

CORINNA TOWNSHIP BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 7 p.m.
Corinna Township Hall
9801 Ireland Avenue NW, Annandale, MN

Unofficial Minutes

Present: Vice-Chairman Richard Naaktgeboren; Supervisor Chuck Carlson; Clerk/Treasurer Mary Barkley Brown; Deputy Clerk/Treasurer Jennifer Kemp

Others in Attendance: Planning Commission Chair Charlotte Quiggle; Mel Dykhuizen; Jeff Lundquist; Peter Schreiner; Charlotte Schreiner; Lynnae Anderson; Steven Anderson; Loretta Helm; Bernie Miller; Richard Wagner

Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance was at 7:00 p.m.

May 3, 2011 Town Board Meeting Minutes: A motion was made by Naaktgeboren, seconded by Carlson, to approve the May 3, 2011 Town Board Meeting Minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda for the May 17, 2011 Town Board Meeting: A motion was made by Naaktgeboren, seconded by Carlson, to approve the Agenda for the May 17, 2011 Town Board Meeting with the following additions: Carlson asked to discuss "How long are building permits good for"? Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearing: to consider vacating the portions of public road legally described as follows: That part of the dedicated road right of way of Sunset Avenue, as shown on the record plat of SUNSET POINT, Wright County, Minnesota that lies Westerly and Southwesterly of the following described line: Commencing at the Southwest corner of Lot 24 of said SUNSET POINT; thence on an assumed bearing of South 87 degrees 11 minutes 49 seconds East along the Southerly line of said Lot 24 a distance of 22.16 feet to the point of beginning of the line to be described; thence South 56 degrees 22 minutes 57 seconds West a distance of 108.67 feet to the southerly line of said Sunset Avenue and said line there terminating. Any person wishing to be heard concerning this matter may make comments to the Board at this time.

Loretta Helm (Marie Tauer's daughter) addressed the Town Board. She asked how this would affect property owners on the road. Naaktgeboren explained that this is actually just a correction of an error from the past road vacation of same property – due to improper wording of previous road vacation documents – and only the paperwork will change. There will not be actual changes to the road.

Resolution 2011-12: Resolution vacating road – was tabled until next Regular Town Board Meeting as 4/5 vote is required for this resolution – need all supervisors in attendance in order to vote.

Recommendations from the Planning Commission Meeting of 5/5/2011:

Original Variance Request:

- a. Variance to construct a replacement dwelling, deck, porch and attached garage approximately 67 feet from Sugar Lake (75 feet required), 17 feet from the top of a bluff (30 feet required) on an undersized lot, 12 feet from the side lot line (15 feet required) and 53.5 feet from the centerline of a Township road (65 feet required) on an undersized lot. Variance to construct a septic drain field 5 feet from a property line (min. 10 feet required) and 10 feet from a building (min. 20 ft required).
 - i. Applicant(s): Peter and Charlotte Schreiner
 - ii. Property Address: 11095 Hollister Ave NW, Maple Lake
 - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 2-121-27
 - iv. Parcel Number(s): 206056001030

Planning Commission/Board of Adjustment Recommendation: The PC/BOA has recommended that the Town Board approve several of the requested variances and approval modified versions of the other requested variances, as follows:

Recommended for approval as requested:

1. Septic system
 - a. 5 feet from side (north) property line
 - b. 10 and 15 feet from the proposed home/garage

2. Garage
 - a. 12 feet from side (south) lot line
3. House
 - a. 12 feet from side (south) lot line

Recommend for approval as adjusted from original request:

1. Garage
 - a. 42.5 feet from the right-of-way of Hollister Ave NW (45.5 ft requested) ****Note:** The centerline of the road is another approximately 8 feet further away.
2. House
 - a. 28 feet from top of bluff (25.6 ft requested)
3. Deck
 - a. 70 feet from the ordinary high water level (67 feet requested)
 - b. 21 and 28 feet from the top of bluff (18.4 and 25.6 feet requested)
4. Three-season porch
 - a. 25 feet from top of bluff, as measured to nearest pier (17.3 feet requested)

****NOTE:** The PC/BOA recommended that the applicant be required to provide a final set of drawings/site plan to indicate the new proposal with all the changes mentioned at the hearing. The applicant has provided a revised site plan (see attached). At the time this report was put together, they had not yet provided revised elevations/cross-sections of the proposed home, but were in the process of developing these.

