

**MINUTES**  
**Bayfield County Planning / Zoning Committee Public Hearing / Meeting**  
**August 17, 2006**  
**Board Room, County Courthouse, Washburn, WI 54891**

1. **CALL TO ORDER OF PUBLIC HEARING:** *By Chairman Beeksma at 1:03 PM.*

2. **ROLL CALL:** *Beeksma, Jardine, Maki, Miller, Rondeau, all present.*

3. **AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION:** *Read by ZA Kastroosky*

4. **REVIEW OF MEETING FORMAT:** *By Chairman Beeksma*

5. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

**A. DONALD W. HAMIL REZONE REQUEST - from R-3 to R-1:** on 9+-acre parcel (ID #004-1122-05), located in that part of Gov't Lot 3, Section 18, Township 44 North, Range 9 West, Town of Barnes.

*Donald Hamil stated there is an estimated acre or 1-½ acres which he wants rezoned to conform to the rest of his property. Director Kastroosky reviewed the subject parcel from a colored map and said in the 1970s when the Town took on zoning, areas 'back from the lake' were zoned R-3. Therefore two acres are in R-3, and the remaining in R-1, which he said is quite typical in Barnes. Kastroosky reviewed the file copy, stating that the Town tabled this request until accurate acreage is received and because of a potential easement issue and that correspondence was received from Christine Webb asking for denial. Another letter was received from Wm. Stewart and Harrington Harkness in opposition.*

*In answer to a question re easement on his property, Mr. Hamil presented an old survey map and stated there never was an actual recorded easement (there were two title searches); 'permissive use' was given in 1998 on the portion behind the Malmstrom's home. He stated he now wants to change the driveway.*

**Speaking in Support:** *none*

**Opposition** *as follows:*

*Diana Malmstrom, adjoining property owner, does not feel this is a good area for small lot development and that much adjoining property is wetland and in a floodplain, feels it will set a precedent. She also reported there is an unsolved boundary/easement dispute w/ them (re driveway), the amount to be rezoned is unclear and asked the Committee to not make a decision until the dispute is resolved in court.*

*Ms. Malmstrom identified the area of the boundary dispute on a map and stated the dispute has been ongoing within the last year (since an offer was accepted on the Hamil property from a 'foreign corporation'). She also reported the potential buyers have made numerous threats to them, (i.e. an iron gate would be put across the driveway, phone calls have been received from them, including at their work places). Malmstrom said both parties have attorneys involved, this issue is not settled, there are plans to build five 'places' next to them and they would no longer be able to use their driveway. **Kastroosky** said that five places would require the Zoning Committee's approval of a lot division. Mrs. Malmstrom said if this is rezoned, they would be allowed to have a house very close to them and that wetlands would be disturbed.*

*Lee Wiesner (Vice Chair Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Barnes) said there was a reason the properties were zoned as they are. Certain lots were zoned R-1 close to the lake and R-2 and R-3 away from the lake to protect the watershed within 1000' of the lake. They are concerned that this will set a precedence and in addition he said their land use plan is still not complete. Wiesner stated the Planning Commission also rejected this request.*

*Supervisor Jardine said he is concerned about 'things like this getting caught in the middle until the land use plan is done'.*

***Barbara Harkness:** (did not sign in – unsure whether this is the correct name) Stated a letter which was sent by her brother (Wm. Stewart III) had not been read (Chairman Beeksma said the letter was on file and would be read). She said she is opposed; she doesn't believe rezone would improve the area and stewardship of the land; requested this be tabled until the dispute is settled and more time is spent looking at how this would improve the situation.*

Chairman Beeksma read a letter of opposition by Wm. Stewart III.

**B. JAMES PETERSON SONS, INC, OWNER AND RALPH FROSTMAN, AGENT - EXPANSION REQUEST to Conditional Use Permit (#03-0483)** (for gravel pit #55-007-00000-0141 to allow crushing) on 40-acre parcel (ID# 024-1054-09), described as the SE ¼ of the SE ¼, Section 20, Township 47 N, Range 8 West, Town of Iron River.

