
From: Tom Willan <tom@ironmanbuildings.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 9:01 AM
To: Violante, Todd; Gault, David; Management, Risk; Lane, Roger; Lowndes, Daniel; Parisi, Joseph
Cc: Julia Willan; Tom Willan; Bollig, Jerome; Peters, Steven; Kiefer, Timothy; Smith, Sarah; Doolan, Michele
Subject: Open records request for all communication regarding petition 11788
Attachments: zlr meeting video summary 02082022 with notes pdf.pdf

CAUTION: External Email - Beware of unknown links and attachments. Contact Helpdesk at 266-4440 if unsure

Good morning everyone,

We are specifically asking under the opens records law for all email communication regarding rezoning petition 11788 that is not a part of the official record in legistar. We want any and all email communication from any Dane County employees, zlr members, DCS, executive Parisi, board members, insurance companies, outside legal counsel, corporation counsel staff, and the Town of Cottage Grove, including any letters, document logs, reports, documents, pictures, police reports, investigative reports, zoning files, as it mentions zoning petition 11788, willan, Tom Willan Thomas willan, Julia Willan, willans, 4407 Vilas Hope Rd, parcel # 0711-072-9971-5 and anything you have as it pertains to those people and the specific subject matter.

Mr. Gault clearly was never part of the February 8, 2022 hearing, how could Mr. Gault know what the ZLR board wanted or what question was being proposed? Mr. Gault references DCO § 10.004(15) in the first sentence of his opinion as being part of the question, but there is nowhere in the February 8, 2022 video transcripts any reference to this. How can you have a fair hearing, if there is ex parte communication going on behind the petitioners back. It is obvious that something had to be communicated but yet there is no notification of it. One of the first things is when someone's rights are being challenged, they receive proper notification of the proceedings so they might object. Dane County cannot take 3 ½ weeks to release an opinion that is not factual to the facts of our petition or the question asked. We want to know what is going on and how this opinion was presented by the board to the Corporation counsel. It appears Mr. Gaults opinion doesn't corelate with the February 8, 2022 video of the ZLR committee.

We have a meeting tomorrow so we would ask you to expedite these documents for our review?
We also ask that you make the attached letter to the ZLR committee a part of the official record,
We ask that when DCS submit documents as part of the record that they use the next number instead of moving DCS documents to Item, 1, 2, 3, These were filed last and they need to stay in order they were filed for court review
we ask that somebody clarify how Mr. Gault came up with his questions he obviously hasn't seen the February 8th hearing or read the transcripts I sent him and the board on. Please forward me the documents I requested or let me know what I need to do to obtain them?

Thanks, Tom and Julia Willan

The Willan's Time tracked Summary of 02/08/2022 ZLR board hearing from video starting at 10.09 minutes of the video

We have put the following summary transcripts of the February 8, 2022 hearing and we added important information in red below for the board to read. The number sequence is written in minutes-seconds for where it is located in the video and who said what. A lot of the words are verbatim, but some are a summary of the words said. Everyone clearly read it and check it against the video.

Attendees to the public hearing, who were preselected panelists were, Supervisor Bollig, Supervisor Doolan, Supervisor Smith, Supervisor Kiefer, Dane County Planning Todd Violante, Dane County zoning administrator Roger Lane, DCS Brian Standing who was there to discuss with the committee recertification of the Farm preservation ordinances later on in the meeting. The Willans were finally granted panelist status 9 minutes later to verbally participate using their smart phone.

At 10.09 of the video recording Bollig announces Petition 11788 to the ZLR board and Tells Roger to state the status of the petition. Ends at 10.16

At 10.17 DCS Lane states the petition was postponed from the January 25, 2022 meeting, to allow the committee to look all the information in the record, there is some housekeeping tonight, there was additional information sent to the board by both the Willans and DCS, There were two letters from the willan to the zlr board that DCS was copied on, there was a biased ex parte communication on January 31, 2022 between Roger Lane, to all the ZLR board members, and Todd Violante, trying to discredit the Willans, The Willans were not notified until 5 days later on February 4, 2022 of the ex parte biased email communication between Lane and the ZLR board, but Violante states in the February 4, 2022 email that in anticipation of the February 8, 2022 hearing notified the Willans on Friday, February 4, 2022 at 5:28 PM of the ex parte communication by Lane. The Willans responded to the February 4, 2022 email of Violante, and the contents of all those emails, and the letters were told by Lane to the board there had to be a motion to become a part of the official record. Ends at 11.58

