

MINUTES
Bayfield County Planning / Zoning Committee Public Hearing / Meeting
August 18, 2005
Board Room, County Courthouse, Washburn, WI 54891

1. **CALL TO ORDER OF PUBLIC HEARING:** *By Chairman Jardine at 1:00 PM.*
2. **ROLL CALL:** *Beeksma, Jardine, Maki, Rondeau; - present; Compton absent/excused.*
3. **AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION:** *Read by ZA Kastrovsky*
4. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

A. HAROLD ECTON, OWNER / DAVID SWAN, AGENT CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST -Planned Unit Development (ten individual units, under condominium ownership and two accessory structures with no more than a total of ten stalls), on 9.8-acre parcel (ID# 044-1070-09) in Govt. Lot 6, Township 44 North, Range 9 West, Town of Barnes.

David Swan, Shell Lake, WI addressed the Committee; he gave a brief background stating eight or nine months ago he spoke w/ Mr. Ecton who had the property for sale for many years. He pointed out that he has gone beyond the Zoning guidelines where he could have 13 lots with potentially 14 structures, but is asking for just ten. They will have “two pages of homeowner-restrictions, which are well beyond county requirements, and many not addressed by the County”. He said they are not asking for “special granting”, but what is outlined within zoning regulations. He believes the property is going to be well protected and has asked the Zoning Dept., DNR, and engineers for any other restrictions to place.

Mr. Swan addressed the ‘dock issue’ and stated he is working w/ John Spangberg (DNR) to place docks where they meet their approval. They want twenty boat slips, limiting the number of slips to two per home. He said some parcels on Bony Lake that could have ten slips and “no one can do anything about it” yet they are requesting two with a proposal of five separate piers.

Swan presented a handout to the Committee and read the section on shoreland protection [“A” on the purple sheet in the handout] (see attachment). He said they are selling “space” and the owner controls that defined space, but nothing outside of that. He said he doesn’t believe one single owner on Bony Lake follows as stringent regulations as they have set up.

Swan said in reference to Lot #3 and concerns that it is a wetland, both Karl Kastrovsky and the DNR felt there is potential of no wetlands at all. He added Northern Environmental delineated the wetlands. Chairman Jardine then asked which items were questioned on the EIA. AZA Mike Furtak replied that one question was whether the entire property or just a portion was delineated for wetlands and added that all of it is mapped but only Lot 3 is flagged, with soil borings done in the entire area.

No one else spoke in support.
Speaking in opposition:

Mary Krook resident of Bony Lake, stated the lake is being destroyed and “it is suicide to put development before environment”. She added that water levels have dropped causing need for new wells, and that wetlands are disappearing on Bony Lake. Ms. Krook was concerned about ten homes being placed on the parcel of ‘sugar sand’. She said a solution would be to turn this property into a forest conservation area and is “willing to do anything to preserve springs that feed Bony Lake” and asked for others to join in.

Supervisor Maki asked if there was opposition to this when the wetland area was logged. Ms. Krook answered ‘yes’, that she was opposed. Maki asked if there are any undeveloped lots on the lake. Answer: ‘yes’. For clarification, AZA Furtak stated at this time that logging and removal of a beaver dam was done by Mr. Ecton but not by the current applicant.

Jim Krook, Bony Lake resident is also opposed; he stated he has walked the land including the wetlands, placed trees on the logged area, and believes Lot 3 and part adjoining it is part of the watershed of the Eau Claire chain and part of the aquifer. He said “anything built on Lot 3 will change that”.

Paul Krook, grew up on the lake and reported things changed since the beaver dam was blown up, and the land

logged; he believes building there will degrade the area.

Judy Scholz, Bony Lake, said PUDs are becoming more popular and doesn't want to see temporary high density development on Eau Claire lakes, especially Bony Lake". She believes Bony Lake was possibly erroneously classified as Class 1.

Blaine Olson, Bony Lake, presented an overhead of a 1971 DNR map. He questioned the rain garden plans, was concerned about ordinance wording of "protection" and actual follow through. He stated he protects and preserves his property on Bony Lake and believes others should as well.