**Ralph Frostman:** asked Director Kastrosky why they have to do this over again and why they had to identify what equipment was at the pit. Kastrosky stated discussion of on-site crushing came about due to concern from some citizens. Upon review of the file it was determined the Zoning Department letter stated crushing was an approved part of the conditional use permit [#03-0483], however when the request was originally published, 'crushing' was not listed as part of the request. Therefore, the public was not properly notified even though it was in the letter, on the application and on the permit. The recommendation from Corp Counsel is that because we were on record to allow crushing, that is stand we should take, but in order to give the proper public process, this public hearing is the way to proceed. Kastrosky added that the property has now sold and they [owners] were concerned what options they may have; in addition no condition was placed on hours of operation, yet the Town has a standard.

**Frostman** said a year ago they crushed for three weeks in July and probably now won't be back until next spring. He said the Town ordinance sets hours, but they 'don't want to get tied down' due to the fact it varies -- one year crushing may be for three weeks and the next year only two. Frostman added this was a pit before this was applied for-- a reclaimed landfill, zoned Industrial, and there is Town Board approval without conditions. What he would like is five days per week from 6:30 AM until 5 PM, without commitment to three weeks per year because of the estimate of approximately only 12 weeks of crushing left total and 'the pit will be done'.

**Kastrosky** asked if they will haul materials in and Frostman stated they would have to add 5-10% rock to the material there so some hauling would be done. **Beeksma** said the calls he received from citizens concerned if hauling would be done & if so, how much. **Frostman** said, 'probably not more into this pit, but more into the nearby pit which is grandfathered'.

**Support:** / **Opposition:** None

**Kastrosky:** Town approval is on file as well as two letters of opposition from Pete Hexum and Bud Kaucnik concerned about homes near the project. **Frostman** stated he previously owned their land, the current owners purchased it from him and they knew about the gravel pits when they bought it.

**C. KUSKUS, LLC, BRUCE HOEKSTRA, OWNER AND WAYNE NELSON, AGENT CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST - 21-Unit Condominium Plat with a Multi-Unit Storage Building:** on 147-acre parcel (IDs 046-1029-09; 046-1030-02; 046-1030-04; & 046-1030-06), described as the NE ¼ of the SW ¼; the SE ¼ of the SW ¼, the SW ¼ of the SE ¼, and all that part of the NW ¼ of the SE ¼ lying South and West of State Hwy 13, all in Section 20, Township 51 N, Range 4 W, Town of Russell. **The EIA (Environmental Impact Analysis) will be addressed as a separate part of this public hearing.**

Director **Kastrosky:** presented an 18-unit map which he said was received 'today'.

**Wayne Nelson** presented background / history of the property stating he has worked w/ the Town Board for the past 11 months and they received the conceptual approval of 21 units, which was later rescinded. They revised it to reflect the current request of 18; it was approved; they are seeking preliminary approval 'at this meeting'.

**Al Simpson** (surveyor from Northern Environmental) presented maps and explained unit locations with the closest one 225' from Raspberry River. **L.U.S. Tulowitzky** asked Simpson why the Raspberry River was not shown on the first maps and he replied because they did not actually survey it or get 'shots' of it but they do have enough data out in the field to do that accurately.

After further discussion re maps and layout, as well as plans to clear out old logged area, etc. Kastrosky reminded the Committee this request was only for 'conceptual approval' today, and won't come back to the Zoning Committee for further review if approved.

There was further discussion of wells, possible clustering of wells, sewer system plans, and marketing plans. It was stated soil testing has not yet been done, the majority is sandy soil. **L.U.S. Tulowitzky** questioned what appeared to

be a newly bulldozed road and the answer was that other than surveying, nothing has been done on the property; it was determined that the bulldozed area was not their property. **Tulowitzky** asked if wetland delineation done. Nelson said, it will be completed if this is approved. There was further discussion on the E.I.A.

### **Opposition:**

**Jack Carlson:** on behalf of Mark and Kathy Wendling, presented handouts, discussed overlay districts and intentions of same. He was concerned about this being 'preliminary'; did not believe there was adequate information before the Committee to approve the conditional use permit.

Carlson said the EIA refers to conservation and development but 'no meat has been presented to the Zoning Committee' and said that needs to be part of the information now. In reference to Section 13-1-63(e), he emphasized words used in this Section such as, 'shall meet all', 'shall include the following', 'must provide', 'may be subject to', and said these things must be required according to the ordinance. He was also concerned that Raspberry River was not shown on the map.