The first objection we have is ex parte communication between DCS and ZLR board members. I remind this board, that constitutional due process requires honesty, integrity, and fair play. In this case Mr. Lane is communicating by email about petition 11788, behind the petitioners back for the sole purpose of influencing the board's decision to deny petition 11788. Mr. Lane is trying to influence the board's decision by first introducing an inference of a "wedding barn" as evidence that we are changing our zoning to have a wedding barn. All the while, knowing full well that "Wedding barn" was never introduced or mentioned by the petitioners. We stand by our position Mr. Lane is a liar, he has personally lied to the petitioners, he has lied under oath in his deposition testimony, he continues to lie to this board all the while the board refuses to address the credibility of Mr. Lane. We deem it highly inappropriate that this board continues to allow Mr. Lane to be involved in petition, while having inappropriate ex parte communication with the board members to influence their decision. The record speaks for Mr. Lanes credibility, and the boards refusal to address these issues is a violation of our due process.

At 11.58 of the recording Supervisor Bollig states he would entertain a motion to make the documents part of the official record, ends at 12.05

At 12.06 there was a motion by Supervisor Smith to accept the documents into the record,

At 12.20 Supervisor Doolan seconds the Supervisor Smith motion,

At 12.40 by unanimous consent the documents were accepted into the record,

At 12.59 Violante starts updating the committee, he refers the ZLR board to a February 3, 2022 letter REC 1 of the official file, announces the Willans are in attendance, and that he would answer questions,

At 14.07 Supervisor Kiefer interjects to recuse himself from voting on the petition Ends at 15.19

At 15.20 Supervisor Bollig asks the committee if there are any questions,

At 15.28 Violante raises his hand and is acknowledged to speak by Supervisor Bollig,

At 15.30 Violante states that based upon Supervisor Kiefer's comments, that if any members need more information, or if any members want an opinion from Corp counsel that could help them make their decision, or if there are some conditions that could be explored, these are all things on the tables, and if the board doesn't feel they are in a position to act this evening, they can postpone, if there is sufficient information to act tonight, I just want to remind the board, that if there is anything they need, given the complexity and amount of material that DCS would help in anyway they can in their decision ends at 16.35

At 16.35 Supervisor Bollig asks the committee if there is anything someone wants to inquire about? Ends at 16.45

At 16.45 of the hearing recording, Supervisor Doolan tells the committee after DCS Violante gets done speaking she knows the DCS recommendations, she feels she is not fully equipped to make a decision, so she wants to hear from corporation counsel on recommended action. Ends at 17.16

At 17.20 DCS Violante asks specifically are there any specific questions DCs can pose to corporation counsel. Ends at 17.36

At 17.36 Supervisor Doolan states, due to the fact that there are no known uses, and the fact the property supports the current zoning, wants to know what conditions of specific uses, in terms of making conditional use permits or conditional use decisions, ends at 18.17

The record speaks for itself in regard to the property use. First thing is Ms. Doolan has to understand under clear Wisconsin express zoning law, the term "use" in order to change a zoning district is not a requirement nor a prerequisite in order to make a change in zoning. A zoning district is a created abstract of uses a citizen can and cannot do in a particular zoning area. As long as a citizens property is located within the confines of a zoning district and supports a purported use of choices for the citizen, it cannot be denied. The Dane County Board wrote and approved the FP-B zoning district ordinance with the full knowledge of the range of uses required under Farm Preservation law for certification. Now DCS doesn't like the law as applied to the petitioners property, therefore they want to conflate issues by asking the ZLR board to simply ignore the law, by opposing the legal, lawful zoning petition 11788 because they want to determine the legal lawful vehicle to obtain zoning. DCS has run out of options with this petition, and DCS are substituting their personal opinion for real evidence as it pertains to petition 11788 and Wisconsin law.

