

Houston County Planning Commission  
February 26, 2026

**Approved March 26, 2026 by Josh Gran and Larry Gaustad.**

The Houston County Planning Commission met at 5:20 p.m. on Thursday, February 26, 2026. A summary of the meeting follows.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Franklin Hahn. Roll call was taken. Members present were Larry Gaustad, Johnathon Glasspoole, Franklin Hahn, Chase Munson, and Richard Schild. Eric Johnson, County Commissioner, was present. Josh Gran was absent. Amelia Meiners and Michelle Burt were present for Environmental Services. Johnathon Glasspoole was present for public hearing no. 1007 but he had to leave after the final motion was complete.

Chase Munson made a motion to approve the minutes of January 22, 2026. Larry Gaustad seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

**Notice of Public Hearing No. 1007** was read for applicants, **Michel and Susan Bashaw**, 1785 Bush Valley Road, La Crescent, MN 55947.

The petitioner is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to build a dwelling on less than 40 acres in an agricultural protection district of La Crescent Township.

- This is currently a 58-acre parcel off Bush Valley Road in La Crescent Township about two miles northwest of Hokah. The applicants purchased the farm from family and intend to parcel off some acreage with the existing structure to sell to another family member. On the remaining acreage, estimated to be about 18 acres, they are looking to construct a single-family dwelling. Since the new parcel will be under 40 acres in size they are requesting the Conditional Use Permit.
- The Houston County Zoning Ordinance (HCZO) 14.3 Subdivision 1 (10) requires the following:

*(10) Dwellings. Single-family non-farm dwellings subject to the following:*

*(a) No more than one (1) dwelling per quarter-quarter section.*

*(b) Non-farm dwellings built after the adoption of this Ordinance shall be setback at least one-fourth, (1/4), mile from all feedlots, except as otherwise provided in this Ordinance.*

*(c) Non-farm dwelling units shall not be permitted on land which is of soil classifications of Class I-III soils rated in the Soil Survey - Houston County by the U. S. D. A. Natural Resource Conservation Service, except in cases where the land has not been used for the production of field crops or enrolled in a government program whereby compensation is received in exchange for the removal of an area from production, for a period of ten years or more.*

*(d) Non-farm dwelling units shall only be permitted on sites considered Buildable Lots as defined by this Ordinance, and shall not be permitted in areas classified wetlands, flood plain, peat and muck areas and other areas of poor drainage. Non-farm dwelling units shall not be permitted on land which has a slope of twenty-four (24) percent or greater. All non-farm dwellings must have an erosion control plan as required by Section 24.*

*(e) Non-farm dwelling units shall be required to be located on lots having ownership of at least thirty-three (33) feet of road frontage on a public roadway or a legally recorded perpetual access at least thirty-three (33) feet wide from an existing public roadway and a minimum lot area of one (1) acre.*

- Further, the applicants should know the purpose of the Agricultural Protection District is to retain land for agricultural production and these regulations are intended to minimize incompatibility between those residential and agricultural uses.

## **SECTION 14 - AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION DISTRICT**

### **14.1 PURPOSE AND PUBLIC NOTICE**

**Subdivision 1. Purpose.** *The purpose of the Agricultural Protection District is to provide a district that will:*

- (1) Retain, conserve, and enhance agricultural land in the County for agricultural uses.*
- (2) Protect and preserve natural resources and environmentally sensitive areas.*
- (3) Restrict scattered non-farm residential development in order to minimize incompatibility between agricultural uses and residential use, and to conserve the expenditure of public funds for new roads, road maintenance, schools, police and fire protection necessary to service scattered residential development.*

**Subdivision 2. Public Notice.** *Persons choosing to reside in the Agricultural Protection District are hereby notified that the agricultural district is a zoning district in which land is used principally and foremost for agricultural production.*

**Subdivision 3. Discomfort Resulting From Agricultural Uses.** *Owners, residents, and other uses of property in the Agricultural Protection District or neighboring properties may be subjected to inconvenience or discomfort arising from normal and accepted agricultural practices and operation, including but not limited to the following:*

- (1) Noise, odors, dust, and hours of operation.*
- (2) The operation of machinery, including aircraft.*
- (3) The production, storage and land application of animal manure.*
- (4) The application of fertilizers, soil amendments, herbicides, and pesticides.*