The PC/BOA has recommended the following conditions of approval:

1. The applicant should submit a permanent storm water management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, or other acceptable best management practices. Once approved, the plan should be implemented at the time of construction or within a reasonable time period after construction is completed.
2. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences on down-slope areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.

Peter Schreiner, Charlotte Schreiner, and Bernie Miller were in attendance to answer questions.

After discussion, a motion was made by Carlson, seconded by Naaktgeboren, to accept the Board of Adjustments recommendation; motion includes conditions listed above regarding a permanent storm water management plan, erosion and sedimentation control measures, along with the following Findings of Fact:

Findings of Fact: The following findings of fact are presented by Staff for consideration by the Town Board, based on the recommendation of the Board of Adjustment:

1) Will the granting of the variance be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan?

No. The Comprehensive Plan states the following as strategies to “protect, preserve, and enhance lake water quality”:

- Require on-site storm water retention and erosion-control plans for all new lakeshore development and redevelopment of existing sites, to ensure that storm water runoff is properly managed and treated before entering surface waters.
 - Comment: No specific storm water retention or erosion-control plan has been submitted as part of the variance proposal, but it has been recommended that such a plan be drawn up as a condition of the variance approval. The applicant has stated an intention to direct downspouts away from the lake and that they have not witnessed any erosion problems in the 24 years they have owned the cabin.

- Seek ways to ensure that new development, landscaping, or other alterations on lakeshore properties preserve and/or provide for the planting of native trees and shoreline vegetation.
 - Comment: One of the stated reasons for not moving the house back further is to allow room for the septic drain field without removing mature trees.
- Require the use of best management practices as outlined by the Minnesota DNR, University of Minnesota Extension, or other appropriate agencies during the development and re-development of all property in the Township to prevent erosion and sedimentation that eventually reaches area lakes and wetlands through ditches, direct runoff, or other means.
 - Comment: No specific storm water retention or erosion-control plan has been submitted as part of the variance proposal, but it has been recommended that such a plan be drawn up as a condition of the variance approval.
- Limit the amount of grading and filling in the shore land area so as to minimize the disturbance of soil and prevent erosion.
 - Comment: The applicant states that they have located and designed the home in such a way as to minimize excavation and disturbance of soil. The cabin does not appear to have a basement now, and thus the excavation for the new basement will be necessary if approved. The recommendation of the BOA is that this excavation be minimized beyond what was proposed to further limit the disturbance of soil.

2) How substantial is the variation requested in relation to the minimum requirement of the Zoning Ordinance?

Lake setback: The recommended approval would place the house behind the minimum lake setback (77.5 feet compared to required 75 feet). The proposed deck would be located within 70 feet, which is not considered a substantial variation given that moving further back would present a practical difficulty in achieving a reasonably sized dwelling and attached garage.

Bluff setback: The recommended approval would place the deck 21 feet from the top of bluff, the house would be 28 feet and the nearest pier of the three-season porch would be 25 feet. These would all be located outside of the bluff impact zone and are thus not considered a substantial variation given that moving further back would present practical difficulties in locating the sewer system and in achieving a reasonably sized dwelling and attached garage.

Side yard setback: The applicant is requesting that the new house, deck and garage be 12 feet from the south side lot line (min. 15 ft required). This is not considered a substantial variation due to the fact that the existing house and deck are also 12 feet from the side lot line and the neighboring property owner has expressed that they have no objection.

Road centerline setback: The applicant is requesting a setback of about 53.5 feet from the road centerline (42.5 feet from right-of-way). Given that the road is a short, dead-end road with very minimal traffic, this setback is considered to not be a substantial variation. Other garages/buildings in the neighborhood area also located at a similar setback.