Lee Wiesner, Bony Lake: Presented a handout with lake measurements taken excluding Lot 3 and part of 4 (spawning ground); he said he began at the north side of the point and explained where tests were taken. He referred to the shallowness of the lake at that point and said that area only allows for canoe or rowboat use. Regarding that area AZA Furtak said no docks would be allowed there per John Spangberg (DNR).

Tom Johnson, Bony Lake: Said there is a realtor whose client does not want to place an offer on an adjacent cottage because of the possible PUD "across the road" and added this may bring about a degradation of values. He stated the question is not whether ten units are allowed but whether the amount of information in the conditional use permit is sufficient and believes it is not. He added that the Town said they have struggled long and hard w/ this issue and they didn't deny but modified it. He wants to see a public trust document for protection and management.

Carole LeBreck, Bony Lake: Referred to there being one dock when the property was a resort with six cabins from the 1940s to the '70s which was "far from the shallows". She was concerned about cumulative effects on the lake and wants open discussion w/ scientific detail and consideration. She asked that the county's own strong, protective language and guidelines be followed and felt it a realistic request to seek input from tribes, citizen's groups, protective agencies, etc. adding that she doesn't believe subdivisions are compatible w/ single family residences.

Dan Fedderly: (Representative of an engineering firm, requested by Tom Johnson [above]) stated the preliminary data seemed adequate but in this situation, because of water resources, the storm water design must be evaluated and believes the remaining site must be included in delineation. He expressed concerned about the transportation element and roads being built to adequate capacity and quality standards and encouraged seeking DOT input for additional accesses. Fedderly was also concerned about the 'conditions' placed on owners by the Developer stating they "should be in codified in the process"

There was another question regarding the area delineated and AZA Furtak again clarified that delineation has been completed on the whole area but only Lot 3 was flagged. Following questions about possible restrictions Director Kastroosky explained deed restrictions are recorded by affidavit.

Dixie Chermak Barnes Supervisor **reported** the [Town] vote was unanimous to approve seven (7) units, Lot 3 to be put into conservancy, and remaining properties to follow all of Applicant's 'Document C' (purple sheet in plan/handout). Supervisor Maki asked Ms. Chermak how many undeveloped lots there are on Bony Lake; she did not know without researching it. Regarding road widths in Barnes, Ms. Chermak stated the Town does have restrictions for roads, safety, etc. Mr. Swan said there was no public input at the Town meeting regarding "seven" units. Director Kastroosky reported the Town held a special meeting in June which he and Mike Furtak attended to answer questions.

Atty. Jack Carlson handed out a summary of materials submitted during the course of application. He expressed concerns which were discussed at the June 2005 meeting regarding the EIA's inadequacies. Advised the Committee to consider Dan Fedderly's input as well as John Spangberg's and stated there are legitimate concerns regarding density issues and he doesn't believe there is adequate information to make a decision and that specific conditions should have been made prior to this point. Mr. Carlson added that "the Town's decision should be taken into account very seriously, to table or deny it."

Chairman Jardine called for a break at 3:05 PM; Public Hearing resumed at 3:15.

Rebuttal:

David Swan: Presented a handout he received 08/17/05 from the Army Corps of Engineers which concurs with the wetland delineation report. He stated that no roadwork, nor building, may be done until the stormwater management plan is completed, and that will be done once they have approval. Kastroosky said there was no "NR216" when the ordinance was written which formerly was a county requirement and now is a state requirement. Also, "they cannot do a plan until they know how many residences are approved -- that is potentially down the road". Jardine stated that regarding the Barnes meeting and their setting it at seven units and 'conservancy', "that came out of left field". Mr. Swan said he is applying for "ten units or nothing" and "six times I asked lake owners for their input on shoreland restoration, it was never received".

Kevin Swan reported they asked Director Kastroosky if there's was a complete application, if they had provided

everything asked for and the response was “yes”. In reference to concern over the docks, they cannot even proceed without DNR approval. Mr. Swan pointed out differences between the Krook’s land versus Ecton’s concerning wetland areas, quoting from the wetland specialist’s soil borings report.

B. STRUNZGARTEN, INC., OWNER AND DON ZIGMON, AGENT REZONE REQUEST (Residential-2 to Residential-3) on 19.23-acre parcel (ID #004-1227-01), described as part of the West ½ of the SE ¼ of the SW ¼, lying East of Sweet Lake Rd in Section 36, Township 45 North, Range 9 West, Town of Barnes.