*Owners, residents, and users of property in the Agricultural Protection District, or neighboring property should be prepared to accept such inconveniences or discomfort as they occur from agricultural uses and are hereby notified that this declaration may prevent them from obtaining a legal judgment against such agricultural uses.*

- Site Characteristics:
  - The SE1/4 SW1/4 of Section 24 is an open quarter-quarter. There is an accessory structure on the north line and the dwelling sits just over the quarter-quarter line. The location of that line as shown on Beacon was verified with the Surveyor's Office and determined to be accurate. Therefore, that dwelling is within the NE1/4 SW1/4.
  - A non-farm dwelling cannot be located on prime agricultural soil. The soil in this area is classified as 388E and 601E, both are VIe which is considered marginal. There is no floodplain, wetland, shoreland, or bluff concern with the building site but the driveway required further review. The closest stream is an unnamed creek mapped 150 feet southwesterly of the proposed location. There is an old pond adjacent to the proposed location that now sits dry. That stream "channel" is also mapped wetland. The driveway location was evaluated by the wetlands team to assess potential impacts and it was determined there were no impacts present. In addition, the DNR reviewed the location since that intermittent stream is a tributary to a trout stream but determined no public waters permit was required. Bush Valley Creek is about 0.75 miles west of this location.
  - Slopes at the building site are under 12% and the location meets buildable lot standard. When the final split is complete there will need to be easement access granted through the original property.
  - There is no feedlot within a quarter mile or mine within 1,000 feet. The applicant has not completed preliminary septic work due to winter weather but wanted to move forward with this request at their own risk.

- La Crescent Township and the ten closest property owners were notified. One comment was received.

Michel and Susan Bashaw were present to answer questions. Chairman Hahn asked the applicants if they had anything to add. Michel Bashaw stated their plan is to build a 2,080 square foot house with a 3-car garage on the family farm. Bashaw stated that his parents bought the farm in 1964, so they plan to split the 64-acre parcel with his sister. Bashaw stated that his sister plans to restore the house and eliminate the buildings that are in disrepair.

Franklin Hahn stated that he has been contacted about the applicants building on 18-acres and was told the building site is located in an open quarter-quarter. Hahn asked Environmental Services Director Amelia Meiners to show the Board and public how the quarter-quarter section is reviewed. Michel Bashaw stated the property will be 27 acres after the parcel split. Bashaw presented a complete survey of the property showing the proposed parcel split and a road easement. Meiners displayed a parcel map containing the quarter-quarter lines. Meiners pointed out where the applicants are wanting to build and the neighboring dwelling that was in question for being within the same quarter-quarter. It was determined that the quarter-quarter line runs across an accessory building. Meiners clarified that Beacon should not be utilized for legal purposes but staff has looked at the location and based on where the corners are, if there was any kind of variability it is not necessarily vertical but would be more horizontal. Eric Johnson asked if the lines displayed on Beacon were verified with the Surveyors Office. Franklin Hahn specified that the neighbor's house is located in a different quarter-quarter. Meiners confirmed that the house is above the quarter-quarter line and the structure in question is an accessory building. The one dwelling per quarter-quarter rule is based on the location of the dwelling, so this would be an open quarter-quarter.

Eric Johnson asked if the driveway would be shared with the exiting farmhouse. Michel Bashaw stated that as of right now he and his wife own the whole property with plans to sell half to his sister. Bashaw stated that the road easement has been surveyed. Bashaw mentioned that the driveway location was also reviewed by Amelia Meiners, SWCD, and DNR. Amelia Meiners stated that there were wetland concerns for a portion of the driveway which required further evaluation. Franklin Hahn stated that an ingress-egress was mentioned in the board packet but this has nothing to do with the Planning Commission. Meiners stated that she would review the easement when she reviews the building permit application. Michel Bashaw stated that it is written to show that since he owns the property right now they do not need permission from his sister to get an easement. Eric Johnson asked what would happen if his sister were to sell the original farmhouse and there is a shared driveway with the new owners. Bashaw does not feel this would be an issue because there will be a legal easement.

Eric Johnson clarified the building location and that the location was marginal farmland. Michel Bashaw stated that the house will be 170 feet south of the property line. Franklin Hahn asked if the building location is currently being cultivated. Bashaw stated there is cultivated land located on the property but the building location is currently used as a horse pasture.