Septic setbacks: The applicant is requesting a setback of 5 feet from the drain field to the north property line (min. 10 feet required) and 10 and 15 feet from the drain field to the proposed garage and home respectively (min. 20 feet required). These are not considered substantial variances in that the affected parties (the neighboring property owner to the north and the applicant) have all stated they are supportive and the tanks and drain field will have adequate room to be maintained.

3) Will the granting of the variance have a negative effect on government services?

The proposed variance would not appear to create any significant additional or negative impact on government services as the use of the property would remain single-family residential in nature. The home would increase in size however, could accommodate a larger number of people, and would appear to be suitable for year-round use if approved. Given that the property is on a dedicated public road, but is not maintained year-round by the Township, there is some possibility that there would be increased demand for snow-plowing and road maintenance – if not now sometime in the future as other homes in

the area are replaced. Still, the potential impact on government services would not be overly negative or out of the ordinary for the neighborhood.

4) Will the granting of the variance effect a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood or be a substantial detriment to neighboring properties?

The neighborhood where the property is located is a mix of small, seasonal, single-story cabins and somewhat larger 1.5 story dwellings with the potential for year-round use. As with other areas of the Township's shore land areas, the homes in this neighborhood has been steadily converting over from the small, seasonal cabins to larger year-round dwellings. The proposed home would be significantly larger than the home immediately to the south (1,280 vs. 528 sq ft) and slightly larger than the home immediately to the north (1,280 footprint vs. 1,237 sq ft). There are several other examples of 1.5 story homes in the immediate area and as such, the Board of Adjustment does not feel that the character of the neighborhood will be substantially changed. This is especially true given the BOA's recommendation that the home not have a full walkout basement, which will reduce the visual impact of the home as viewed from the lake. The variance would not result in a substantial detriment to neighboring properties as it will be of sound construction and of customary design for a residential dwelling.

5) Could the practical difficulty be alleviated by a feasible method other than a variance (taking into account economic considerations)?

To avoid the need for the requested variances, the home would either 1) need to be reconstructed to exactly the same footprint and height, or 2) be moved to an alternate location that would meet the required 75 foot setback.

The applicant has stated that the practical difficulty associated with moving the home back is: 1) that it would require additional earthwork, 2) that it would require moving the septic system to a less desirable location, 3) it would require the removal of mature trees, and 4) that it would increase the slope of the driveway and eliminate a 14' level space in front of the garage door. The BOA recognizes that these all combine to create a practical difficulty that is unfeasible to address with anything other than a variance.

6) How did the practical difficulty occur (including whether the owner created the need for the variance)?

The need for the variances is created primarily by difficulty with constructing a reasonably sized home and garage on a lot that presents numerous topographic and dimensional limitations. Moving the home/deck/porch further from the bluff and lake only exacerbates other problems that include increased need for excavation/fill, reduced road centerline setbacks, and less desirable septic system locations.

7) Will the granting of the variance adversely affect the environmental quality of the area?

The most likely impact on the environment would come from an increase in impervious surfaces and/or an increase in the use of the shore land areas and from moving the proposed deck/home closer to the lake than what exists now. The impervious surface coverage will increase rather substantially, although it is shown to remain just at the 25% maximum total coverage and 15% building coverage. The number of bedrooms is increasing from 2 now, to at least 3 with the possibility of additional bedrooms through future remodeling. This, plus the year-round nature of the home to be constructed, could increase the use of the lake.

The impacts mentioned above, however, are not so unusual or out of the ordinary that they cannot be addressed. Storm water runoff impacts can be minimized with best management practices to infiltrate and/or treat water before entering the lake. Recreational use of the lake, even if it is at a higher level than previously, would not be significantly greater than what is typical of other homes around the lake and the near-shore area is not identified as having unique habitat or stands of aquatic vegetation.

8) In light of the above factors, will allowing the variance serve the "interest of justice"?

This criterion comes from the 2008 MN Supreme Court decision addressing the criteria for variances. Unfortunately, the Court did not seem to provide much direction as to what it means by "interest of justice". As such, it is left to the local government to interpret "interest of justice" as it sees fit.

