

**LE SUEUR COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**88 SOUTH PARK AVENUE**  
**LE CENTER, MINNESOTA 56057**  
October 16, 2025

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Roche, Jeanne Doheny, Shirley Katzenmeyer, Tina King, and Commissioner Steve Rohlfig

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Pam Tietz, Doug Krenik, and Al Gehrke

**OTHERS PRESENT:** NONE

1. **Call to Order:** Chairperson Jeanne Doheny called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

2. **Agenda:** Additions/Corrections: NONE.  
Motion to approve the agenda was made by **SHIRLEY KATZENMEYER**.  
Second by **TINA KING**.  
**MOTION APPROVED. MOTION CARRIED.**

3. **Minutes:** **September 18, 2025**, Meeting, Additions/Corrections: NONE  
Motion to approve the minutes was made by **TINA KING**.  
Second by **MIKE ROCHE**.  
**MOTION APPROVED. MOTION CARRIED.**

4. **Applications:**

**ITEM #1: GOODRICH CONSTRUCTION, MANKATO, MN (APPLICANT); MATT & LISA MOZINGO, MADISON LAKE, MN (OWNER):**

Request that the County grant an Interim Use Permit to allow grading, excavating, and filling of 1 cubic yard in the bluff for the installation of Helical Piers for stabilization of an existing porch in a Recreational Residential "RR" Shoreland District of Lake Jefferson, a Recreational Development "RD" Lake. The subject property is Lots 2 and 3 of Biehn's Subdivision, Section 4, Washington Township.

Trevor Rudenick presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Trevor Rudenick was present for the applicants.

INITIAL COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT:

Mr. Stubbs explained that he had spoken with the applicant, and they informed him they were a victim of an email scam where they believed their request had been approved. Therefore, they did not plan to attend tonight's meeting. The applicant asked if staff would be willing to appear as their representative and asked if the Planning Commission was able to speak with the applicant over the phone if they had technical questions staff were unable to answer. Mr. Stubbs agreed to this request and Mr. Rudenick would act as representative for this application.

#### INITIAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chairperson Doheny asked staff how the screened-in porch changing to an enclosed structure impacted the request. Mr. Stubbs explained that the original permit included a house and a screened-in porch. That made the screened-in porch a legal nonconforming structure which would have allowed it to be replaced without a permit but since it was converted to an enclosed porch, it was intensified and would now need a variance in order to be replaced.

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE: NONE

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

#### FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Member Katzenmeyer asked why it appears the number of piers are increasing from the four shown in the images to the six shown on the plan. Mr. Rudenick explained in addition to the porch, there was an unpermitted deck on the property that is being removed as a part of this request. To accommodate for the removal of the deck, the landowner needed to add a landing and stairs to make the elevated enclosed porch accessible from the ground. The Ordinance allows for stairs and a landing to be built within a Bluff. The two additional piers are to support the stairs.

Commissioner Rohlfing stated it would be a good idea to start incorporating training on these different types of stabilization projects so the Planning Commission members have a frame of reference when they are reviewing these types of requests.

Member King stated she appreciated the minimal impact to the sensitive area and believed this proposal was a good idea.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: NONE

#### REVIEW OF PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

Mr. Rudenick read each of the proposed conditions into the record.

#### FINDINGS:

1. *The Interim use would not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminishes and impairs property values within the immediate vicinity. (4-0 in support)*
  - *The applicant stabilizing their porch through a method which has minimal impact to the Bluff would have little to no impact on the use and enjoyment of neighboring parcels. It is unlikely the proposed use would be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity.*
2. *The establishment of the Interim use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for uses predominant in the area. (4-0 in support)*
  - *The proposed repair would have no impact on the future development or improvement of surrounding vacant property.*
3. *Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other facilities have been or are being provided. (4-0 in support)*
  - *There are no known drainage issues on this property, and the repair of the porch would not be likely to cause any future drainage issues.*

4. *Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide sufficient off-street parking and loading space to service the proposed use. (4-0 in support)*
  - *The residential property includes a 1700 square foot driveway and a 16x24 attached garage. Based on this information, there appears to be adequate parking to accommodate the needed space for vehicles and excavator necessary to complete the proposed project.*
5. *Adequate measures have been or will be taken to prevent and control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise and vibration, so that none of these constitute a nuisance, and to control lighted signs and other lights in such a manner that no disturbance to neighboring properties will result. (4-0 in support)*
  - *The applicant stated that an excavator would be used to drill in the piers. As long as the construction only occurs during normal working hours, it appears unlikely to create a nuisance to neighboring properties.*
  - *There would be no reason for this type of work to occur outside of normal working hours.*
6. *The Interim use is consistent with and supported by the statement of purposes, policies, goals and objectives in the Ordinance. (4-0 in support)*
  - *The proposed installation of helical piers is supported by the objectives of the Ordinance. The proposed repairs will cause minimal impact to the sensitive feature of the bluff, and the installation of helical piers will ensure the dwelling is stable as well. Failure of the structure could impact the bluff, so the stabilization would lessen the likelihood of any impact.*
7. *The Interim use is consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. (4-0 in support)*
  - *The land use plan lists the preservation of sensitive natural resources are one of its goals. The subject parcel was developed before bluffs and steep slopes were considered as a resource that needed protection. Although the purpose of the request is to improve the stability of the porch and deck, the secondary benefit of installing the piers may be added stability for the bluff.*

