at the May Meeting (2009) of the Farmington Town Board the following rezoning issues were reviewed. Mark Mattison – approved rezone of 17 acres from Exclusive Ag to Agriculture District "A". He also proposed the sale of the farmhouse with 1.1 acres surrounding it; the board stated that he would have to have a full 2 acres with the home in order to sell it. So that is a Town requirement to have the 2 acres. So once the application was made on August 28, 2009 in October Mark attended another meeting and this is the reply from the Clerk at that time; from an e-mail dated October 8, 2009 at the October meeting of the Farmington Town Board the following Zoning decision was made – Mark Mattison approval for the rezoning from Exclusive Ag to Ag "A" for 1.1 acres owned by Mark Mattison located at W8535 Highway "V" and the additional property owned by Steve and Betty Sacia necessary to make a 2 acre parcel, the property to also fulfill the County Ordinance to be at least 200-ft deep from the County Road to which it is adjacent.

Department Recommends: The residence could be sold as is the existing home was allowed but an additional residence would be inconsistent with the County's Plan so we recommend denial.

This application for rezoning is not consistent with the future land use classification adopted in the Future Land Use Map of the La Crosse County Comprehensive Plan. The Land use Classification is: Agricultural and Rural. The purpose of this district is to preserve agricultural land for food and fiber production; protect productive farming by preventing conflicts between incompatible uses; maintain a viable agricultural base to support agricultural processing and service industries; reduce costs of providing services to scattered non-farm uses.

QUESTION Bina: Did he actually buy the farmhouse on the land or didn't he?

ANSWER Bluske: Yes, he did. That came with the original 14.37 acres. So, he bought the 14 acres on the Northwest side and he bought the 1.1 acres.

QUESTION Bina: So, he wouldn't need the 1.1 acres at all if he wasn't going to live in the house? If he's going to build a house on the other side of the road your allowing the sale of that house but then who ever goes in there will have the same problem he had because the lot isn't big enough, so, nobody is going to be allowed to live in that house in the first place, according to the rules of the County now.

ANSWER Bluske: That's right.

REMARKS Bina: So therefore if he could renege on that house and tell them he don't need the house and just go on the other side it would be almost the same scenario as what you said but he wouldn't need the house and whatever money went into those buildings there.

Wehrs: But he's lived in that house since 2004.

QUESTION Bina: Well, he'll never be able to sell it unless he has more land and he'd have to donate land from across the road and I don't think that would be a contiguous lot?

ANSWER Bluske: No, it has to be on the same side.

Bina: Then he will have to buy more land from Sacia to sell the house.

Manthei: That's what this .9 acres on the map is all about.

Bina: Oh, that gives him the 2 acres he needs ok, now I got you.

Bluske: He's here now to rezone all of it.

Bina: Ok, I wasn't following that part now I've got it cleared up.

Pedretti: The gist of the problem is it shouldn't of been sold in this size of acreage because it's Exclusive Ag.

Bluske: If it would have been under 5 acres and the house we wouldn't be here.

QUESTION Pedretti: And if it had been over 35 acres it would have been fine but because it's in between

ANSWER Bluske: Yes.

REMARKS Handy: He also could remedy this by asking for Conditional Zoning for the existing house and nothing else which wouldn't be changing the land use and as you'll see the staff recommendation on that would be similar to what we'll be doing with the Hagel property, but he's asking for an additional house which makes a change in the land use which then puts it in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.

QUESTION Pedretti: So, the committee could do a Conditional with no additional houses on it or a Conditional with only one additional house on it?

ANSWER Bluske: That's correct.

QUESTION Bina: Has the applicant signed an agreement on that 14.37 acres?

ANSWER Pedretti: He already owns it, he bought it in 2004.

Bina: I didn't go on the tour the other day so I didn't get the whole explanation so I'm just getting caught up with you.

QUESTION Wehrs: I also was not on the tour so on the southeast part of the creek is that being farmed right now, anything being produced off that land right now?

ANSWER Bluske: We didn't see anything. Listed there on the application at the front on the bottom we always indicate, when something is coming out of Exclusive, what the current acreage is being used for. So, out of all the acreage there 30% is being farmed right now and Mark had indicated that north and west of the creek was being farmed. The .9 acre to be added to the 1.1 acre had corn on it, everything else is pretty much idle.

QUESTION Wehrs: Is there any way to do this where we say you can build on what's not being farmed? On the 70% that's idle, below the creek, building on the farmland is not good but if he built in the woods where nothing is happening?

ANSWER Bluske: Well, it kind of appeared that...