Carlson added there is reason for all these requirements, the Developer is going from what would be seven residences to 18 and must meet the requirements. Other concerns, he said, are soil conditions (presented colored soils maps), slopes, and sanitation and added, 'this isn't preliminary, this is seeking a conditional use permit'; he contended the submittal before the Committee did not present enough information for action.

After a question presented by Jardine, **Kastrosky** reviewed the procedure for condo plats. He said it does not flow the same way as land divisions because it is a form of ownership. He added that 'we are trying to play catch up in the ordinance to make that happen', adding that in a convention land division, there is a preliminary review and approval by the Committee and a final review and approval by the Committee. There is not that same process on condominium development, he said, but there should be, and that is a recommendation before them (with the ordinance revisions. Karl added, 'procedurally they can ask the applicant to come back for further review if they feel it is inadequate, or if they approve it today, it won't come back and the Dept. will be responsible in making sure it complies w/ all the provisions.

**Judy Larsen** (Bayfield) stated conditions are important and not having perk tests yet is a 'serious flaw'. She asked the Committee to consider the impact on the Raspberry River watershed by a mound system and consider the destination of the waste water. She said it sets a precedent and impacts the rural character of the Township including impact on services. She after the first, second, and third landowners in condos, there tends to be problems. Requests they place deed restrictions or covenant restrictions immediately; is concerned that w/ a lot of houses there is a change in view. Ms. Larsen also requested that the Committee impose lighting restrictions, to light the ground, not the sky.

**Bruce Hoekstra** said, per Karl Kastrosky, they will have 21 days to submit covenants; they will protect green space, want to have a 'green environment'; they will restrict lighting-- they have concerns for the environment of Bayfield, they aren't going to change that. He added, they would have had the covenants with him to present as they are in place, but was told they due in 21 days.

**Jardine** asked about the Town's conditions. **Kastrosky** said the only condition he could see was that the plat be limited to 18 units. That is the only condition listed.

**Kastrosky** said they may have had miscommunication on the 21 days. He stated they were really pushing to have the application complete by the deadline date and ready to place on the agenda, and added what he hoped he said was the fact that as long as we had those within 21 days for the public hearing, it would be fine. **Hoekstra** said his understanding of their conversation was that once this hearing took place, then the final plat map was next, and then the covenants. Kastrosky apologized if he misspoke. Hoekstra added that they are trying to be above board, and suggested they look at the EIA, it addresses soils, they fully intend to have the required soil tests, they won't put any septic in there that would be a problem.

**Mark Wendling:** owns property to the west, he plans to build there and is opposed to the high density, stating it is not compatible in that area. He said the land use plan speaks of 'livability' and feels this would impact that as well as the rural character, aesthetics, having a negative impact on natural resources. Wendling was also concerned about the water table and neighboring wells; said there has not been much investigation of soil types; was concerned w/ steep grades.

**Rebuttal:**

**Nelson:** said he understands all the things that must be complied with and that this is the first for the overlay in Russell and the first one for the County. He added they have been working with this for eleven months with public hearings, on agendas over and over, there was no opposition at meetings and was approved at the Town of Russell. Nelson said he believes they have followed the correct procedure w/ the Dept., the Zoning Committee and the Town and that Russell steered the majority of their plan.

**Supervisor Miller** asked about approval procedure. **Kastrosky** said to approve this, the final must comply w/ Russell, and the County and that the Committee can ask for conceptual approval and then ask for them to come back again. **Jack Carlson:** said Subsection 5 states part of the plan is to have the information in place if they approve the concept. **Kastrosky** stated they can't approve the condo plat without that information and would rather not have that happen that it's left 'with our office'. He added that the policy for the EIA now is that it is part of public hearing and review approval process, now in conjunction with it.

**D. JOSEPH AND KAREN CHAUDOIN REZONE REQUEST - from Ag-1 to R-1** on 40-acre parcel (ID #010-1059-01), located in the SE ¼ of the SW ¼, Section 26, Township 51 North, Range 6 West, Town of Bell.

**Joseph Chaudoin:** Reported they changed to Ag-1 in the past to operate a turtle farm, however, the project was rejected so he was left w/ Ag-1 zoning and would like R-1 back. **Kastrosky:** reviewed the application and file and reported that the Town states they want R-3 zoning instead of R-1, however, they don't have that authority without proper publishing / noticing and he believes it must be re-noticed. **Chaudoin** stated he can live with R-3 zoning if that should be the decision, however, he said he needs some kind of assurance in this.