It is clearly in the record; however I will tell everyone what the law actually says and it is your choice to accept the truth or vote against us? What Wisconsin law say's and Mr. Violante confirmed during the

January 25, 2022 hearing, is that any citizen of Dane county under DCZ, who may want to change their zoning district, get to decide if they want to look outside their current district for a more appealing district that fits their property dreams and desires. You must first talk with the Town chairperson before you file an application, we did that. Then it requires the petitioners to fill out an application¹ and pay a fee to Dane County to get a petition number and a hearing date set, prior to the ZLR board hearing, a petitioner has to file another application with the Town of Cottage Grove, and pay a fee, we did that! On November 11, 2021 we then had a public hearing before the Cottage Grove Planning committee². It is obvious that neither the board nor DCS have watched these videos because they keep asking questions that were addressed in the video but are ignored both in the staff report or at the public hearing. This is substantial evidence for approval. The Town committee has asked all the same questions the ZLR board has asked, and we have explained it as a matter of law. It appears the ZLR board wants to disregard the evidence of approval and disregard what the law says because DCS are opposed for reasons wholly unrelated to zoning? We are telling the board to watch the videos so you have looked at all the evidence, and not the opinions of DCS.

At 18.23 Supervisor Bollig asks Violante if it is clear what Doolan wants, then Supervisor Bollig asks Supervisor Doolan what she is looking for? Then poses that the willans are here tonight to pose a question on their intended uses, and clarifies Supervisor Doolan is looking for specific uses Ends at 19.20

At 19.24 the Willans are made a panelist so they can answer questions of the ZLR board,

At 19.56, Supervisor Bollig tells the Willans that Supervisor Doolan has posed a question of a specific use of the property,

At 19.57 Mr. Willan begins by explaining to ZLR that the information is in the record, we plan on using the barn to run Ironman Buildings from the barn office, It cannot be done under the existing zoning because we want to use the FP-B. Todd and I had an hour and a half conversation regarding this, Violante was in agreement this is a possibility, and there are other things we can do, we went through the list, Todd seemed to be in agreement with that, one of the areas of disagreement are he wants conditions, and once again nobody has told us of any conditions, We remind the board this is not a conditional use permit, what they are proposing is conditional zoning, and we are not necessarily opposed to it, but nobody has told us what part of the ordinance doesn't qualify, The FP-B is pretty specific on what it is, and if Todd wants to discuss our conversation, because nobody has told us, I have been working 10 years to get the right zoning, and I think I have found the right zoning district I just have to get some cooperation, I remind the Board, our Town approved it, Our town represents 4000 people, and our Towns people are the recipients of the zoning, ends at 23.30

It has always been our position by the application, that the reason we are changing zoning districts is because we live in a Farm preservation district, we own an old, restored barn we have spent 100k rehabbing under building permit number M1658³, we have over the minimum 20,000 square feet to qualify for the permitted by right uses of FP-B zoning district. Ironman Buildings is just one of the many permitted by right uses we plan on using or may or may not be using. The abstract permitted by right uses of FP-B zoning district is a citizen's right in their pursuit of happiness, not a government power to

¹ REC 4 application

² REC 9 Video recording of 11-11-2021 planning commission hearing

³ REC 7 P. 50

pick and chose based upon an arbitrary and biased process after the fact. As we have stated all along, this is about an illegal control by Mr. Lane using words like “appropriate” zoning district where a biased zoning administrator thinks the legislature has granted him the power to choose the Willan’s legal lawful dreams and desires for their property. As a matter of law, Mr Lane is wrong on multiple levels, he doesn’t get to choose our legal lawful zoning vehicle in the pursuit of our happiness. Neither does Mr. Violante!

At 23.31 Supervisor Bollig asks DCS Violante if he wants to comment?

At 23.34 Violante starts commenting, DCS Violante says we had a constructive conversation on Friday, one of the primary issues, is we would not be opposed to the Willans running Ironman buildings from the barn, what is most apparent, is a conditional use permit through the current RR-2 district, however the vehicle for that is a conditional use permit through the RR-2 zoning district, as a limited family business. He says the difficulty of doing it through the FP-B zoning district because the broader permitted by right uses under the current ordinance, some of the uses are compatible, however some may not be, because some uses may have further reaching impacts, If it means the willans revise their rezoning petition to include conditional use permit, ends at 24.58

As we pointed out previously, What Mr. Violante is essentially telling this board, is they can deny this zoning petition based upon Willan’s choice to change zoning instead of applying for a conditional use permit? We don’t think the law allows this. We don’t need a conditional use permit for our dreams and desires under FP-B, therefore 59.69e doesn’t apply to this zoning petition. DCS are conflating conditional use permits with rezoning to a legal lawful zoning district that supports the willans pursuit of happiness of their dreams and desires. DCS position is the same Jim Crow crap, that wouldn’t allow black people to choose where they live, based upon an arbitrary power that whitey knows best!