Michel Bashaw responded to the comment that was included in the board packet. Bashaw feels that the proposed house is around the corner of the neighbor's home, so there will be no impact on their view or recreational hobbies. Bashaw stated that when determining the location of the house they did not want to waste extra land. Bashaw stated that the plan is to keep the property in the family.

Chairman Hahn asked if there was any public comment.

Bruce Vongroven, neighboring property owner, stated that he was not familiar with the quarter-quarter section, so he looked for some input and talked to people he trusted. Vongroven had a few concerns with the Conditional Use Permit request. His first concern was with the initial notice as it did not show where the house was going to be located. Vongroven stated that he went back to the Environmental Services Office for further definition and an approximate location of the house was provided. Vongroven explained that the

accessory building that the quarter-quarter line goes through is their garage which is 3 feet off their house. Vongroven assumed the garage was part of the structure since the garage goes with the house. Vongroven stated his concern with a fixture being located in the same quarter-quarter section as the applicant's house since they were under the impression that being the garage was there this section would not be buildable. Vongroven's second concern was that you are not supposed to build on cropland. Vongroven stated that they originally purchased their property from Michel Bashaw and over the 25 years they have owned the house a number of crops have gone into the field where the house is going to be located. The crops have ranged from hay, corn, and possibly more. Vongroven stated that they received a brief drawing of where the house was going to be located and it is in the cropland. Bruce Vongroven stated they have a field road that runs along the property line which is close to the tentative location of the applicant's house. Vongroven asked how many feet the house would be off the back line. The Vongroven's utilize the field road and they hunt the whole area. Vongroven is concerned about the setback for discharging a gun near a house. Vongroven stated that in Houston County you cannot discharge a weapon next to a building but was unsure of the exact setback required by the County. The Vongroven's turkey hunt, deer hunt, and bow hunt. Vongroven stated that the reason they purchased the property is because it is a pristine valley. Vongroven feels that sitting a big house in the valley will decrease their property value.

Environmental Services Director Amelia Meiners read a comment that was submitted after the comment deadline. Meiners stated that since this was more of a Township request since they have road authority on Bush Valley Road the comment was forwarded to La Crescent Township.

Franklin Hahn asked if the proposed house would impact the bluff road that Bruce Vongroven mentioned. Amelia Meiners stated that the minimum setback of 50 feet from the property line will have to be met. Meiners stated that by meeting this setback the applicants are able to build on more level ground and feels that the house will be further than 50 feet from the property line. Meiners stated that there should be no impact to slope stability.

Franklin Hahn asked if the proposed house is within 2 miles of a plotted city.

Richard Schild asked the applicants if they knew how long it has been since there were crops planted in the proposed building location. Amelia Meiners stated that she did not verify this. Michel Bashaw stated that the last time there were crops at this location was about 6 years ago but it was determined the field was too hard to get to.

Eric Johnson asked what class soil was at the building location. Amelia Meiners stated that the soil is class VI. Johnson clarified that this would be why the property is not considered prime farmland. Meiners confirmed and mentioned that classes I, II, and III are prime.

Richard Schild asked if there was a rule if the land hasn't been planted for so many years it is no longer considered cropland. Amelia Meiners stated that if someone were to have a similar request but it was on prime ground that is mainly timber or it has never been in row crop production it is exempt from the rule. Chase Munson asked how many years. Meiners stated 10 years to be considered exempt. Michel Bashaw stated they do not plan on planting crops and he has talked to the DNR about planting trees.

Eric Johnson asked if there was a power line located near the building site. Michel Bashaw confirmed that the power line is located next to the property to the north of the building location. Bashaw stated that power has been installed on the building site.

Amelia Meiners stated that she has visited the property and where the house will be located there is enough of a hill where they could not see the neighboring property. Michel Bashaw feels that it will be difficult to even see the house from the road.

Chairman Hahn asked that the Findings be read if there were no additional comments or questions.