The Planning Commission noted the following as issues relating to "the interests of justice":

1. Many other homes and buildings within the area do not meet side the required side yard setbacks.

2. Nearly every home along Hollister Avenue within 500 feet of the property is not meeting the required 75 foot setback to the lake. Many are closer than the proposed home.
3. With the exception of some small sheds and an occasional garage, most buildings on properties within 500 feet meet the required 65 foot setback to the centerline of the road.
4. Many properties along Hollister Avenue within 500 feet (lake side lots) do not have garages on their property. It appears that roughly half of them do have garages. In most of those cases, the garages meet the required road setback.

Motion carried unanimously.

Bernie Miller will e-mail a copy of the erosion and sedimentation controls, which are on the landscape plan.

Original Variance Request:

- b. Variance to construct a replacement dwelling approximately 60 feet from Pleasant Lake (75 feet required) and approximately 12 feet from the side lot line (15 feet required) on an undersized lot.
 - i. Applicant(s): Steve Anderson
 - ii. Property Address: 11649 – 89th Street NW, Annandale
 - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 19-121-27
 - iv. Parcel Number(s): 206062000080

Planning Commission/Board of Adjustment Recommendation: The PC/BOA has recommended that the Town Board approve the requested variances, as follows:

1. House
 - a. Approximately 66 feet from the ordinary high water level of the lake (75 is normal minimum)
 - b. 12 feet from the side (east) lot line
2. Lake side deck
 - a. 60 feet from the ordinary high water level of the lake (75 is normal minimum)

****NOTE:** The PC/BOA recommended that the applicant be required to provide more detailed information as to the distance between the existing house and the existing septic tank. The discussion of this issue was related to whether the deck/house could be moved further back than 60/66 feet stated in the PC/BOAs recommendation.

The applicant has provided information indicating the septic tank is located 26 feet from the existing dwelling. The minimum required setback between a dwelling and a septic tank is 10 feet. With the proposed enlargement in the home (depth), this would appear to allow for the proposed home to be moved back another 13-14 feet.

The PC/BOA has recommended the following conditions of approval:

1. The applicant should submit a permanent storm water management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, or other acceptable best management practices. Once approved, the plan should be implemented at the time of construction or within a reasonable time period after construction is completed.
2. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences on down-slope areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.

Steve Anderson addressed the Town Board. As requested by the Planning Commission, Mr. Anderson provided more detailed information as to the distance between the existing house and the existing septic tank.

Naaktgeboren: Would you have a problem with moving the house further back from the lake?

Anderson: Only 75' wide. I will lose more of my view of the lake. One neighbor is 2' from the side lot line. The other has a boat house on the lake. A tree would have to be removed.

An overhead view of the property was shown.

Quiggle: The Planning Commission preferred the house get shifted back if there was more room to the sewer.

Naaktgeboren: If you move the house back another 9' the house would be 75' from the lake.

Anderson: I thought moving back just 10' was a fair compromise.

Carlson: The idea is to "make it right one house at a time".

Naaktgeboren: The Planning Commission said if there was additional room – it could go back another 9' toward the sewer. Then the house would be where it is supposed to be.

Quiggle: You would be at 75' back from lake and 69' for the deck.

Anderson: I tore down four sheds and re-did the front beach area. I added native plants.

Carlson: Thank you.

Anderson: I am trying to build a basement. There is no place to go. We did our best with the design. We were concerned with the height of the structure. We have addressed those factors. We have changed the roof line to have better watershed.

Carlson: Front of house to back – pitch to grass? 3'drop.

Anderson: 1063.41 existing.

Carlson: Moving 10' back plus more – are you going to have to raise the cabin to make the elevation work?

Anderson: Probably at some point.

A motion was made by Naaktgeboren, seconded by Carlson, to approve the Planning Commission's recommendations with the following change: Move the house and deck back 5 feet further from the high water mark (71' dwelling and 65' deck from high water mark). Motion includes conditions listed above regarding a permanent storm water management plan, erosion and sedimentation control measures, along with the following Findings of Fact:

Findings of Fact: The following findings of fact are presented by Staff for consideration by the Town Board, based on the recommendation of the Board of Adjustment:

1) Will the granting of the variance be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan?