At 24.59 willans state they are not interested in revising the petition for a limited family business, we discussed it on Friday, we explained that DCS wrote the laws, approved the laws, now they don’t like the law, so they want to change it as it pertains to us, at the ZLR board hearing level, ends at 27.45

At 27.48 Julia Willan asked to speak, she had a question, I guess because the Town voted unanimously for our FP-B zoning, what are the specific areas of concerns that the board doesn’t want us to have? ends at 28.20

At 28.21 DCS Violante starts out by stating the FP-B zoning is more intensive uses that are commercial in nature, that DCS are looking at the property as a residential property, DCS doesn’t see it defined as a farm, and because of the intense uses of the ordinance, that, once the zoning is granted, the full range of that zoning district is allowed by right, without any further action by the Town or county, ends at 30.33

Mr. Violante is against more intensive uses that are commercial in nature, but yet him and Mr. Lane say they wouldn’t be opposed to rezone to LC to run a heating contractor business, even though we are not in the heating contractor business, we are in the agricultural service and agricultural building business. You can have limited commercial but you cannot have the agricultural commercial uses. Commercial is defined as “occupied with or engaged in commerce or work intended for commerce”.

Does it matter whether it’s agricultural commercial that, Provide for a wide range of agriculture, agricultural accessory and agriculture-related uses, at various scales with the minimum lot area

necessary to accommodate the use. The FP-B district accommodates uses which are commercial or industrial in nature; are associated with agricultural production; require a rural location due to extensive land area needs or proximity of agricultural resources; and do not require urban services. or The Limited Commercial Zoning District is intended for small commercial uses that may need to locate in predominantly rural areas due to their often-large service areas and their need for larger lot sizes. In appearance and operation, such uses are often similar to agricultural uses and are therefore more suitable to a rural area. DCS are for Limited commercial but are against agricultural commercial? Why?

At 30.34 Willan states that the law is created by the State of Wisconsin, at that anytime DCS could have moved the permitted by right uses they disagree with and move them under conditional use, You can't change the law, tonight because you now have concerns, ends at 32.56

At 32.57 Supervisor Bollig states we are being redundant with our arguments for FP-B, and he asks us a question, are you folks saying, that either approve this the way you applied for it, or deny it, is that where we are at right now? Ends at 33.28

At 33.29 Willan answers, we are 2 months into this thing, and nobody has brought any conditions, we tried 2 months ago for corporation counsel opinion, we don't have a problem getting corporation county opinion, but we have to set the boundaries, take your concerns and put them in writing, nobody has done that, reminded the ZLR board and Staff the Town approved it unconditionally, the State of Wisconsin doesn't let you barter permitted by right uses, ends at 34.34

We asked for corporation counsel opinion 2 months ago, and DCS had the power to ask for it, they chose not to. If Dane County Corp Counsel want to get on official record, telling this board they have the legal right to deny this petition because the Willans have chosen legal lawful rezoning to FP-B instead of conditional use permits and conditional zoning, by all means, feel free to put it in writing? It is our position that any opinion by Corp counsel has to be based upon the circumstances of the material facts in record of evidence. We are saying as a matter of Law, we qualify in every aspect for FP-B zoning, we are not required by any law to file or obtain conditional use permits as part of the rezoning process, the Town of Cottage Grove has approved the petition, Dane County board has adopted the Town of Cottage Groves comprehensive land use plan as stated by Mr. Standing during latter testimony to the ZLR board, that there is no ordinance or state law that prohibits our rezoning to FP-B under petition 11788, and if the board votes to deny it, they will be violating the Willan's civil rights.

