

CORINNA TOWNSHIP  
Minutes  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT / PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
April 10, 2018  
7:00 PM

Guck called meeting to order at 7:00pm on April 10, 2018

Board of Adjustment/Planning Commission Members Present: Barry Schultz, Trish Taylor, Larry Smith, Dick Naaktgeboren, Al Guck, Steve Niklaus, Bill Arendt, Ben Oleson (Zoning Administrator)

Others in Attendance: Karin Lindquist, Andrew Scheu, Jeff & Michal Jude, Bob Bruns, Wayne Lindberg, Tom Denny, Chad Schleif, Paul Schleif, Sean Schleif, Tiffani Kiebel, Rory Norgren, Dean Woodford, Marilyn Woodford, Dean Hoglund, Pat Thompson, Rick & Melissa Riesgraf, Kevin & Laura Carlson, Bernie Miller, Justin Ahlstrom, Joan Cole, Diane Wiltersmuth, Chris Lodermeier

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda; Smith made a motion to approve the agenda. Arendt seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously

**Public Hearings**

Conditional use permit to move approx. 150 cu yds of soil from one part of the lot into a field on the same property to address drainage concerns.

Applicant: Chris Lodermeier

Property address: 9337 Gowan Ave, Maple Lake

Sect-Twp-Range: 13-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000134100

**Present:** Chris Lodermeier

**Lodermeier:** Not sure about the 150yards came from that is actually the distance that I would be moving it. I am looking at approximately 425 yards & 400 yards. There are two projects as noted. One is excavation for a walk out basement to the west there is a slight slope to the property line. It is where I have the black lines indicated. Right now I have a steep entrance and would like to make that a walk out basement. Then we would be moving the soil to a low point in the field to the far right. Due to heavy rains it washes out. I have planted grass to the right and has collected soil. What I would like to do is fill that area in and make it easier to farm and have less of a wash out.

**Oleson:** The reason for the application is the amount of soil being moved in a shore land district. Primarily we are looking for erosion control and not affecting the neighbors. It is almost a 40 acre parcel with long driveway to the house. I did get some comments from soil and water district, they said it looked like a good plan in place for erosion control.

**Lodermeier:** I did talk to them about putting soil in one area and getting back to the natural grade and possible garage in the future so we would grade that back to the natural slope.

**Oleson:** We did have some follow up conversation and we talked about the water and where it would go, it does have to go somewhere when it comes off the field and will it make it better. You can see to the west there is some wooded area and natural vegetation. I don't know that

there is a huge concern about erosion as long as it does not make it worse. You can see from the photos with the snow melt it was running off pretty good.

**Lodermeier:** There is some natural vegetation. There was more erosion from that field and that natural vegetation prevents that.

**Audience:** None

**Taylor:** I don't have anything other than making sure you have permanent storm water management to ensure you are not going to affect the neighbors and move as little as possible. The farmer that you rent to is fine with you moving soil?

**Lodermeier:** It is usable as it is, but this will help with the gullies. Majority of the silt will stay on the property and does not go more than 15 ft.

**Taylor:** With the woods there it should not be an issue.

**Arendt:** What is going on with the septic?

**Oleson:** It was compliant in 2010 and not worried about it for this project affecting it.

**Arendt:** I am good with it.

**Niklaus:** I think it looks good.

**Naaktgeboren:** Where you are going to take out for the walk out is there enough fall?

**Lodermeier:** We did have it scoped out and it does.

**Naaktgeboren:** In the field where you fill it in. What are you going to keep it there, I think there needs to be some type of vegetative swale to get it to stay.

**Smith:** I agree with Dick, you need to do some sort of grass strip/swale to keep it there and need to get it established before you put the fill in. Recommend you get silt fence up and some straw to keep that soil there. My other concern is where are you are going to put the additional dirt if that is full?

**Lodermeier:** I am pretty sure there is plenty of room for it in the field.

**Schultz:** Did you build the home and that the footings are good for the walk out?

**Lodermeier:** Yes I did and they are good.

**Schultz:** Then I am fine with it.

**Guck:** I am good.

Taylor made a motion to approve a conditional use permit to move approx. 425 cu yards of soil from one part of the lot into a field on the same property. With the following conditions:

1. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at minimum silt fences between the area of disturbance and the road and neighboring property to the west, seeding of all disturbed areas and installation of erosion control blankets as identified in the submitted erosion control plan, or as otherwise recommended by Wright county SWCD and/or approved by the Zoning Administrator.
2. The applicant shall implement a permanent stormwater management plan in the area of the fill on the field, the walkout basement and the driveway turnaround designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of runoff from the site prior to it flowing onto the neighboring property to the west. These may include planting vegetation in the area of the turnaround and walkout basement area. In the area of the field, it could include the creation of a vegetated swale, rock check dams, or other appropriate 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.
3. The applicant shall submit a stormwater mitigation plan that identifies additional best management practices that could be taken to address stormwater containment that may

be necessary if the land alterations were to negatively impact the neighboring property or the lake if the approved plan proves to be inadequate.