Chase Munson made a motion to bypass questions 9, 12, and 14 that are not applicable. Richard Schild seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Section 11.05 of the Houston County Zoning Ordinance requires the following:

Subdivision 1. Findings. The Planning Commission shall not recommend a conditional use permit unless they find the following:

1. That the proposed use conforms to the County Land Use Plan.

Staff Analysis: The Land Use Plan makes numerous references to preserving prime agricultural land and the fact that non-farm dwellings are only allowed on marginal ground promotes this goal.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

2. That the applicant demonstrates a need for the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: This proposal will allow the applicant to move back to the family farm while allowing another family member to continue occupying the existing structure.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

3. That the proposed use will not degrade the water quality of the County.

Staff Analysis: Prior to building permit issuance, a septic designer will need to identify two type I septic system locations and design a system meeting MPCA requirements which will mitigate water quality concerns. An erosion control plan has been approved by the SWCD.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

4. That the proposed use will not adversely increase the quantity of water runoff.

Staff Analysis: The applicant will need to meet all requirements of their erosion control plan to address any runoff concerns before, during and after construction, but the addition of a single-family dwelling should not adversely increase the quantity of water runoff.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

5. That soil conditions are adequate to accommodate the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: The Soil Survey – Houston County identifies slope as the main limitation for building sites on 301E and 688E soils due to it requiring extensive land shaping. Both recommend that the building be designed to conform to the natural slope of the land.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

6. That potential pollution hazards have been addressed and that standards have been met.

Staff Analysis: Adequate treatment of septage is likely the biggest potential pollution hazard, but a septic designer must design and install a system meeting minimum state standards.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

7. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided.

Staff Analysis: This is a new building site, so new utility installations are necessary and all costs are the responsibility of the applicant. Access will adjoin the existing driveway and the new portion has been approved through the erosion control plan.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

8. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide sufficient off-street parking and loading space to serve the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: There is sufficient off-street parking to accommodate typical residential use.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

9. That facilities are provided to eliminate any traffic congestion or traffic hazard which may result from the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: N/A

10. 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.

Staff Analysis: The primary use of the surrounding acreage is agricultural or recreational in nature and the addition of a single-family dwelling will not impact that use.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

11. That the establishment of the Conditional Use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for predominant uses in the area.

Staff Analysis: This dwelling meets the density standard in the ag protection district and will not impact surrounding agricultural fields and recreational land. Orderly development meeting ordinance standards can still take place.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

12. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to prevent or control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise and vibration, so that none of these will constitute a nuisance, and to control lighted signs and other lights in such a manner that no disturbance to neighboring properties will result.

Staff Analysis: N/A

13. That the density of any proposed residential development is not greater than the density of the surrounding neighborhood or not greater than the density indicated by the applicable Zoning District.

Staff Analysis: This request meets the required agricultural protection district density limitations.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

14. That the intensity of any proposed commercial or industrial development is not greater than the intensity of the surrounding uses or not greater than the intensity characteristic of the applicable Zoning District.

Staff Analysis: N/A

15. That site specific conditions and such other conditions are established as required for the protection of the public's health, safety, morals, and general welfare.

Staff Analysis: A non-farm dwelling should not negatively affect the public's health, safety, morals and general welfare if constructed according to the approved erosion control plan and septic design requirements.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

Chairman Hahn asked for a motion on the findings if there were no additional comments or questions.

Larry Gaustad made a motion to accept the findings as presented. Johnathon Glasspoole seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hahn asked for a motion on the conditional use request if there were no additional comments or questions.

Johnathon Glasspoole made a motion to recommend the Houston County Board approve a Conditional Use Permit for a single-family dwelling on less than 40 acres in the Agricultural Protection District with four conditions in La Crescent Township:

1. The Permittee shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
2. The County may enter onto the premises at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner to ensure the permit holder is in compliance with the conditions and all other applicable statutes, rules, and ordinances.
3. Operation of a home occupation from this site requires an Interim Use Permit.
4. New parcel must be similar to that identified within this request or approved by Zoning Staff prior to recording to ensure standards are met.

Richard Schild seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.

The application, with the conditions, will be presented to the Houston County Board of Commissioners for final action.

Johnathon Glasspoole was not in attendance for the remainder of the evening. The Planning Commission members present at this point were Larry Gaustad, Franklin Hahn, Eric Johnson, Chase Munson, and Richard Schild.

**Notice of Public Hearing No. 1008** was read for applicants, **Barta Family Trust**, 600083 206th Street, Eagle Lake, MN 56024.

The petitioner is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to build a cabin in an agricultural protection district of Houston Township.