At 34.34 Supervisor Bollig asks staff what is your position on this? Ends at 34.59

At 35.00 DCS Violante starts out by saying we have differing perspectives of it, and he thinks if there is information the committee needs, and if some of it needs a legal interpretation of the things being identified, that it may be helpful to get an opinion of Corp counsel, but we need to be specific, about what is being asked, Is the willan property a farm under the states application, or under the DC ordinance definition, is the willans existing business Ironman buildings is that considered an ag related business, there are questions like that, they have stated their administrative opinion and not a legal opinion, and we differ with the willans on these interpretations, ends at 36.20

At 36.21 Supervisor Doolan starts talking, is there an advantage to running the business in the barn under FP-B and what conditions, we need to know what his business is defined as on the legal level, and I want to know where the state's law stops at the county level, under the umbrella of FP-B what are

some of the concerns and are there ways to put conditions on those concerns to restrict those things, and what we can do to accommodate the willans in what they are wanting to do, ends at 38.06

Dane County Corp counsel must address these questions because they are pertinent to the petition and the board has a right to have the correct answer. The only answer to this question is it is totally legal to run an agricultural related business from the property with the permitted by right uses of FP-B on the Willans property. The Dane County adopted the Town of Cottage Grove comprehensive plan and The Farm Preservation ordinance under chapter 91 for all their citizens equally that qualify, since the Willans property is located in a farm preservation district, The Town of Cottage Grove approved FP-B, the Willans are therefore allowed to participate under FP-B zoning.

At 38.06 Supervisor Bollig asks DCS Violante, do we know what they want?

At 38.07 DCS Violante says. I think on its face the Willans have indicated, that they would like to do their Ironman buildings conducted from the barn, now one question he would have for Roger, is, how would ironman buildings be accommodated under the FP-B zoning district, would it be a permitted use, or would it need a conditional use permit? it ends at 38.40

As the board can see below, Mr. Lane never answers this question posed by Mr. Violante. The question is “ how would ironman buildings be accommodated under the FP-B zoning district, would it be a permitted use, or would it need a conditional use permit?”

At 38.41 DCS Lane starts out by saying that this is where the planning and development office differ, that in the last claim Ironman Buildings is an agricultural accessory business, has to be on a farm, looking at the property, you would not meet the definition of a farm, because it appears there are no agricultural uses, it does not look like agricultural production as defined by the state is going on, there becomes a major problem by trying to use a farm land preservation ordinance for commercial development, that in all intensive purposes, is a typical building contractor, the intent of FP-B business, is to have agricultural businesses that are directly used in agriculture such as, coops, nurseries, farm implement dealers, that is what the FP-B zoning is geared toward, this is not the only zoning district, within the DCZO, When Mr. Willan stated he wanted to run Ironman buildings from the barn, DCS provided the Willans with 2 options, 1) obtain a conditional use permit for a limited family business, so he can run a small family business from the accessory building, or 2) change the zoning to at the time it was C-1 or C-2 or change the property to limited commercial, LC allows commercial development it allows We have designed for just such a heating contractor business, We have told Mr. Willan FP-B is not the appropriate district to have a single family residence, as well as a business, a contracting business, Ends at 44.03

Mr. Lane claims to the ZLR board, there are only two options available to the Willans, when the material fact is under Wisconsin law, there are three clear legal lawful choices for the Willans to obtain their pursuit of happiness for their dreams and desires of their property. Apply for FP-B zoning to use the unconditional permitted by right uses of the ordinance, just like every citizen who's property is located in a farm preservation district gets the opportunity to obtain FP-B zoning district.

Mr. Lane fails to inform the board that in order to apply for LC, the first thing is the Willans would have to petition the Town of Cottage Grove to move the property out of the Farm preservation district. That can only be done once a year and the deadline passed for that, then because LC is not part of the

adopted comprehensive plan, the Town of Cottage Grove would have to make some exceptions that will be a reason for conditioned zoning. See zoning that needs an exception to the comprehensive plan or a conditional use permit, is now open for conditional zoning. We don't know what the Town would do, but we know they have already agreed to FP-B zoning and LC is a longshot at best.

As far as the limited family business route, it requires by ordinance that the 75 year old barn will meet commercial codes, when as a matter of law, it can never meet commercial codes. The building was designed and built to agricultural building codes, and it is impossible to take a 75 year old barn and retrofit commercial codes. Also we have already received Town approval, we would have to throw our Town of Cottage Grove approved rezoning petition 11788, start the process all over again, to do what? Obtain the same thing we are obtaining from the rezoning petition. As we have said, this isn't about FP-B zoning, it is about DCS stopping the Willans from having legal lawful FP-B zoning when we are as a matter of law, we are entitled to it! Mr Lane testified under oath, we are an agricultural related business, the record proves we are an agricultural related business, therefore we are entitled to FP-B zoning. We are definitely not a heating contractor or anything else as Mr. Lane wants to define us, because Mr. lane hasn't submitted any tangible evidence proving his statement is factual.

