

Angela Lepak

From: Jennifer Bourbonais
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 7:53 AM
To: Michelle Claviter-Tveit; Angela Lepak; Mark Lindhorst
Subject: FW: PMH Holdings (Glenmore Resort)

Rec'd after deadline but still include in correspondence materials for the PC .Thanks.

From: Jon & Kathy Welles <jonwelles@charter.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 10:17 PM
To: Jennifer Bourbonais <BourbonaisJ@StLouisCountyMN.gov>
Cc: jmw8191@yahoo.com; vikings4life311@yahoo.com; kdanz6320@charter.net; Mvanduke@outlook.com
Subject: PMH Holdings (Glenmore Resort)

WARNING: External email. Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good afternoon,

I am Jon Welles and I am writing this message on behalf of myself, my family and persons that own property that is adjacent to or close to Glenmore's cabin property and to the parcel that is under consideration for development of a RV park.

We have voiced our concerns to Mr. Hrvol as to potential noise, light pollution, excess vehicle traffic (including 4-wheelers and ATVs), excessive boat traffic without adequate dockage and resort people trespassing on our property walking dogs etc. Paul has been forthcoming in his response and has expressed a desire to operate this new venture similar to the current resort style which is family, fishing and relative peace and quiet. So be it. As long time cabin owners, we have always tried to have a positive relationship with the resort. Paul has proven to be a good manager and we pray for the same going forward.

But, on top of the expected concerns that were previously expressed to Paul; upon reading the staff report we have 2 additional serious concerns. Under proposal details it says "Additional sites may be added but will not exceed the density threshold for the property, which could be up to approximately 49 sites. We consider anything over 15 sites to be totally EXCESSIVE and if the permit is going to be issued there needs to be some restrictions as to the potential number of sites. While we have expressed our desire to Paul to not move forward with this project we have stated that if he does, he should only go to 10 sites or less. Up to 49 sites? That will destroy the neighborhood/shoreline as it is today.

Our other concern is what happens if Paul decides in the future he doesn't want to run a RV park with the rest of the resort? Or, neither he or his family wants to own the resort/RV park anymore. Is he free to sell that parcel with the permit separate from the cabin resort parcel so that someone else can simply pick up where Paul left off but may not have the same concern for the privacy of the neighbors? Is it possible for him to break up the 2 situations—RV park and cabin resort and sell them separately? There needs be a restriction regards to the future sale of the parcel or parcels!

Thank you!

Jon and Kathy Welles

Maron Krois

Ken and Mary Danz

Mike and Sonya VanDuker