- This is a 42-acre parcel about four miles north of Houston in Looney Valley.
- The Houston County Zoning Ordinance provides the following requirements for cabin structures:

### **14.3 CONDITIONAL USES**

**Subdivision 1. Conditional Uses.** *In the Agricultural Protection District, the following uses may be allowed only after obtaining a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with the provision of this Ordinance.*

(5) *Cabins. Cabins, subject to the following:*

(a) *Not more than one (1) cabin per quarter of a quarter section shall be allowed.*

(b) *A cabin shall not have a permanent foundation or basement, or otherwise be permanently attached to the ground.*

(c) *A cabin shall be for transient use only and shall not be used as a permanent, year-around dwelling.*

(d) *No cabin shall have a gross floor area exceeding 400 square feet.*

(e) *Cabins shall not be connected to modern utilities, including electricity, telephone service, and septic.*

- Site Characteristics:
  - This is a parcel in Houston Township consisting of timber ground that is used recreationally. Development options are limited here due to slopes and low lying, wet ground. There is a dwelling within the NW1/4 SW1/4 but no other cabins have been permitted or appear to be present within this quarter-quarter.
  - The portion of this property near the road contains an unnamed creek and is mapped wetland, however there is no mapped floodplain. The unnamed creek is not classified as a public water so there is no setback to the ordinary high-water level or other shoreland rules that apply. There is a small rise in elevation to the area where the cabin is proposed and a small building site. It does meet buildable lot standards.
  - There are three dwellings within 1,600 feet of this proposal.
- Houston Township and the 10 closest property owners were notified. No comments were received.

Paul Barta was present to answer questions. Chairman Hahn asked the applicant if he had anything to add. Paul Barta explained that his family has owned this land in Houston County since the late 90's and it has been used mainly for recreational hunting purposes. For the last 20 years, a camper has been moved to the property seasonally. Barta stated that hauling the camper in and out makes it challenging to do food plots, trail maintenance, and other things that need to be done on a hunting parcel to make it useable. Barta hoped to be granted a Conditional Use Permit for a small cabin, so they wouldn't have to worry about maintaining a camper, moving it on and off, and to avoid the troubles that come with having a camper. Barta reached out to the property owners that live in the area where the proposed cabin will be located. Barta stated he has come to know most of the neighbors in their time owning the property and wanted to make sure people knew about the request to ensure there wasn't any opposition because he would not want to move forward if the people that live in the area were uncomfortable with the cabin. Barta stated that everyone he talked to was very good about it. Barta stated that he made himself familiar with the Ordinances for Houston County and presented a list he made of the specific items that need to be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. Barta explained that the cabin would be small and considered seasonal for hunting with occasional use for maintaining the land.

Franklin Hahn asked if the proposed location of the cabin would be accessible by a vehicle with the wetland located in the area. Paul Barta stated that the area has tall grass that has never been terribly wet. Barta further explained that the cabin will not be located too far off the Township road. According to the diagram provided by the applicant there is an area labeled for parking which would be a short walk to the cabin. Barta stated that the area labeled for parking is where the camper is usually parked.

Eric Johnson stated that he is familiar with the area and it is really wet along the Township road, so he asked the applicant if the cabin would be off the wet area. Paul Barta stated the area around the stream is the main wet place but there is a spot that is elevated. This spot is not very big but it would be ideal for a

small cabin. Barta mentioned a conversation he had with Environmental Services Director Amelia Meiners about the setback from the toe of a bluff if the criteria were met. Barta stated that he needs the required setback from a bluff to the cabin to be able to fit an ATV. Amelia Meiners stated that she was initially concerned with the wetlands but the cabin location was confirmed to be above the wet area.

Larry Gaustad asked if the applicant plans to build the cabin or have one moved in.

Franklin Hahn asked why there are ordinances set in place for cabins that are very restrictive yet a person can get a permit for a cold storage building to later add electricity, then a kitchen, then a bedroom, and so forth. Amelia Meiners thought the rules for cabins were original to the Zoning Ordinance. Eric Johnson asked the applicant if he intends to add electricity, plumbing, and more to the cabin. Paul Barta stated that it is not the intention to add plumbing or electricity since they are on the property seasonally for long weekends. Meiners explained that the site is very difficult to locate any structure on with the hill restriction on one side and the wetland on the other. Meiners does not feel that a dwelling and a septic system could be placed on the property which makes a cabin a great use for the property.

Chairman Hahn asked if there was any public comment.

Steve Hartwick, resident in Money Creek Township, asked if the Township allows overnight parking on a Township road. Eric Johnson clarified that there will be no parking on the Township road.

Chairman Hahn asked that the Findings be read if there were no additional comments or questions.