4. If, at any time within five years of the approval of the placement of the fill the Zoning Administrator determines, after consultation with the Wright County SWCD and the landowner, that significant erosion, drainage or other negative impacts from storm water runoff are occurring as a result of the project, the applicant shall implement best management practices sufficient to mitigate those negative impacts, whether or not such necessary practices were contained in the original or mitigation plan identified in #3 and 4 above. This may include the removal of fill placed during this process to restore an area for flow or detention of water.

Schultz seconded the motion.

Niklaus: Is there a formal way or who follows up?

Oleson: Before they begin work some of this will have to be done and it would be me following up and checking that it was done. There is not a formal sign off, it is more me checking on it.

Naaktgeboren: How many yards? Is it 400 + 425 yards?

Lodermeier: Yes

Taylor amended her motion to approve no more than 825 cubic yards. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Variance to construct a 2nd story addition to an existing 24' x 48' dwelling with 8' x 12' porch approx. 56 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required) and 7 ft and 13 ft from the side lot lines (min. 15 ft required).

Applicant: Dean and Marilyn Woodford

Property address: 9599 Jeske Ave, Annandale

Sect-Twp-Range: 16-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206031000300

**Present:** Dean & Marilyn Woodford

**Woodford:** We plan on adding a second story onto the cabin, it has a flat roof and the intention was to add the seconded story, however, they did not do that. There was some concern on the OHW and that was confirmed it was ok from Taylor land survey. It is about 5ft from the neighbor on the north and the setback from lake about 56ft. We are not changing any impervious land, just adding the second story it would be difficult to move back due to the garage and septic. The tanks were new in 2010.

**Audience:** Justin Altman, we are the neighbors to the north. We have concerns to them adding on. In reality they are finishing a three season porch and adding a full second story. When it was marketed in 2010 it was a two bedroom cabin and it is currently a 3 bedroom house. At some point the garage on the right was converted to a bedroom. This is a significant reconstruction. We feel it will be out of sync with other houses in the area, about five houses are one story and one home added partial second story. Being this is such a narrow lot being only about 5 ft from our property and 12 ft from the other property and being so close to the lake I feel it would block our view. We want to make sure this is well thought out. We also have some concerns with the construction process, there is a steep slope and they had to access our property to get a well in and I would like to know if that would be necessary again. If they are adding a footing inside the house and if that would destabilize that slope at all. Also, concerns with the size of the septic. As I understand the septic was designed for a 3 bedroom

house and they have that now so making sure there are no more bedrooms. My final concern is the increased traffic on this small lot. They are great entertainers and have a large family, we understand that they have family coming up, however, concerned with added bedrooms it will increase the traffic, noise and air pollution. The last point is the placement is the septic and the impairment in doing that cannot be due to the owner's action. When they replaced that it was their choice where to place it and I feel there is plenty of room to move back. It may be inconvenient. As it is on the current foundation creates those concerns.

**Oleson:** The reason for the variance is the side yard on both sides and the lake setback. I was concerned at first regarding the flood elevation, however, we did get confirmation that they are meeting that. The primary question is if this is a home can support the second story, and if not and it had to be tore down would you be ok with the setbacks.

**Naaktgeboren:** What is the elevation we have to have?

**Oleson:** 996.2 is the base flood, they used 996.4 is the bottom line. They are fine, they are above that at 998.

**Naaktgeboren:** You said there is a question if the house can support the second story. Do we know that?

**Oleson:** We do not and there has been mention that there would have to be a footing put in.

**Naaktgeboren:** Is your neighbors shed on your property?

**Woodford:** It was moved last summer.

**Naaktgeboren:** There is a retaining wall – is that on your land?

**Woodford:** It is our retaining wall.

**Naaktgeboren:** Is something going to be done with it? It is already starting to fall down.

**Woodford:** We are going to address that.

**Naaktgeboren:** I do not have an issue with it as far as the view, you have a large 2 story a few houses down. I don't have a problem if you can proof your foundation can handle it and you do something with the retaining wall.

**Woodford:** There will not be any impairments as far as construction, we will not need to use their driveway that was for the well only. You talk about large family, there is only one weekend a year that our whole family is there which is the week of the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. As far as the view your deck is further forward from our cabin.

**Naaktgeboren:** Do you have a bedroom in the garage.

**Woodford:** No we did think about that, however, we are staying with a 3 bedroom. There used to be a garage attached to the house, that is no longer there and it is some sleeping quarters in there.