REMARKS Handy: The appropriate process would be to amend the Comprehensive Plan first then request the rezoning.

Bluske reviews possible home sites on the aerial photo on lands lying north of the County Road.

Manthei: To move this off center I'm going to **MOTION to approve the request. Second by Wehrs –**

QUESTION Pedretti: With any conditions?

Bina: It would appear to me the only farmland he has in the upper left hand corner – (Northwest) if that were not disturbed even though it's rezoned he would probably rent that out anyway. That one piece on the other side is so small, as one petitioner said you can't even turn your combine around on it, I guess I don't have any problem even though this is Exclusive Ag as long as he doesn't disturb the farmland part of it, I don't have that big of a problem if he can find a buildable site and I'm not sure if he can or not. If he can I don't have any problem with the motion now if he can't then he's up the creek for some expenses he didn't expect.

QUESTION Manthei: So, if the motion passes he still needs to abide by everything that comes through the County for the other regulations?

QUESTION Pedretti: But could he build more than one house?

ANSWER Bluske: Yes, once you get Ag "A", 20,000 sq ft. is the smallest lot you can go.

Bina: Unless we put an inclusion in the list you add that the farmland he has on his property can't be built on unless it goes back to Exclusive Ag.

Pedretti: Or a condition for one additional house that's what 'm getting at.

Bina: That would be simpler, yes.

QUESTION Pedretti: Can that be a friendly amendment Mr. Manthei – one additional house?

ANSWER Manthei: I'm ok with that

QUESTION Pedretti: Ms. Wehrs?

ANSWER Wehrs: Ok.

Vote on motion as amended -

5 – Aye, 1 – No (Mach), 1 Excused (Meyer)

ZONING PETITION NO. 1827 James M Hagel, W6101 County Road D, Holmen, WI 54636. Petitions to rezone from the Exclusive Agriculture District to Agriculture District 'A'; a 5.53 acre parcel for refinancing purposes for continued residential use on lands described as: Part of the NE-NE of Section 9, T17N, R7W described in tax parcel 10-150-1. Town of Onalaska.

Appearing in favor: James Hagel, W6106 County Road D, Holmen, WI 54636.

The only purpose for this rezoning is I'm trying to refinance this to get my ex-wife's name off the ownership title for this land and the only way to do it is by refinancing. The banks are pushing the issue they want this setup so if they would foreclose or whatever the land will be resalable and they are saying that right now it's not.

Correspondence: None.

QUESTION Bluske: No correspondence from Town of Onalaska?

ANSWER Hagel: I was there last week I'll be there tomorrow night.

QUESTION Pedretti: You were at the Planning Commission?

ANSWER Hagel: Yes.

Department Recommends: Conditional Approval to Agricultural District "A" with a deed restriction being recorded indicating no further subdividing of this parcel.

Motion Bina/Keil to approve.

6 – Aye, 0 – No, 1 Excused (Meyer)

ZONING PETITION NO. 1828 David J & Julie Harter, W5726 Koss Rd, Onalaska, WI 54650. Petitions to rezone from the Transitional Agriculture District to Agriculture District "A", 17.41 acres for several single family residential home sites off Koss Road, on land described as: Part of the E 1/2 –NW of Section 26, T17N, R7W described in tax parcel 10-695-1 & part of the SW-NW & NW-SW being a 35-ft wide parcel described as: Commencing at the Southeast corner of the SW-NW of Section 26, T17N, R7W: thence Northerly, 38' more or less, along the East line of the SW-NW to the Northwesterly line of a parcel of land described in Document No. 1421240 and the POB; thence S38°29'30"W 161', more or less, along the Northwesterly line of the parcel described in Document NO. 1421240, to the centerline of Koss Rd; thence Southwesterly, 84', more or less, along said centerline; thence N38°29'30"E 281', more or less, along a line parallel to, and 35' Northwesterly of the Northwesterly line of the parcel described in Document No. 1421240 to the East line of the SW-NW; thence Southerly 56', more or less, along said East line, to the POB. Town of Onalaska.

Appearing in favor: Dave Harter, W5726 Koss Rd, Onalaska, WI 54650.

I had a neighbor approach me who wanted to continue to live in the valley but wanted a new home, and asked about purchasing this property. That's why we're here today. He was looking at anything from 12 to 17 acres so we wanted to rezone the whole area in case he takes the 17, subsequently we've had another person put in a written offer for the full 17 so we're going to have to work that out, the reason to rezone the 17 acres is to accommodate a neighbor who wants to stay in the valley.

QUESTION Pedretti: Now in the front (of the petition) it says for several single family residential?

