

there is a Commercial and Agricultural Zoning Districts encompasses the proposed 11.13 acres site. The commercial district is located along the south side of US Highway 2.

Snyder stated that the applicant noted that starting on a new site they have ample acreage to comply with County setbacks and provide safer traffic passage in/out of the proposed facility. The applicant stated that the proposed facility will meet all Minnesota Dept. of Ag guidelines and standards regarding containment, and permit requirements. Also, noted the applicant stated that in 20 plus years CVC has existed in harmony with surrounding land uses and has never required emergency services to be called out to the site. They often receive compliments by vendors and insurance agents of the cleanliness and safety compliance of the existing facility.

Snyder said that per the Crookston Fire Department guidance, they will be planning to furnish a fire hydrant outside of the new facility for fire safety concerns. The proposed site can be tied into the City of Crookston municipal water supply system. No emergency plan has been established to date but the county emergency manager along with the Crookston Fire Department have met regarding the plan. Meetings with the City, County and CVC began in early October. The City was noticed on both of these hearings and no other comments were received.

Snyder stated that there are over 100 homes located within 1 mile of this proposed facility and 1 small church. The applicant noted on their application that the proposal is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance as it will meet all Department of Ag standards and safety practices. The variance is also consistent with the comp plan as it replaces an existing facility located within the City of Crookston and moves this operation further from the majority of homes located within Crookston.

Snyder said the applicant noted that the proposal puts the property to a reasonable use as the site will make things safer for traffic. Also noted on the variance application was that the current facility is located on a triangular lot that would push this building closer to the county road and would not fit within the existing city parcel. If approved the site will fit the character of the locality as there is a commercial building to the north also operated by CVC. To tear down the existing facility and build on the existing city parcel would not allow for safe traffic flow and encroach further onto the County Road hence the need for this variance. If approved the applicant will need to obtain a CUP for construction of the facility.

Snyder said that the only comment received was from Rich Sanders, County Highway Engineer, that commented that Polk County Highway department's only concern was the addition of another approach to the south but after conversations with Mr. Spivey they have no concern with the proposed site layout.

Snyder then went over slides showing the application, letter from CVC (which was read to the group), maps showing the zoning districts and homes within a 1-mile radius, sketch and certificate of survey showing building location/plans, drawings of the proposed building, photos of the site and surrounding area. On the certificate of survey, it shows a parcel A

and B – Snyder asked Spivey what the plans were. Spivey said the plan is to build on parcel A and B would be just us securing this piece of land to make sure they have enough for any future development as they would need to have all access off Co Rd 214 and not off highway 2. Spivey also explained some of the building drawings as to how they would operate. No outside scale is being planned as all the product is weighted before loading.

Snyder then stated that staff feels that the applicant has satisfied the practical difficulty criteria. The request is reasonable as it moves the existing fertilizer operation further from the majority of homes 1 mile from the proposed facility. There seems to be circumstances unique to the existing fertilizer storage site including irregular lot size and lack of room for construction within the city limits of Crookston. The request puts the property to a reasonable use, will fit in with surrounding nearby land uses and will be safer for traffic concerns off County Rd 214. Thus, staff recommends approval of the variance with the following conditions:

1. The variance will only be approved by CVC if able to obtain a CUP from the County Board of Commissioners.
2. That the use of the property shall at all times be in compliance with all Federal, State of Minnesota and County of Polk rules and regulations.

Snyder then asked if there were any more questions or comments? Spivey said that on the aerial photo and explained how the truck traffic will flow, which was Mr. Sanders concerns. We started this process about 4 years ago and now we finally have financing available. Everything is a dry fertilizer, nothing explosive. Baird said they hear that this is a top-notch facility and have never had any issues. Feels that this expansion is an asset to Crookston and the County. Gagner asked if any of this could be incorporated into the City? Spivey said he cannot answer that. Snyder said that the City has been involved in this process and they have not commented and the correct time to comment would be before this hearing. Spivey said the existing ton operates at about 60 ton per hour, where the new facility will run at 250 ton/hour and will cost us about 6.5 million to build.

Baird asked if they are on city water? Spivey the facility to the north is on city water with a private hydrant that they pay for, so the existing building has city water. Insurance and the city require a hydrant within 1000 feet and right now we believe we are within 600 of two hydrants.

Powers then closed the meeting for public testimony.

With no other questions or comments from the Board, Snyder asked the Board the variance Questions.

| Question | Jore | Gagner | Franks | Wright | Powers |
|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 4. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 5. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 6. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | yes |

Snyder stated with 30 yes's and 0 no's, that the criteria to either grant or deny the variance has been met.

A motion was made by Gagner to approve the variance request with staff conditions. Second by Franks.

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Meeting adjourned.