**Motion made by SHIRLEY KATZENMEYER to recommend Approval of the application with the conditions proposed in the staff report.**

**Second by TINA KING.**

**MOTION APPROVED (4-0). MOTION CARRIED.**

**ITEM #2: LE SUEUR COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT:**

Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to adopt standards and definitions for Cannabis-related businesses and the permissible zoning districts. The proposed amendments would affect Section 4 Definitions, Section 7 Conservancy District, Section 8 Agriculture District, Section 10 General Business District, Section 11 General Industry District, Section 13.2 Special Protection Shoreland District, Section 13.4 Recreational Commercial Shoreland District of the Le Sueur County Zoning Ordinance.

Aaron Stubbs presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Aaron Stubbs represented the County for this proposal.

**INITIAL COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT:**

Mr. Stubbs explained these definitions and changes to the listed uses in each zoning district were the same changes the Planning Commission reviewed in August; however, there was some confusion when the public notice was created that led to the creation of Section 28 and the performance standards within that Section being the only items included in the notice. Mr. Stubbs stated once staff identified the discrepancy, they only took Section 28 to the County Board for final review.

INITIAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chairperson Doheny had questions about some of the definitions and the selection of specific words within some of the definitions and whether some definitions could be consolidated. Staff said they would look into those definitions further and see if changes could be incorporated.

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE: NONE

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION: NONE

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: NONE

**Motion made by TINA KING to recommend Approval of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.**

**Second by MIKE ROCHE.**

**MOTION APPROVED (4-0). MOTION CARRIED.**

**ITEM #3: LE SUEUR COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT:**

Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to update the setbacks between an accessory structure and all other structures on a property by exempting grain bins, grain legs, and all components of a grain handling system from meeting the required internal setback to one another. The proposed amendments would affect Section 7 Conservancy District, Section 8 Agriculture District, Section 10 General Business District, Section 11 General Industry District, Section 13.2 Special Protection Shoreland District, Section 13.3 Recreational Residential Shoreland District, Section 13.4 Recreational Commercial Shoreland District of the Le Sueur County Zoning Ordinance.

Aaron Stubbs presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Aaron Stubbs represented the County for this proposal.

INITIAL COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT:

Mr. Stubbs listed and discussed a few examples of landowners that were required to pursue variances in order to meet this standard. He also explained how staff had recently issued a Notice of Violation to a landowner related to the setbacks between their Grain Bins. During that explanation Mr. Stubbs was asked about the purpose of the setback.

Mr. Stubbs stated the five-foot separation requirement is a requirement that came from MN State Building Code and is related to the prevention of fire spreading from one structure to another.

He also stated he and his staff have contacted members of the community who are involved in agricultural operations as well as members in the community involved in firefighting. None of the individuals that staff spoke with expressed a concern related to a fire within a Grain Bin.

INITIAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chairperson Doheny asked if the County ever decided to adopt and enforce MN State Building Code, would this decision have an impact by creating a series of nonconforming structures throughout the County. Mr. Stubbs explained agricultural structures are exempt from the standards in MN State Building Code. If the County ever decided to adopt and enforce the MN State Building Code, we would need to define those structures we believe fall under that category.

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE: NONE

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION: NONE

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: NONE

**Motion made by SHIRLEY KATZENMEYER to recommend Approval of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.**

**Second by TINA KING.**

**MOTION APPROVED (4-0). MOTION CARRIED.**

**5. P.C. Discussion Items:**

1. September Planning Commission Items
  - a. Retaining Walls request was approved with conditions as recommended by the P.C.
  - b. Floodproofing request was approved with conditions as recommended by the P.C.
2. Comp. Plan Update
  - a. Township Focus Group – 3p on October 30th @ 4H Building
  - b. Public Open House – 430-630p on October 30th @ 4H Building
3. Reminder about Alternate Meeting Dates used in the event of inclement weather for upcoming P.C. Meetings.
  - a. Alternate date is the Monday after the scheduled meeting:
    1. Nov. 24<sup>th</sup>
    2. Dec. 22<sup>nd</sup>
    3. Jan. 19<sup>th</sup>
    4. Feb. 23<sup>rd</sup>
    5. Mar. 23<sup>rd</sup>
4. November 20<sup>th</sup> P.C. Meeting
  - a. Deadline is October 21, 2025
    1. Private Cemetery

6. **Warrants/Claim-signatures:**

7. **Adjournment:**

Motion to adjourn meeting by **SHIRLEY KATZENMEYER.**

Second by **MIKE ROCHE.**

**MOTION APPROVED (4-0). MOTION CARRIED.**

The meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Jeanne Doheny at 8:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

**Aaron Stubbs**

*Recording of the meeting is on file in the  
Le Sueur County Environmental Services Office*

DRAFT