**Speaking in Support / Opposition:** None

**E. DEBORAH & DAVE SCHEDLER CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST: Convert / expand existing resort to a planned unit development (PUD) under condominium ownership to allow 5 units** on their 22.74-acre parcel (ID# 024-1079-05), located in part of Gov't Lot 5, Section 28, Township 47 North, Range 8 West, Town of Iron River. **The EIA (Environmental Impact Analysis) will be addressed as a separate part of this public hearing.**

No one was present to address this request. **Kastrosky** reported this is the 'Hermitage', they wish to change the form of ownership on the existing resort to condo ownership; they want to expand to add units. He said there is a map on file w/ unit locations and sizes; the existing resort meets criteria of the ordinance, as well as statutory requirements of 703; there is no other correspondence in the file except Town approval; EIA received is adequate for the project.

**Speaking in Support / Opposition:** None

**F. PETITION TO AMEND ORDINANCE - Sections 13 & 14**

**Director Kastrosky** reported on the two petitions before the Committee. One, he said, is simple-- just raising the fee for condo units to \$100 from \$50; individual lots are now \$100, this is to bring condo units into line with that.

The other, is a long petition dealing w/ all types development, rentals, condo, multi-units, etc. and the condo PUD amendment is very long, a large change from the past. He stated he doesn't expect approval yet, but is looking for public comments, concerns, and suggestions on it (which has been in the works for three years, but put together in the last six months). **Kastrosky** suggested they hold a special meeting for this Item, or at least table it until September's meeting. **Jardine:** suggested they hold a special meeting for educational purposes first for just the Zoning Committee, and then bring it back publicly.

**Kastrosky** said there might possibly be citizens in the audience who wished to address this agenda item. **Jack Carlson** stated that this item has a lot to do w/ last month's meeting as well as 'today's issues' and 'there needs to be more time to digest it before this can be enforced'.

**Other Comments:**

**Lee Weisner** spoke re density of multi-unit developments around lakes and rivers, possible amendment changes and was concerned about the number of docks and slips allowable on PUDs. **Kastrosky** stated he would like the opportunity to meet w/ the Lakes Assoc. to discuss this further.

**Ingemar Ekstrom** representing the Bayfield County Lakes Forum, asked that this be tabled at least until Sept.; said he had met w/ Karl Kastrovsky in June w/ amendments and numerous suggestions, however, didn't receive any feedback until two days ago. He felt it is important to table this so they can present their concerns.

**L.U.S. Tulowitzky** said this also would be the time to speak to short term rental accommodation issues.

**Barb Swenson:** Reported on a lot next to her property which began w/ a small cottage on it, then owners said they would build a small chalet, however, it is now a large rental, which she said is like having a hotel next to them. She stated this is a business on residential property and believes the County was 'conned', it is a home which sleeps 12 to 16 people and is an incompatible land use.

**Kastrovsky** stated the existing ordinance states two or more rentals require a conditional use permit. He said there have been problems in the past with home rentals; the threshold is short term-- 30 days or less. We are starting to see properties turning into weekend rentals; suddenly people find themselves living next to a 'resort' with different people there all the time. This is a 'change of use of the land', he said, and the problem has become more prevalent, therefore, 'we are trying to get handle on this'.

**Ingemar Ekstrom** stated they had an experience w/ an adjacent property owner who rented short term in the past and it became a 'nightmare'; he said short term rentals can become a huge problem.

[Chairman Beeksma advised those speaking on this agenda item to not get specific with certain property owners, names, etc., however, the following continued to address a specific property.]

**Joe Weinberg:** [did not sign in, unsure of name] Reported he lives two homes away from the property mentioned by Ms. Swenson; he referred to the R-1 requirements in the Ordinance and stated what is occurring is intrusion, not harmony.

**John Milloy:** Property owner on Lakeshore Drive (Barksdale) said there is intrusion as well as traffic hazards involved, and added that this 'flew completely under the radar'. The property referred to became a commercial venture with their website referring to it as an executive retreat, wedding location, etc. Some additional problems have involved neighbor's personal furniture being used as well as taking neighbor's firewood.

**Marie Everson:** Addressed the property spoken of above. She said she bought the property in 2003 for future retirement, to have extended family there and rent to corporation and their families. She said she believes Zoning always knew her intent. In reference to the neighborhood problems, she said she must know about problems in order to do something about them, is willing to work w/ neighbors but has not been talked to. Ms. Everson agreed there should be rules about disturbing neighbors. Re weddings, Ms. Everson said they will not have additional weddings after the one which is already booked.