John Zigmon: 36-year-property owner petitioned to reclassify his parcel for uniformity in zoning. Director Kastrosky said there is separation of 7 and 12 acres because of the road which was later abandoned by Barnes, creating parcels with two different zones. He also noted the application shouldn’t state the request is for “uniform lot division” but “uniform zoning”. He also said when this agenda item was publicly noticed only one parcel number was listed, which was in error. He recommended that if the Town, the Zoning Committee, or citizens feel it is too confusing, it would be sent back to be republished. AZA Furtak added that with the abandonment of Old Sweet Lake Road, it could end up with an undescribed portion “not now described legally anywhere”.

Speaking to clarify the Town’s decision, Supervisor Chermak said they denied this, and asked to “bring it back for R-3 being made R-2”. No one else spoke in approval / disapproval.

Kastrosky reported on letters of concern / opposition on file from: Mary Lou Blegen; Jerry Bartho; Timothy Blegen; Alan / Patricia Nielsen; David Oren; Dawn / Ted Buck; and John / Lisa Shaughnessy (of Hendrickson Family Residential Trust).

C. LANCE REASOR REZONE REQUEST – Residential-1 to Residential-Recreational Business for a portion of his 43-acre parcel (ID #024-103910990) described as Lots 10 and 11 of his preliminary plat more accurately described as, the portion of land contained in the above legal description lying between County Highway H and the grade. Located in Govt. Lot 4, Sec. 17, Township 47 North, Range 8 West, Town of Iron River.

Lance Reasor presented maps to the Committee explaining layout of the parcel. He said he felt it best use as R-RB for a small storage building. Kastrosky said the Town disapproved without listing a reason on the form. Chairman Jardine read from the Iron River minutes which stated “commercial should not be mixed w/ residential”.

No one else spoke in approval.

Speaking in disapproval:

Tom Boggess stated he lives across the road and is opposed to this in a residential area.

Kastrosky said there is a file letter but it pertains to confusion on this stating “lot division” and is not rezone.

D. STEVE APFELBACKER, OWNER / ROBERT MICK, AGENT REZONE REQUEST – Forestry-1 to Residential-Recreational Business on a .27-acre parcel (ID #006-1058-04-000 and #006-1058-02-005) located in part of the SE ¼ of the NE 1/4, Section 28, Township 50 North, Range 4 West, Town of Bayfield.

Steve Apfelbacker stated clarification is necessary to make the approximate three foot strip consistent w/ parcels in the immediate area. Director Kastrosky reported Town Board approval is on file, approved “to conform with surrounding zoning districts, consistent with the land use plan”. He added it was an oversight on the Zoning Department’s part and came to [the Dept.’s] attention with a potential lot division. He said there are no letters of opposition or support on file. Supervisor Maki questioned why we put people through this and Kastrosky answered “because maps are official and part of zoning ordinance, so we have to go through this process”.

No one spoke in approval / disapproval.

E. JIM BLOSS, TOM BLOSS, JERRY BLOSS, JOHN BLOSS, AND PATRICK ST. GERMAIN – REZONE REQUEST (Forestry-2 to Residential-1) on 12.50-acre parcel (ID #024-1032-02-001) described as Lot 1 of CSM 1250 located in the NE 1/4 of the SW ¼, Section 12, Township 47 N, Range 8 W, Town of Iron River.

Pat St. Germain represented the applicants stating they submitted an application and thought it was approved. Director Kastrosky reported this was a court decision, an adverse possession case, the Forestry/County did not own it and they won the court case on adverse possession. He added that “we permitted the structure, however, it is not allowed in an F-2 zone so this is hopefully the last step in approval and there are no letters opposition or support on file”.

No one spoke in approval / disapproval.

5. **ADJOURNMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING:** Motion by Maki to adjourn at 3:59 PM, seconded by Beeksma and carried.

6. **CALL TO ORDER OF ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING:** By Chairman Jardine at 3:59 PM.

7. **ROLL CALL:** Beeksma, Jardine, Maki, Rondeau – present; Compton, absent/excused.

8. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S):** Motion by Rondeau to approve the June 27, 2005 Special Meeting minutes, second by Beeksma; carried. Motion by Beeksma, second by Rondeau to approve the July 21, 2005 minutes; carried.