Chase Munson made a motion to bypass questions 8, 9, 12, 13, and 14 that are not applicable. Eric Johnson seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Section 11.05 of the Houston County Zoning Ordinance requires the following:

Subdivision 1. Findings. The Planning Commission shall not recommend a conditional use permit unless they find the following:

1. That the proposed use conforms to the County Land Use Plan.

Staff Analysis: The Comprehensive Plan encourages development to conform to the natural limitations presented by topography. There is a very limited building envelope on this parcel making a cabin likely the only option available to the applicant.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

2. That the applicant demonstrates a need for the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: The applicant indicates the cabin is intended for recreational use to replace a seasonal camper and will allow them to enjoy and better maintain the property.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

3. That the proposed use will not degrade the water quality of the County.

Staff Analysis: A cabin cannot have a permanent foundation so with minimal ground disturbance the construction should not degrade water quality, and the addition of a cabin to the land should not change the overall use of the land in a negative manner. A portable toilet will be used to temporarily hold septage for disposal off site.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

4. That the proposed use will not adversely increase the quantity of water runoff.

Staff Analysis: The cabin footprint is minimal and is not anticipated to have an effect or minimal effect on quantity of water runoff.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

5. That soil conditions are adequate to accommodate the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: The soil survey indicates that soils at both sites can accommodate buildings, but they should conform to the natural slope of the land.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

6. That potential pollution hazards been addressed and that standards have been met.

Staff Analysis: There are no anticipated pollution hazards.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

7. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided.

Staff Analysis: No utilities are proposed or allowed with cabins. Access is from the township road from which there is an existing access point that the Township approves of.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

8. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide sufficient off-street parking and loading space to serve the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: NA

9. That facilities are provided to eliminate any traffic congestion or traffic hazard which may result from the proposed use.

Staff Analysis: NA

10. 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.

Staff Analysis: Traff Drive is a dead-end road. There are three dwellings in close proximity but the seasonal nature of this proposal should not impact the use and enjoyment of those properties. The closest dwelling is around the hill enough that this structure will not be visible.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

11. That the establishment of the Conditional Use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for predominant uses in the area.

Staff Analysis: There is already a dwelling in this quarter-quarter and the proposed use is compatible with the nature of the neighboring properties.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

12. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to prevent or control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise and vibration, so that none of these will constitute a nuisance, and to control lighted signs and other lights in such a manner that no disturbance to neighboring properties will result.

Staff Analysis: NA

13. That the density of any proposed residential development is not greater than the density of the surrounding neighborhood or not greater than the density indicated by the applicable Zoning District.

Staff Analysis: NA

14. That the intensity of any proposed commercial or industrial development is not greater than the intensity of the surrounding uses or not greater than the intensity characteristic of the applicable Zoning District.

Staff Analysis: NA

15. That site specific conditions and such other conditions are established as required for the protection of the public's health, safety, morals, and general welfare.

Staff Analysis: Public health, safety, morals, and general welfare are not anticipated to be impacted with a simple cabin.

Board agreed to the finding by a unanimous vote.

Chairman Hahn asked for a motion on the findings if there were no additional comments or questions.

Chase Munson made a motion to accept the findings as presented. Richard Schild seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hahn asked for a motion on the conditional use request if there were no additional comments or questions.

Larry Gaustad made a motion to recommend the Houston County Board approve a Conditional Use Permit for a cabin in the Agricultural Protection District with two conditions in Houston Township:

1. The Permittee shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
2. The County may enter onto the premises at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner to ensure the permit holder is in compliance with the conditions and all other applicable statutes, rules, and ordinances.

Chase Munson seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.

The application, with the conditions, will be presented to the Houston County Board of Commissioners for final action.

**Notice of Public Hearing No. 1009** for **Burns & Hansen, P.A. on behalf of Cory & Jackie Baker**, 22848 State 16, Rushford, MN 55971, **Scott & Cindy Hatleli**, 23263 Hatleli Drive, Rushford, MN 55971, and **Rosemary Iversen**, 2835 Casco Point Road, Wayzata, MN 55391 was withdrawn prior to the hearing.

Following the public hearings there was a brief discussion held by the Planning Commission regarding the presentation of a petition from a Houston County resident. It was determined that the petition should instead be presented to the Board of Commissioners.

Eric Johnson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Larry Gaustad seconded. Motion carried.

Submitted by the Planning Commission Clerk on February 27, 2026.