**Brenda Spurlock** reported she works for Ms. Everson, lives next to their property, she has not been disrupted, and is not aware of anything disruptive or that the neighborhood has been damaged.

**G. PETITION TO AMEND ORDINANCE - Sections 13 & 14** [Note, above discussion covered both Items F. and G.]

**6. ADJOURNMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING:** Motion by Rondeau, seconded by Miller to adjourn the public hearing at 3:38 PM; carried. Chairman Beeksma called for a five-minute break.

**7. CALL TO ORDER OF ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING:** By Chairman Beeksma at 3:48 PM.

**8. ROLL CALL:** Beeksma, Jardine, Maki, Miller, Rondeau, all present.

**9. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S):** Motion by Maki, second by Rondeau to approve the July 20, 2006 minutes without correction or addition. Carried, 5 yes, 0 no.

**10. BUSINESS:**

**A. DONALD W. HAMIL REZONE REQUEST - from R-3 to R-1:** on 9+-acre parcel (ID #004-1122-05), located in that part of Gov't Lot 3, Section 18, Township 44 North, Range 9 West, Town of Barnes.

Motion by Jardine, second by Rondeau to **table** this Item. **Motion carried, 3 yes, 2 no-- Miller & Maki opposed.**

**B. JAMES PETERSON SONS, INC, OWNER AND RALPH FROSTMAN, AGENT EXPANSION REQUEST to Conditional Use Permit (#03-0483)** (for gravel pit #55-007-00000-0141 to allow crushing) on 40-acre parcel (ID# 024-1054-09), described as the SE ¼ of the SE ¼, Section 20, Township 47 N, Range 8 West, Town of Iron River.

Jardine made a motion to **approve** with the condition of hours 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM; second by Rondeau. **Discussion: Kastrosky** said Peterson requested 6:45 AM to 6:00 PM and the Town's ordinance is 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM. Jardine then **amended** his motion to honor the Town ordinance to **approve the request with hours of operation of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM for four weeks maximum annually.** **Motion carried, 5 yes, 0 no.**

**C. KUSKUS, LLC, BRUCE HOEKSTRA, OWNER AND WAYNE NELSON, AGENT, CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST: 21-Unit Condominium Plat with a Multi-Unit Storage Building** on 147-acre parcel (IDs 046-1029-09; 046-1030-02; 046-1030-04; & 046-1030-06), described as the NE ¼ of the SW ¼; the SE ¼ of the SW ¼, the SW ¼ of the SE ¼, and all that part of the NW ¼ of the SE ¼ lying South and West of State Hwy 13, all in Section 20, Township 51 N, Range 4 W, Town of Russell. **The EIA (Environmental Impact Analysis) will be addressed as a separate part of this public hearing.**

Miller made a motion to **table** this request; second by Maki. **Motion was defeated, 3 to 2** (Miller and Maki-- yes; Beeksmas, Rondeau, Jardine-- no.) Jardine said he believes they could approve the condo plat 'conceptually', so they can continue from this point, with conditions placed before the final plat. Miller said he would be able to give that type of approval and amended his motion to **approve the condo plat conceptually;** motion seconded by Rondeau. Kastrosky asked if they wanted this Item placed back on the agenda as a 'business item' in the future; the answer was 'yes'; motion carried—5 yes, 0 no.

**D. JOSEPH AND KAREN CHAUDOIN REZONE REQUEST - from Ag-1 to R-1** on 40-acre parcel (ID #010-1059-01), located in the SE ¼ of the SW ¼, Section 26, Township 51 North, Range 6 West, Town of Bell.

Motion by Maki to **authorize** Karl Kastrosky to look into the request to zone property to R-3 instead of R-1, **verify** it with the Town of Bell, and **waive** the fee when it is brought back to the Zoning agenda. Second by Rondeau; carried—5 yes, 0 no.