9. **BUSINESS:**

A. HAROLD ECTON, OWNER / DAVID SWAN, AGENT CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST -Planned Unit Development (ten individual units, under condominium ownership and two accessory structures with no more than a total of ten stalls), on 9.8-acre parcel (ID# 044-1070-09) in Govt. Lot 6, Township 44 North, Range 9 West, Town of Barnes.

Chairman Jardine said “testimony has been heard, application received and approved for the EIA, we have four choices: approve, table, send back to the Town because of miscommunication of number of units, or deny”. Jardine said he believes “they have followed the requirements”.

Supervisor Beeksma said “just about all of the opposition wanted more information. I want to know what information is lacking”. Jim Krook said part of the property is an inlet, it is not defined where water into Bony Lake comes from. Beeksma then asked “doesn’t the delineation satisfy”? Crook answered, “no”, and stated he has walked this in spring and “you are going to have runoff into the lake. If there’s an inlet in Bony Lake, the inlet is in that corner”. Mr. Johnson said there is a disclaimer on the wetland delineation summary, that it was not a complete delineation wetland report”.

Jardine then asked for Kastrosky’s opinion. He responded saying, “the ordinance is our guidance, he read from the ordinance subdivision section as well as the E.I.A. section and added, “these are residential units in residential zoning, believe it is best use of the land, buffer zone, best development for the property”. He also said he doesn’t like the dock situation and we don’t have authority there “but it is a big question mark”. Kastrosky stated that “we operate by standards, if you don’t like the standards, then change them-- can’t measure emotion but only standards”.

David Swan stated they “have to follow DNR guidelines”.

Supervisor Rondeau said [opponents] “keep asking for more information, information is provided, Army Corps information, DNR dock issue [information]”. He said he has enough information to make a decision and added that a conditional use permit is a powerful tool for the Zoning Committee to check on them. Maki agreed with Rondeau and said he’s still concerned about the number of Bony Lake lots yet to be built on.

Jardine asked a question of Town Supervisor Dixie Chermak. He stated that there have been comments alluding to the fact that people, neighbors, relatives, etc. influenced the decision in the Town of Barnes. Ms. Chermak stated it did not influence her decision.

Director Kastrosky said if there are reservations regarding the amount of information received, there is the option to make approval contingent upon the stormwater plan. He added this also would require a condo plat and a condo declaration needs to be forthcoming.

Beeksma said the question yet remains regarding delineation “done so far, with Mr. Krook asking that we do a complete delineation-- what’s the difference”? David Swan quoted from the ‘determination’ regarding the manicured lawn area. He clarified, “that area was not flagged, but they did map it with a GPS unit and wetland boundaries are indicated”. Krook said his “concern is runoff into lake that comes from Lot 3, and Hwy 27; if a building goes on Lot 3, runoff will come through there”. Mary Krook stated “we are concerned about the wetland and that the committee is ignoring the science”.

Rondeau made a motion to approve a ten (10) unit PUD with restrictions as proposed on ‘Document C’ referencing shoreland, building and dock issues including shoreland restoration which is covered on the “yellow colored sheet” [attached to these minutes]. Second by Maki; motion carried.

B. STRUNZGARTEN, INC., OWNER AND DON ZIGMON, AGENT REZONE REQUEST (Residential-2 to Residential-3) on 19.23-acre parcel (ID #004-1227-01), described as part of the West ½ of the SE ¼ of the SW ¼, lying East of Sweet Lake Rd in Section 36, Township 45 North, Range 9 West, Town of Barnes.

Director Kastrosky said considering the confusion on this matter, before the Committee denies it, he would request they send it back to the Town. Motion by Maki, seconded by Beeksma, to table, send back to the Town of Barnes for clarification. Mr. Zigmon then requested this be heard after the first of June, 2006 because of his schedule. Maki amended his motion to reconsider this after June 2006; second by Beeksma; carried.

C. LANCE REASOR REZONE REQUEST – Residential-1 to Residential-Recreational Business for a portion of his 43-acre parcel (ID #024-103910990) described as Lots 10 and 11 of his preliminary plat more accurately described as, the portion of land contained in the above legal description lying between County Highway H and the grade. Located in Govt. Lot 4, Sec. 17, Township 47 North, Range 8 West, Town of Iron River.