ANSWER Harter: That was wrong it's limited to two and only two because of if they only took 12 acres there could be a 5 acre parcel that we would look at developing at some other time, but it's beginning to look like it will be 17 but we wanted to put in for two only in case that was the scenario he only took 12. Also that way we can divide this any way we want, we are still in discussion regarding the location of the

property lines and there wasn't a definite location to the west for division and it really can't be until we figure out how many acres he's actually going to take. So that line to the left (indicates on map) could be at an angle it could go back evenly so by rezoning the entire 17 acres we can move that any way we want once we get down to what will be the final shape of the lot. Now one thing to mention is the Temte's who live there (indicates on map) have a first right of refusal and that plays into the negotiations since they would just as soon not see a house in this area, would be quite close to them. We are actually talking about building here (indicates on map) with the first person, the second person that put in an offer was looking more in this area and he is out of town on business so we will discuss it more with him, we are going to accommodate the Temte's so it won't be a bother to them. The 17 acres is the maximum we would it go, we've got 52 acres in the farm and we want to maintain that 35 acres. My wife Julie is here, she's really the one that uses the farm, she has horses and we have to maintain enough acreage for the horses also.

QUESTION Mach: How much of an incline does that land have?

ANSWER Harter: It's, if you get into the woods up near the top here (indicates on map) it could be over 30% but the fields are less than 30%.

QUESTION Mach: Also the road that leads, you have a little way to get down in there, do you have a culvert or is there water that flows quite a bit?

ANSWER Harter: There is a culvert and water flow through here (indicates on map) that goes down and then right in front of their house, Temte's house, crosses their driveway, the property line here and then goes down through here so we would have to actually extend the culvert that they already have under their driveway. The new driveway would run parallel to Temte's.

Pedretti: Just for the record on the tour we were looking at the wrong spot.

Bluske: We were looking at; let's call it Julie's horse fence not along Temte's line.

Pedretti: Just so you get it in your mind that it is a little different from where we were parked.

Mach: Oh, ok.

Bluske reviews contour map of area to be rezoned. Areas of 30% slope, areas of less than 30% slopes.

Discussion by committee and Bluske and Harter regarding slopes.

Harter states area has been pasture for 21 years and can drive area with a vehicle.

REMARKS Handy: If you can get a crop of hay off it, rule of thumb it is probably less than 30% slope.

Harter indicates that the 2 home sites proposed are both on the least steep areas of the parcel. Buyer aware of what can and can't be built on.

OPPOSED: None

Correspondence: Town of Onalaska will meet tomorrow.

Department Recommends: Approve as Conditional Zoning for 2 additional homes.

This application for rezoning is consistent with future land use classification adopted in the Future Land Use Map of the La Crosse County Comprehensive Plan. The Land use Classification is: Residential.

Motion Manthei/Keil to approve.

6 – Aye, 0 – No, 1 Excused (Meyer)

TERMINATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 184 – TERMINATION NO. 51 La Crosse County Zoning, Planning & Land Information Department, 400 4th St N – RM 3170, La Crosse, WI. Petitions to terminate Conditional Use Permit No. 184 filed by Gary & Rayna Wortman, W4895 County Road Q, Holmen, WI 54636 and passed by the County Board on November 30, 1989 to repair and sell classic automobiles and automobile parts. Reason for terminating – the repair and sale of vehicles has not occurred in at least 10 years. Town of Farmington.

Voluntary letter of termination on file

Department Recommends: Terminate Conditional Use Permit No. 184

Motion Keil/Manthei to terminate Conditional Use Permit No. 184

6 – Aye, 0 – No, 1 Excused (Meyer)

TERMINATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 355 – TERMINATION NO. 52 La

Crosse County Zoning, Planning & Land Information Department, 400 4th St N – RM 3170, La Crosse, WI. Petitions to terminate Conditional Use Permit No. 355 filed by Dennis J. Waller, W3865 Pump House Rd, Mindoro, WI 54644 and passed by the County Board on March 21, 1996 to operate a fire arms business out of an existing residence on land zoned Residential District "A". Reason for terminating – the firearms business has not operated for a period in excess of 12 consecutive months. Town of Farmington.

Conditional use has been discontinued for a period of 12 consecutive months. Owner of the property is now Union State Bank of West Salem

Motion Mach/Manthei to terminate Conditional Use Permit No. 355

6 – Aye, 0 – No, 1 Excused (Meyer)

Motion Manthei/Keil to adjourn

6 – Aye, 0 – No, 1 Excused (Meyer)

Meeting is adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

Approved November 30, 2009

Mike Weibel, Recorder