**Oleson:** It was a 3 bedroom and will stay a 3 bedroom.

**Niklaus:** You are pretty close to the lake with the second story will you have more run off?

**Woodford:** We are going to put gutters in and have rain barrels and a flower garden to the one side to manage the run off.

**Smith:** My question is do you have 7ft side walls?

**Woodford:** Yes

**Smith:** I'm having a hard time reading the numbers are they going to add to it or how are they going to do that?

**Woodford:** They are going to be 9ft and they are going to add lumber on to it.

**Smith:** My concern is can the footings sustain the second story and would like to see something on that. I would have a hard time approving without seeing something.

**Schultz:** On this picture only 3 bedroom just want to confirm that it will only be a 3 bedroom home. My concern is the footings also. If he has to put new footings in does that change anything?

**Oleson:** I guess the question to you is would your answer change if you have to rebuild? Would you want them to move back and would the side yard make a difference. The side yard on the one side you cannot drive on.

**Schultz:** I am somewhat ok with it, just the footings would be a concern.

**Guck:** The footings and the porch that is going to put over it, then you are really not on the same footprint that you were before and are you adding closer to the lake. You are going to do 3 bedrooms if you have one that is not attached they have to use the bathroom so basically it would be a four bedroom.

**Woodford:** There is no bedroom in the detached garage, we use that as a garage. The bedroom they were referring to was to the old attached garage which is no longer there.

**Taylor:** I would like to see it tabled to see if the footings are adequate enough, my concern is that you are not going to convert the storage room into a bedroom which would then be a four bedroom. I do not have an issue with building over your existing footprint. Is the porch coming out a new addition?

**Woodford:** No, it is there we are just putting footing under it.

**Arendt:** I agree with the footings and not knowing that it will work.

**Woodford:** We can have someone take a look at it.

Schultz made a motion to table so that they can find out if the footings will support the second story. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Variance to construct 12' x 22.5' screen porch addition to a dwelling approx. 48 ft from Sugar Lake (min. 75 ft required) and attached garage approx. 37 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required). Dwelling being added to is as allowed by 2017 variance to be 48 ft from Sugar Lake and 51 ft from the centerline of the township road and approx. 4 ft from a side lot line.

Applicant: Kevin and Laura Carlson

Property address: 11605 Gulden Ave NW, Maple Lake

Sect-Twp-Range: 1-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206085000150

**Present:** Keven & Laura Carlson, Rory Norgren, Bernie Miller

**Carlson:** Purchased earlier this year, there was a variance approved in November. We are going to leave as is, however, we would like to add a garage and porch. We are looking at two options to be considered. We would remove the existing shed. One change is the driveway and have it on our property.

**Miller:** A couple things we did was to reconfigure the septic system. This new one will be better since we had some issues with the driveway. We will be removing some impervious coverage with the existing driveway and opens up some opportunities for rain gardens and infiltration. The ultimate goal is to have it be year round and place to park. If you look what it is now and what they're asking for the impervious number goes from 28.2 to under 25. I don't know how you can make it any better. There are open to some options with the porch. There is some question to changing the patio but it may actually be closer.

**Audience:** None

**Oleson:** Last fall it was different owners and were asking for a partial second story and that was approved. At this point we are dealing with the lake setback and road setback, the garage will be within the road setback, the porch is due to the house being within the lake setback. In the last year variance they wanted to go a little forward with the house and we told them it had to be where it was now. The existing house is within 4ft of side property line but they are not going any closer. There is a driveway that will be removed to get to 25% impervious and building coverage will go from 9 to almost 14.

**Schultz:** I'm pretty much ok with what you asking for as long as you remove the building to take care of impervious.

**Guck:** I do not see any problems your porch is good and further back than where the house is. I think this is better than the previous plan.

**Naaktgeboren:** how much of the existing patio is going to be removed?

**Miller:** Let me clarify - the existing stone wall would be taken out, however, I did leave it in the calculation and we can meet the 25% without taking the wall out.

**Naaktgeboren:** If you meeting the 25% with the existing patio I'm ok with that

**Miller:** That patio is included at the 24.9% impervious coverage.

**Naaktgeboren:** You're maxed out, as far as the screen porch we did not want it going out further so with putting it back further I am ok with that.

**Niklaus:** I'm good.

**Taylor:** In the previous variance we said you need to be under 25%. Just making you aware that you can add nothing. Not even a burning pit where you want to sit around. Also, it was stipulated that you needed to have a 20% buffer zone making sure that is done.