**E. DEBORAH & DAVE SCHEDLER CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST: Convert / expand existing resort to a planned unit development (PUD) under condominium ownership to allow 5 units** on their 22.74-acre parcel (ID# 024-1079-05), located in part of Gov't Lot 5, Section 28, Township 47 North, Range 8 West, Town of Iron River. **The EIA (Environmental Impact Analysis) will be addressed as a separate part of this public hearing.**

Kastrosky said he didn't see anything wrong w/ this request and [if they] choose not to table it, then they might address the request to convert and approve the EIA as presented. Motion by Rondeau to **approve the EIA,** second by Jardine carried—5 yes, 0 no. Motion by Rondeau, second by Maki, to **approve the conditional use request as presented;** motion carried—5 yes, 0 no.

### **Agenda Review and Alteration**

**F. PETITION TO AMEND ORDINANCE - Sections 13 & 14**

Motion by Jardine, second by Rondeau, to **table Item F.,** schedule a work session, then bring back as a public hearing item. Motion carried, 5 yes, 0 no.

**G. PETITION TO AMEND ORDINANCE - Sections 13 & 14**

Kastrosky said this agenda Item will not affect any currently submitted condo plats with extra fees, it will be for the future. Motion by Jardine, second by Rondeau to **approve the ordinance amendment to revise condo unit fees to \$100 each** (a change from \$50. Carried, 5 yes, 0 no.

**H. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION ON ASPENWOODS FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – Washburn**

It was noted this Item was pulled from the agenda per Applicant's request as they are dealing with a wetland issue and reconfiguring three lots; request is to table until further notice. Motion by Rondeau, second by Jardine, to **table** this until further notice. Motion carried, 5 yes, 0 no.

**I. THERESA RAUWOLF – SECOND RESIDENCE ON PARCEL:** on 15-acre parcel (#004-1186-05) in the W ½ of the SE ¼, of the SE ¼, Section 23, Township 45 N, Range 9 W, Town of Barnes.

Kastroosky said Town Board Approval is on file, applicant wants to combine use of the well; property cannot be divided in the future. He said the request is for a 1979 mobile home to be placed for accommodations of family members.

Motion by Jardine, second by Rondeau, to **approve**; carried 5 yes, 0 no.

**J. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION RE Update On Lincoln Land Trust (Bayfield) – 56 Lots**

Scott Koziar provided an update: they have been working w/ Karl, the Dept., and his surveyor and the 'Final' will be submitted in Sept. Re the sanitary issues discussed at the last meeting, he said the engineer reported on feasibility of onsite sewer systems will be about \$60,000 versus high pressure lines which would nearly double the cost and the recommendation at this time is it is not feasible to run sewer to site. He said it is feasible to build a pump station on the corner of Hwy J to handle future homes. There was discussion on numbers of lots, other details as well as economical issues involved.

Kastroosky said it's possible to address in the covenants and deed restrictions that the lots may or may not be served by sanitary district sewer and when / if it comes by they will hook up within an allotted time. He added that buyers will be well aware in their covenants and reminded the Committee this was on the agenda as an update only at this time.

**K. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION NR115 Re-Write Update:** Karl reported there was no progress to report; a meeting was scheduled on the 30<sup>th</sup>.

**L. CITIZENS' CONCERNS / INPUT:** None

**M. OTHER ITEMS THAT MAY COME BEFORE THE COMMITTEE (Discussion Only)**

- ◆ Maki brought up the **meeting time** and the hardship it causes on some. Miller was in agreement as well as Bruce Hoekstra and Wayne Nelson, speaking from the audience who had to take time off work to be present. Kastroosky reminded the Committee no action could be taken as this was not on the agenda. Jardine commented that comp time has to be paid for employees required to attend evening meetings, plus for those traveling home late at night in the winter to far ends of the county, it is a hardship as well. Supervisor Miller said if the County wants to limit the Board to retired people then the time of day doesn't matter.
- ◆ Kastroosky said he was planning to discuss changing some fees, user fees, etc. but if they can cover that in the work session they will have; said he would set up a meeting and advise them.

**10. MONTHLY REPORT:** Motion by Rondeau, second by Jardine to **approve**; carried.

**11. ADJOURNMENT:** Motion by Maki, second by Jardine, adjourned at 4:18 PM. Carried.

**Karl L. Kastroosky, Planning / Zoning Director  
Bayfield County Planning / Zoning Dept.**

Prepared by MJJ on 8/31/06  
Approved by KLK on 9/8/06

cc: Administrator; Clerk; Corp.Counsel; DNR; Committee; Supervisors

K/ZC/MINUTES/2006/Aug