



GRANT COUNTY SOUTH DAKOTA  
PLANNING AND ZONING OFFICE

210 East 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Milbank, SD 57252-2499  
Phone: 605-432-7580  
Fax: 605-432-7515

### Minutes for the meeting of Grant County Planning Commission

**Members present:** Tom Adler Tom Pillatzki Nancy Johnson Richard Hansen Bob Spartz Mike Mach

**Alternates present:** Don Weber Jeff McCulloch

**Members absent:** Mark Leddy

**Others present:** Todd Kays Luke Muller Amber Christenson Linda Lindgrer Miles Schumacher Claire Frazee Al Robish Bob Hicks Duane Dolen Donna Dolen Grace Beck Wendy Storm Steve Storm Bob Tuttle Diana Bren Teresa Kaaz Dan Kaaz Greg Wall Joeline Hicks Bert Loehrer Mark Lounsbury Dave Page Tracy Rosenberg Kristi Mogen Mark Mauersberger Nichole Bury Jerry Bury Richard Pike Kevin Krakow Roger Solum Bobbie Bohlen Helen Humphreys Laura Kelly David Lau Kelly Owen Sheri Meagher Laurie Folk Bill Street

Agenda for the meeting of Grant County Planning Commission/Board of Adjustment.

Meeting Date: **June 11, 2018** **Meeting Time: 4:00 P.M.** **Court House Basement**

1. **Call Meeting of the Planning Commission to Order**
2. Items to be added to agenda by Board Members or Staff- none
3. Invitation to address the Planning Commission- none
4. Approval of Agenda Motion by Mach second by Pillatzki carries 6-0
5. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. Monday, May 14, 2018 Motion by Mach second by Hansen carries 6-0.
6. Plats
  - a. Steven N & Wendy Storm, owners of SE1/4 of Section 14, Township 120 North, Range 51 West of the 5<sup>th</sup> P.M., Grant County, South Dakota request the plat of Storm Addition, in the SE1/4 of S14, T120N R 51. (Mazeppa Township) Motion to approve by Pillatzki second by Spartz carries 6-0.
  - b. Clayton Tucholke, owner of portion of SE1/4 Section 2, Township 118 North, Range 49 West of the 5<sup>th</sup> P.M., Grant County, South Dakota requests the plat of Lot 4 Peiker's addition of SE1/4 S2, T118N, R 49W. (Georgia Township) Motion by Spartz second by Adler carries 6-0.
7. Planning Commission work session on Grant County Wind Energy System Zoning Regulations.
  - a. Setback Discussion with the Planning & Zoning Board, the meeting was turned over to Todd & Luke at this time:

Agenda: Brief overview of work session topics, Explanation of work session process, Planning Commission Discussion, Based upon Wind Forum and submitted comments  
Topics: Setbacks, Decommission, Flicker, Noise, Lighting, Misc

Work Session Process: Not a public forum, Time reserved for Planning Commission Discussion, Planning Commission may ask questions of the audience, Public will be allowed to submit comments based upon the planning commission discussion and outcomes prior to next work session, Handouts/questionnaires

1<sup>st</sup> meeting question "Does the Planning Commission want to develop rules that in effect "zone out" wind energy systems? – Answer was "no"

Does the Planning Commission feel that the wind regulations need to be reviewed and possibly updated? – Answer was "yes"

Setbacks: General Questions to consider regarding setbacks?

Setback from What? What should the setback be? How is setback measured?

Current Regulations:

Off-site residences, business, churches, and buildings owned and/or maintained by a governmental entity and public buildings = 1,000 feet

On-site or lessor's residence 500'

Centerline of public right-of-way shall be at least five hundred (500) feet or one hundred ten percent (110%) the height of the wind turbines, whichever distance is greater

Distance from any property line shall be at least five hundred (500) feet or one hundred ten percent (110%) the height of the wind turbine, whichever distance is greater

Setback Suggestions: 1,500 feet,  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile from residence, 2 mile setback for non-participants w/ waiver to their property line

Setbacks Questions & Discussion:

1. Is there something else we should be establishing setbacks from? Cities? Lakes?  
The discussion and questions summarized are: Municipality because the growth of a town could be cramped, LaBolt Dam outside the municipal boundaries, define lake as with residences or a fishery. Public Parks- city/state, LaBolt, no setback at the county level, US Fish & Wildlife. Lakes- with residences or developed, Deuel County ranked the lakes and tiered setbacks, could list lakes such as Albert, LaBolt, Twin Brooks Lonesome. Airports-
2. Do we measure setback from a residence or a residence's property line?  
What do you measure from- residence versus property line to tower base, whatever is greater x is the property line at 110% AND y is from the house at 1000 feet, Poll of P&Z shows they are ok with current regulations of base to front door. Consensus is to keep both measurements conceptually.
3. Do we want to set a single setback from residences or differentiate between participating and non-participating?  
Current regulations, would anyone want to separate them to make more regulations, using conditions make more work for everyone if you are going to be giving everyone the same condition anyway and a variance just slows the process down if there is a consensus for the zoning rules it would be better to just say that, burden of safety in the message that a car to be sold has a known problem, you should state that up front so it is known to the buyer but it is not the role of the government to get in the middle of a transaction, just like a realtor selling a house the government has no role in the middle of the transaction.
4. What should the Setback be?  
Should it be X amount or a distance the height of the tower to 500 feet and then 110%, there was no response to the question if it should change, Kays asked for suggestions for models and stated it was  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile in Roberts County plus footage, Codington county is 1500 feet for the first 500 ft tower and 2  $\frac{1}{2}$  feet for every 1 foot over 1500 which would make a 600 ft tower setback 1750 feet. Model suggestions are: baseline with current, 2 miles- no, 1  $\frac{1}{2}$  mi yes from Tom, 1 mile setback yes from Spartz, Pillatzki and Mach,  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile from Pillatzki and Hansen. Base + multiplier: 2640 is 2.6 times the current, Pillatzki suggested  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile & 1 mile with multiplier. A poll of who is ok with the current setbacks with support from 4/6 members to see the model with Johnson asking for  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile & 1500 ft, Adler & Hansen asking to see 1500 ft. Spartz would like to see model for 1000 feet with multiplier at 700 ft. Pillatzki would like to see multiplier with 500 ft & 1500 ft.  
Models that will be reviewed at next meeting are: 1000 ft,  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile, 1500 ft, 2640 ft, 1 mile, 1  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile, current and  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile and 1500 ft with multipliers.  
Summation- 1500 ft municipality setback minimum so to not hamstring growth, include planned developments in setbacks, list the lakes and include model discussion, public parks and airports fall back to FAA. Models will show the ability to site in Grant County and provide a matrix to others.

Please get all information you wish to review to Krista and she will scan and share with the group to the websites.

What is next: First District Staff will apply suggested setbacks to GIS modeling, Make recommendation at July Meeting

July/August Meetings: Setback analysis, Flicker, Noise, Lighting Decommissioning, Other

September: Public Forum to react to recommendations

October: Adoption Process

Kays turned the agenda back over to Johnson and excused himself from the meeting at this time.

8. Open address to Planning Commission- none

9. Matters for Board Discussion/Staff Report- none

10. Next meetings:

a. Regular meeting: **Tuesday- July 10, 2018** at 4 PM- made note of day change.

11. Executive Session (if necessary)- none

1. Adjourn as the Grant County Planning Commission Motion by Mach second by Hansen carries 6-0.

Krista Atyeo-Gortmaker  
Planning and Zoning Officer  
Grant County