At 44.04 Supervisor Bollig asks what is the recommended zoning district for that property? Ends at 44.07

At 44.08 DCS Lane states limited commercial would be an appropriate zoning district, ends at 44.35

Once again Mr. Lane can recommend anything he wants to whomever he wants except us, he isn't representing us or acting as our agent, therefore he is not in charge of choosing the vehicle we choose to pursue our happiness to obtain our dreams and desires through FP-B zoning. There is no law backing up Mr. Lanes outlandish and bold attempt at usurping our decision.

At 44.36 willan asks to make a comment, Agricultural related uses do not have to be on a farm per Dane County code, and secondly Limited Commercial is not compatible with farm preservation district, my neighbors don't have it, What fits and what the Town of Cottage Grove approved was FP-B, it fits into their comprehensive plan, Everyone wants to bypass the legal reasons why it fits, He(Lane) wants to define me as x, but we think there is a different definition, and that is the way it is going to be, he can define us how he wants, corp counsel can define how they want to define us, and ultimately this board will have to make their decision and someone will probably be looking at that decision, ends at 45.56

At 45.57 Supervisor Bollig states that the board understands what we are saying, and then goes on to say lets be crystal clear, are you saying, you folks want FP-B and you don't want anything else? Ends at 46.12

At 46.13 willan states there is no zoning district compatible with the Town Comprehensive plan, I've spent a long time learning this stuff, ends at 46.21

At 46.22 Supervisor Bollig says, its FP-B or nothing? Ends at 46.24

At 46.25 Willans states that it's pretty much it, FP-B or nothing? Ends at 46.29

At 46.29 Supervisor Bollig asks the committee if they have any more questions? Ends at 46.38

At 46.39 Supervisor Doolan has a question, as we have defined the farm preservation does the state define farm or agricultural use, similarly as DC defines it as? Ends at 46.53

At 46.57 willan states they define it exactly,

At 46.58 Supervisor Doolan says, she is asking Todd,

At 46.59 Lane says DCS Brian Standing who was addressing the ZLR later on in the agenda, and is working on the Farm preservation law, would be available for comment,

At 47.11 DCS Brian Standing states he was not prepared to speak on this petition; however he would answer some questions.

At 47.23 Supervisor Doolan asked Brian Standing, by definition, of what FP-B zoning would be, is it defined by DC the same as the state,

At 47.42 Standing states, to be clear, the state standards are minimum standards, the county can be more restrictive with their ordinance, to be clear these are minimum standards for certification of a farm land preservation ordinance, which means properties located can become eligible for tax credits, its one of multiple levels, we will talk about later, FP-B allows agricultural uses, accessory uses, and agricultural related uses, The county definition of an agricultural related use, is identical to the state statute. Ends at 48.38

As I said above, it was the same. One of the levels of Farm preservation is zoning and we agree with this interpretation.

48.39 Supervisor Bollig asks Supervisor Doolan whether that answers her question?

At 48.46 Supervisor Doolan states, yes, sort of, she then asks a follow-up to question to DCS Standing, asks if how DC defines it, Supervisor Doolan states “what I’m hearing is, Mr. Willan’s property doesn’t meet those standards, is that correct? Ends at 49.05

This assertion by Ms. Doolan is absolutely inaccurate, because nobody anywhere in this entire hearing recording, has anyone ever said the Willan’s Property doesn’t meet the standards of FP-B zoning. Because they can’t, everyone knows that as a matter of law the property qualifies for FP-B zoning and meets all the standards of FP-B zoning. What DCS is essentially telling the ZLR board, is they don’t like the ordinance, and because the Willans haven’t filed a conditional use permit application that is governed under 59.69(5e), instead of a rezoning petition under 59.69(5) therefore the board should deny it! The DCS know they cannot say the Willans property doesn’t meet the standards of the ordinance, they are conflating to legal processes into one, and inferring to the board they should deny the petition.