Kastrosky in summary reminded the Committee the Town denied this application. Motion by Beeksma, second by Rondeau, to deny; motion carried.

D. STEVE APFELBACKER, OWNER / ROBERT MICK, AGENT REZONE REQUEST – Forestry-1 to Residential-Recreational Business on a .27-acre parcel (ID #006-1058-04-000 and #006-1058-02-005) located in part of the SE ¼ of the NE 1/4, Section 28, Township 50 North, Range 4 West, Town of Bayfield.

Motion by Maki, second by Beeksma to approve, carried.

E. JIM BLOSS, TOM BLOSS, JERRY BLOSS, JOHN BLOSS, AND PATRICK ST. GERMAIN – REZONE REQUEST (Forestry-2 to Residential-1) on 12.50-acre parcel (ID #024-1032-02-001) described as Lot 1 of CSM 1250 located in the NE 1/4 of the SW ¼, Section 12, Township 47 N, Range 8 W, Town of Iron River.

Motion by Beeksma to approve, Maki seconded; carried.

Agenda Review and Alteration

F. SCOTT JOHNSON EXPANSION OF SALVAGE YARD –Town of Eileen (Tabled on 7/21/05):

Kastrosky noted that Town Board input had not been received last month although it had been approved by them last April, but actually not mailed (to the Zoning Dept.). It was received July 22, 2005. Scott Johnson presented photos of the berm he installed. Motion Beeksma, second by Rondeau, to approve this expansion; carried.

G. LANCE REASOR PRELIMINARY PLAT REVIEW – Town of Iron River (Tabled 05/19/05):

Lance Reasor, and Tim Oksuita presented the preliminary plat map. Kastrosky reviewed the procedure. Maki questioned the soil conditions present. Answer was “sand”. Kastrosky reported that roads have been installed, and Lot 4 lakebed issues have been resolved, TBA was received May 12th. Motion by Maki, second by Rondeau, to approve; carried. Kastrosky said the final plat will be on the agenda next month.

H. TOWN OF RUSSELL OVERLAY DISTRICT – Tabled on 7/21/05:

Kastrosky reminded the Committee they wanted to look at this again after the Town made some changes. Atty. John Carlson explained the overlay district plan and reviewed the history for Maki, who had been absent during past discussions.

Maki questioned old growth timber and how the determination is made and how it can be taken from owners as well as how historic sites are determined. Regarding the timber, Carlson said a certified forester would make determinations. Maki was opposed to the Town’s processes with this and stated people were not allowed to speak at meetings, and that this was manipulated by the Town. Town Supervisor Dave Good replied that public notices had been put out for over 1-1/2 years and Maki had never appeared at any of the meetings; he said people were not denied due process, and again repeated that Maki never attended any meetings.

At this point Chairman Jardine stopped the discussion as it became futile. (After the following motion, Mr. Good apologized to Mr. Maki and the Committee for his “outburst” which he acknowledged as inappropriate.).

Director Kastrosky reported that last month's decision to proceed with placing on the Full Board's agenda after corrections, and making it agreeable with Corp. Counsel Bussey legally, was approved at the Town's current meeting. Motion by Rondeau, second by Beeksma, to **approve** and **pass to the Full Board**. Three 'yes' votes; one 'no' - Maki opposed. Motion carried.

I. VICKI LYNN HANSEN 29-UNIT CAMPGROUND: Tabled on 7/21/05

This item was **withdrawn** as it is awaiting a land survey.

J. IRENE ZAMBORI SPECIAL USE REQUEST - Second Residence on Parcel: (#050-1001-03) SW ¼ of SW ¼, Section 1, Township 48 N, Range 5 W, Town of Washburn.

This Item was withdrawn and removed from the agenda.

K. MICHELLE NELSON SPECIAL USE REQUEST - Residence in Commercial Zone: (#042-1093-10) .374-acre parcel in Lots 5-9, Block 10, Port Wing Proper, Section 29, Township 50 N, Range 8 W, Town of Port Wing.

Michelle Nelson said she has been trying unsuccessfully to obtain a mortgage to fix her place up and they won't accept it because it is in a commercial zone. Kastrosky said he has personally spoken with the underwriters and "they won't be budged".