The Comprehensive Plan states the following as strategies to "protect, preserve, and enhance lake water quality":

- Require on-site storm water retention and erosion-control plans for all new lakeshore development and redevelopment of existing sites, to ensure that storm water runoff is properly managed and treated before entering surface waters.
 - Staff Comment: No specific storm water retention or erosion-control plan has been submitted as part of the variance proposal, but it has been recommended that such a plan be drawn up as a condition of the variance approval.
- Seek ways to ensure that new development, landscaping, or other alterations on lakeshore properties preserve and/or provide for the planting of native trees and shoreline vegetation.
 - Staff Comment: No specific landscaping plans have been presented to plant native trees or preserve shoreline vegetation. One or more trees may need to be removed as a result of the construction. Moving the home to the west to meet the required side yard setback may damage up to three existing trees near that property line. The applicant is attempting to preserve these trees along the west line and is a primary reason for requesting the side yard setback variance. The applicant is proposing to remove one tier of retaining wall to allow for the construction of a walkout basement.
- Require the use of best management practices as outlined by the Minnesota DNR, University of Minnesota Extension, or other appropriate agencies during the development and re-

development of all property in the Township to prevent erosion and sedimentation that eventually reaches area lakes and wetlands through ditches, direct runoff, or other means.

- Staff Comment: No specific storm water retention or erosion-control plan has been submitted as part of the variance proposal, but it has been recommended that such a plan be drawn up as a condition of the variance approval.
- Limit the amount of grading and filling in the shore land area so as to minimize the disturbance of soil and prevent erosion.
 - Staff Comment: The applicant is proposing to eliminate one tier of retaining wall and excavate out existing soil to allow for a walkout basement.

2) How substantial is the variation requested in relation to the minimum requirement of the Zoning Ordinance?

Lake setback: The PC/BOA has recommended that the house/deck be moved back at least 6 feet so that the deck is no closer than 60 feet from the ordinary high water level (OWHL) of Pleasant Lake. The house would be about 66 feet from the lake. These are not considered substantial variations given that the existing house is 60 feet from the lake and the existing deck is about 54 feet from the lake.

Side yard setback: The recommended side yard setback of 12 feet (min. 15 feet required) is not considered a substantial variation as it is consistent with or greater than many other existing side yard setbacks in the area.

3) Will the granting of the variance have a negative effect on government services?

The proposed variance would not appear to create any significant additional or negative impact on government services as the use of the property would remain single-family residential in nature. The home would increase in size however, could accommodate a larger number of people, and is intended for year-round use if approved. The road serving the property is a dedicated road that is already maintained by the Township, so no significant additional road maintenance would be required. The potential impact on government services would not be overly negative or out of the ordinary for the neighborhood.

4) Will the granting of the variance effect a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood or be a substantial detriment to neighboring properties?

The neighborhood where the property is located is a mix of mostly small, seasonal, single-story cabins and a few larger 1.5-2 story dwellings. As with other areas of the Township's shore land areas, the homes in this neighborhood are likely to steadily be converted over from the small, seasonal cabins to larger year-round dwellings.

Overall, the BOA does not feel that the character of the neighborhood will be substantially changed. The variance would not result in a substantial detriment to neighboring properties as it will be of sound construction and of customary design for a residential dwelling.

5) Could the practical difficulty be alleviated by a feasible method other than a variance (taking into account economic considerations)?

To avoid the need for the requested lake setback variance, the home would either 1) need to be reconstructed to exactly the same footprint and height, or 2) be moved to an alternate location that would meet the required 75 foot lake setback and 15 foot side yard setback.

The BOA has agreed that the location of the existing trees and the desire to preserve them represents a practical difficulty when considered in light of the alternative locations for a home, which would either require the removal and relocation of an existing septic tank or the loss of trees.

The current location of the septic tank does allow for the house to move further back from the lake and this would be a feasible way to minimize the requested variance.

6) How did the practical difficulty occur (including whether the owner created the need for the variance)?