At 49.06 DCS Standing states, “it’s hard to tell if building an accessory shed is.... I defer to roger, it is his call, he is the zoning administrator, and he is charged by statute to interpret the ordinance, what he would say and agricultural use has to be clearly has to be related to agricultural, and an accessory shed construction certainly could be agricultural, it doesn’t have to be, those uses have to have a clear tie to agricultural, and even if they are not on a farm, they have to be related to agricultural, that the use like an implement dealer wouldn’t necessary be located on a farm, but the products they sell, are necessarily and clearly related to agricultural use, and I think what Roger is saying is in this case, because the proposed use, is just the building of sheds, it is not necessarily related to agriculture therefor doesn’t meet that definition. ends at 50.34

Two things about this statement, first Mr. Standing clearly knows that building Agricultural barns like the Willans do clearly fits within the FP-B standards, and secondly he defers the Question to Roger who is part of the hearing and Roger never answers Doolan's question that the property doesn't meet the standards. Lanes silence speaks volumes to the truth because he knows, as a matter of law the Willans property meets all the standards FP-B zoning district, and he would be telling a lie if he flat out said to Doolan yeah, it doesn't meet the standards.

At 50.37 Willan tells DCS Standing using the definition of barns, agricultural barns, DCS Standing never replied

At 50.45 Supervisor Bolligs asks Doolan if that answers her question?

At 50.46 Supervisor Doolan states yes it does

At 50.50 Supervisor Bollig as he understands the willans want FP-B zoning designation with no change?
Ends at 51.11

At 51.12 willan states by law, we are entitled to FP-B

At 51.16 Julia Willan states to the board, as the Town has approved, we would ask this board to approve it also ends at 51.21

At 51.22 Supervisor Bollig says ok, so committee if you have no further questions, I would entertain a motion, ends at 51.30

At 51.42 Supervisor Smith asks a question of supervisor Doolan that we had a motion for corporation counsel opinion, would she still like that and if you do we should postpone unless she is rescinding the request? Ends at 51.59

At 52.01 Supervisor Doolan states she would like to have an opinion form Corp counsel, her question is does Mr. Willan's business is specific agricultural, and would it meet the criteria of farm preservation, and considering the Village(Town) approved it, where does that weigh in, or where should that weigh into the boards decision? Ends at 52.56

At 52.58 Don't know if he was prompted by Lane or Violante, but DCS Standing who was still a panelist, asks a clarifying question of Supervisor Doolan, "I think what you are asking, whether the proposed use would meet the ordinance and statutory definitions of an agricultural related use. Is that correct"? Ends at 53.13

Once again, the purported "use" is the abstract permitted by right uses of FP-B zoning, that's what the application says, that is what the Town Videos show, so the question for corporation counsel is based upon all the factors that the Town of cottage Grove considered under the same set of circumstances, can the Willans property be used for the permitted by right uses of FP-B zoning district? If not how come? If not all of the permitted by right uses, which ones are not allowed by law? If Corp counsel wants to chime in based upon the record of this petition, on its interpretation of whether Ironman Buildings can run from the barn under FP-B feel free? We are saying if we can't run ironman Buildings under FP-B we still want the permitted by right uses of FP-B zoning district

At 53.14 Supervisor Doolan responds yes!

At 53.16 DCS Brian Standing states the follow-up question what are, the zoning committee and county board options given that the Town of Cottage Grove has approved the zoning petition? ends at 53.28

The options are limited to Wisconsin 59.69(5) and chapter 91 and chapter 10 FP-B zoning. Mr. lane thinks he can determine what has been equally put on the books as an ordinance, but we say as a matter of law he cannot, Mr. Violante cannot, therefore as a matter of law we are entitled to FP-B zoning district.

At 53.29 Supervisor Doolan says correct.

At 53.36 Supervisor Bollig asks Supervisor Doolan if those are her questions,

At 53.39 Supervisor Doolan states correct.

At 53.50 a Motion to postpone for Corp Counsel opinion was made by Supervisor Smith, second by Doolan, motion carried with Kiefer abstaining. Ends at 54.18

This is a true and accurate depiction of the video hearing of February 8, 2022. Please let us know what official timeline is being used for this Corp Counsel opinion so we will have time to participate, read, address, our concerns with the opinion?

Sincerely Tom and Julia Willan