Motion by Rondeau, second by Maki, to **approve including permission to rebuild the existing structure in the event the structure burns down, unless prohibited by ordinance**. Motion carried.

L. JAMES BIGOTT WAIVER OF EIA: .8-acre parcel (ID# 034-1123-01) in Lots 7-9, Block 5, Namakagon Village, Section 7, Township 43N, Range 5W, Town of Namakagon.

Anne and Jim Bigott reported that they have a resort with two cabins and a residential unit; they want to incorporate a bar and bait store in an existing building and have a sanitation system big enough to accommodate it. Kastrosky said the garage/storage building formerly was a house which they want to convert and expand as a bar and a conditional use permit will be presented in the future. He added there is very little environmental impact in this situation which is Garden Lake Resort, however, there is concern about the "road loop" and a safety issue with that. The Applicants stated they will deal with that, possibly blocking a portion of it off.

Motion by Rondeau, second by Beeksma, to **waive the EIA**; motion carried.

M. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION – REVIEW OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR PIKE'S BAY SANITARY:
Town of Bayfield

Kastrosky said from his perspective there was nothing new to provide the Committee. Neil Schultz reported on information received since last month's meeting, and presented portions of various meeting minutes, and other documents and letters with some sections highlighted.

Regarding a report from Strand & Assoc.(Engineering firm), Schultz believes it is just "a lot of personal opinions"; he went through highlighted areas of the document with the Committee. Neil said originally it was recommended they [Sanitary District] purchase more acreage than they actually did. Schultz believes they are in violation of their conditional use permit as well as DNR regulations and said the facility is 180' from his property, one a 220' encroachment on his buildings and wants them to move their buildings.

Kastrosky stated that he had asked Atty. Nordling's position and it was basically "it is OK now", adding, he didn't say that we need to take action now. Supervisor Beeksma, referred to Nordling's letter which stated they were to "provide setback between units". Beeksma added that he believes "they [Sanitary District] knew it all along". Schultz requested the Department write them letter telling them they are in violation.

Supervisor Rondeau requested the Dept. set up a packet like Neil Schultz did and submit it. Supervisor Maki said "there are three different units involved here plus units of government, we need to throw it to them". Director Kastrosky said he is not comfortable in writing the letter. Rondeau suggested he "run it by Mark [Abeles Allison], maybe he would [write it]".

Beeksma said, "it's not that difficult, I don't agree with Karl, this is no different from any other violation". Kastrosky said, "but with a house we have total control". Beeksma suggested sending the same letter to the DNR and all parties involved. Kastrosky then agreed to send a letter. Maki said "this all came to us, we approved it here at this Committee, we can't pass it off". Maki stated that Neil has already done the work [for us] and suggested the letters be sent certified.

N. CITIZENS' CONCERNS / INPUT:

- Supervisor Maki again brought up the Town of Russell proposal stating people were not welcome at meetings, they could say only a few words and then were asked to sit down and "it was not fair shake with what came to us".
- Maki stated that the [Town of Russell] old growth timber needs to have the procedure clarified and discussed; he wants to see the old growth situation voluntary, not forced.
- Re daytime meetings: Jardine reviewed other counties who have daytime meetings, and reported that custodial staff won't be here after 9:00 PM any longer. Kastrosky said he needs to know to schedule for the next agenda.

O. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION - NR115:

- Kastrosky stated the public hearings are over and the counties cannot support it as drafted, but have gained a little more control now. Reps from each county will be meeting in the future.

P. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION - 2006 BUDGET

- Kastrosky reported "we are held to a 2% increase for 2006; there are no big changes, we now have an office in Cable to save mileage with cost \$1500 a year total, saving in efficiency, gas, etc."

Q. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION – STRATEGIC PLANNING

- Director Kastrosky stated he completed the plan and turned it in to the Administrator's office.

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

11. ADJOURNMENT: Motion by Rondeau, second by Beeksma to adjourn at 5:52 PM; carried.

**Karl L. Kastrosky, Zoning Administrator
Bayfield County Zoning Dept.**

Prepared by MJJ on 9/9/05
Approved by 9/12/05 by KLK

Attachment: Document C – Bony Lake – Conditional Use Permit

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

K/ZC/Minutes/2005/Aug