The need for the variances is created primarily by the size of the proposed home, the desire to maintain the location and use of the existing dwelling site, the desire to not move an existing septic tank and the desire to save existing mature trees.

The lot dimensions, tree location and septic tank location were not the result of actions by the applicant as these were in place when the property was purchased recently.

7) Will the granting of the variance adversely affect the environmental quality of the area?

The most likely impact on the environment would come from an increase in impervious surfaces and/or an increase in the use of the shore land areas. The impervious surface coverage will increase slightly, but appears that it will remain well below the maximums allowed of 15% (buildings) and 25% (total).

The impacts associated with the additional impervious surfaces could be addressed via a storm water management plan; although as stated previously the property appears that it will remain well within the ordinance requirements. Recreational use of the lake, even if it is at a higher level than previously, would not be significantly greater than what is typical of other homes around the lake and the near-shore area is not identified as having unique habitat or stands of aquatic vegetation.

8) In light of the above factors, will allowing the variance serve the "interest of justice"?

This criterion comes from the 2008 MN Supreme Court decision addressing the criteria for variances. Unfortunately, the Court did not seem to provide much direction as to what it means by "interest of justice". As such, it is left to the local government to interpret "interest of justice" as it sees fit.

The BOA noted the following as issues relating to "the interests of justice":

1. Many other homes and buildings within the area do not meet the required side yard setbacks.
2. Nearly every home along this street within 500 feet of the property is not meeting the required 75 foot setback to the lake. Several are significantly closer than the proposed home.
3. It appears that the only factors preventing moving the house back to the required 75 foot setback is the location of the current septic tank and the desire for a walkout basement. While the full 75 foot setback may involve a practical difficulty, there does not appear to be these difficulties if the homes is moved back to a setback of 60-64 feet.

Anderson: Can you build in the existing footprint with the addition of a crawlspace?

Quiggle: That would require another variance.

Mrs. Anderson: Why do the Schreiners get to do so much?

Steve Anderson: I started with a three bedroom and restructured to a two bedroom. I thought the Planning Commission was reasonable. We won't be able to look to the left or right.

Naaktgeboren: Marohn's cabin blocks view.

Anderson: Tree and boat house block one side.

Carlson: Sewer has been certified?

Anderson: Yes. Moving 5' back starts to affect walk-out basement.

Naaktgeboren: You have the room. That is why I made the motion. Any further discussion?

Motion carried unanimously.

Requests to be on the Agenda:

1. Jeff Lundquist - Liquor License Renewal. Jeff Lundquist asked for renewal of Liquor License (off sale, on sale, and Sunday) for Two Friends of Annandale, Inc. Hitching Post at Lake Center, 10480 State Highway 24 NW, Annandale. A motion was made by Carlson, seconded by Naaktgeboren, to approve the request. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Melvin Dykhuizen – Zoning Classification Change. After discussion with the Town board, Dykhuizen was advised to continue the process with Corinna Township Planning and Zoning Administrator Ben Oleson.

Maintenance Outlook Report: Reviewed.

Montgomery Avenue Seal Coat: Southside is seal coating this summer. Pre-construction meeting with Wright County was 5/12/11. Clerk Merrill does not know the final costs yet.

Hemlock/80th Street Crack fill and Sealcoat: Corinna letter of 5/17/11 to City of Annandale regarding upkeep of road. Clerk Brown was asked to find estimate of City of Annandale's portion of the road and send it with a revised letter.

Other Business:

1. Planning Commission: Charlotte Quiggle, Chairman asked if we could revise the way we word the agendas for variances. Clerk Brown will check with Ben Oleson.
Where to Get PDF of Files Larger Than 11x17 Inches: Deputy Clerk Kemp is checking feasibility of acquiring PDF file from Wright County for variance requests.
Next Corinna Planning Commission Meeting: 6/2/11, 7 p.m., Town Hall.
Clearwater/Pleasant Regional Park: Letter of 4/20/2011 to Greg Kryzer from John Peterson; 4/21/2011 letter to John Peterson from Greg Kryzer.
 2. Jay Bowers - 8029 Iten AV NW: Received complaint regarding business possibly started in residential neighborhood. Letter of 4/25/2011 regarding possible zoning violation; e-mail of 5/3/2011; Second letter of 5/13/2011 sent to Bowers.
Gordon/Bryan – 6400 102nd Street NW: Citation issued – first court appearance 3/30/2011 was continued to 4/6/2011, at which time Mr. Gordon entered a plea of not guilty. The pre-trial hearing is 5/25/2011 at 1:30 p.m.
10815 Grover Avenue NW: Retaining wall in road right-of-way. Dearing will talk to property owner.
11723 Gulden Avenue NW: Dirt pile in road right-of-way. Dearing will re-check.
Robert Balogh, Jr. – 8611 Griffith Avenue NW: Metro West letter of 9/28/10 sent certified mail to Robert Balogh regarding the condition of buildings at 8611 Griffith AV NW. The hazardous condition of the buildings was reported to Metro West Inspection Services on 7/29/10. Letter of 2/7/11 to Corinna from Attorney Tim Young. Memo of 2/10/11 from Tom Salkowski. In regard to noxious weeds: Mr. Balogh received a continuance for dismissal on the condition that he mows his grass by 5/20/2011.
 3. 108th Street Informational Meeting: A motion was made by Carlson, seconded by Naaktgeboren, to host an informational meeting for 108th Street NW and Lawrence Avenue NW on Sat., 5/28/2011 at 8 a.m. Motion carried unanimously. Clerk Brown will send out notices to neighbors and publish notice in the local newspapers.
108th Street-Notify Utility Companies: Dearing to notify Xcel – others. Clerk Brown will contact John Dearing.
 4. Junk Amnesty Report: Saturday, 7/30/11 – Clerk Brown is to contact all volunteers.
 5. Brandon Beckman 5K Memorial: Sept. 3, 2011 – Permission to use Ireland Avenue NW requested. After discussion regarding last year's race, a motion was made by Naaktgeboren, seconded by Carlson, to approve the use of Ireland Avenue NW, "as Corinna had no complaints last year". Motion carried unanimously.
 6. Wright County Sheriff's Office 1st Quarter Summary Report for Law Enforcement Activity in Corinna Township: Reviewed.
 7. Federal Communications Commission: Letter of 4/14/2011 regarding compliance with 1/1/2013 narrow banding deadline. Wright County Sheriff's Department Captain Howell said that this is for a two-way radio with the City of Annandale. This is no longer being used. No action is necessary.
 8. MN Association of Townships: Membership cards were distributed.
 9. MN Association of Townships: Summer Short Course Monday, June 20 – Reviewed agenda. No one is planning to attend.
 10. How Long is a Building Permit Good For? Carlson received a complaint about a house that has been unfinished for 6 years. Clerk Brown was directed to look into the complaint.
- Any Other Business That May Come Before the Board:

11. Renewal of Whispering Pines 3.2 License: A motion was made by Naaktgeboren, seconded by Carlson to renew license. Motion carried unanimously.
12. Kadabra Subdivision: After discussion about road work being started in the Plat of Kadabra, a motion was made by Carlson, seconded by Naaktgeboren, to lift the ban on building permits being issued in the Plat of Kadabra. Motion carried unanimously.
13. Michelle McIntee Request: Ms. McIntee called regarding a wedding on July 30, 2011 from 3:30 – 8:30 p.m. She wanted permission to have her guests park on the township road. After discussion, Clerk Brown was directed to have Ms. McIntee ask Dean Flygare if the guests could use his business parking lot, which is adjacent to McIntees property, in order to keep the township road clear for normal traffic.

Payment of Claims: Motion by Dearing, seconded by Carlson, to approve Direct Deposit Payroll Checks #250 through 253; EFT 2011-31 through EFT 2011-34, Check #16253 through Check #16266, in the amount of \$15,540.40. Motion carried unanimously.

With no further business to come before the board, a motion was made by Naaktgeboren, seconded by Carlson, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

June 7, 2011

Mary Barkley Brown, Clerk/Treasurer

Richard Naaktgeboren, Vice-Chairman