**Arendt:** I'm fine with the porch going to the side and septic.

**Smith:** I'm ok with it just surprised you made it under so I'm good.

Taylor motion to approve Variance to construct 12' x 22.5' screen porch addition to a dwelling approx. 66 ft from Sugar Lake (min. 75 ft required) and attached garage approx. 37 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required). Dwelling being added to is as allowed, as per your variance approved on 04/10/2018 by the Corinna Township Board of Adjustment with the following conditions:

1. 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 between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.
2. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of rainwater from the lot prior to it flowing into the lake. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, establishing or maintaining a buffer of native vegetation along the shoreline, 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 and maintained indefinitely. The plan required by the 2017 variance approval ("That the applicants install and maintain a minimum 20 ft deep vegetative buffer zone along at least 75% of the shoreline width, to contain native vegetation") shall still be in effect and shall meet the requirements of this condition.

Smith seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Conditional use permit to place approx. 200 cu yds of fill on the lots on either side of the road to fill in low spots and even out yards.

Applicant: Rick and Melissa Riesgraf

Property address: 11831 Gulden Ave NW

Sect-Twp-Range: 1-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206086001140

**Present:** Rick & Melissa Riesgraf

**Riesgraf:** We live to the north of the property to the North of the property in question our family built in 1951. We bought this and the property on the west driveway is a horseshoe and it is a big hollow swale in there. When the road was built in 1951, there were two culverts in there and at some point it was taken out. Now the water flows from the north and collect in ours. So what we would like to do since we have the opportunity to get some free soil is fill in some of that and on the east side we would like to level out not more than 3-5" in a few spots nothing to add elevation. About a week ago Soil & Water contacted us and thought maybe it was wetland. I have been over to talk with them and we are working on that issue. We are looking at no more than 200 cubic yards.

**Audience:** None

**Oleson:** So like the first application this is for being more than 50 Cubic yards. We are looking at neighboring properties and the lake. As he said there was potential to find out if it is wetland. We may find out that it is not. I did talk to the road maintenance person today he did mention that there may have been a culvert there at one time.

**Riesgraf:** The property on the west side it used to drain off, it does not do that anymore since others have built.

**Oleson:** It is kind of low spot for all of the neighborhood, the conversation with John Dearing when he was out there, the idea is put a culvert in the driveway and it would have an outlet that would drain. However, that would have to be confirmed with surveyors when the snow is gone.

**Smith:** 200 yards is not going to be a lot of fill so you may want to look at what you really need. I think what needs to be done is some elevations shot to see what it would take and where it would be directed.

**Naaktgeboren:** We need to get some elevations to see where the water is going to go once you add the fill. I know to the east there has been a lot of fill. Completely filling in I would say no, but see what the lake elevation is. I feel we need to table to get some elevations.

**Niklaus:** Is the goal is to get the water to the lake?

**Riesgraf:** Eventually that is where it would go.

**Niklaus:** And is that where it should go?

**Naakgeboren:** Depends we don't want to dump it on someone else. If it is possible you show it down before it gets there.

**Niklaus:** How many properties come to yours?

**Riesgraf:** Three or four.

**Schultz:** What type of fill?

**Riesgraf:** Clay I'm thinking.

**Schultz:** I agree we should table.

**Taylor:** My only thing is I do not want to see all the run off into the lake.

**Naaktgeboren:** I think you can slow it down.

**Taylor:** If you can slow it down with a buffer.

**Arendt:** I agree table and get elevations & find out about culverts.

Larry made a motion to table for elevation information. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion carried it unanimously.

Create a residential entitlement division of 10 acres (max. 2.5 acres allowed) from a 40 acre tract. The remainder 30 acres to be combined with an adjacent parcel.

Applicant: Gregory Jude

Property address: None

Sect-Twp-Range: 35-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000354400

**Present:** Dean Hoglund, Greg Jude Seller, Tiffany Kiebel,

**Hoglund:** In the application it explains what we would like to accomplish. When you look at the ariel photo there is a lot of the area that is not able to be farmed. In going with a 10 acres we feel it is the best way to accomplish what we are trying to do. The limit of 2.5 acres is to preserve the Ag. Land, however, it is not farmable land and there is a better chance to build and best use of the property.

**Audience:** I'm a neighbor on 55 I just want to know the plan.

**Schleif:** We will be continue to farm it, connecting it to our farm.

**Oleson:** The reason is because the ordinance has a maximum lot size in the Ag. District like this to preserve the farm land when the soil is considered prime Ag. Land which they are. They want to do the 10 acres split. I did have one comment just asking if they were planning to build a bunch of homes there, I explained it would be just the one home.

**Arendt:** I am fine with it with the recommendation they could only build on 2.5 acres.

**Oleson:** That is something we did on a similar application so if they wanted to continue farming they could do so. If you were to impose that condition it would mean they would have to confine buildings within 2.5 acres.

**Guck:** Would there be anything that someone else could do?

**Oleson:** Not without going through re-zoning.

**Schultz:** If they were at 10 acres do they get more privileges?

**Oleson:** Possibility of a bigger shed.

**Niklaus:** With the conditions that are there I am fine with it.

**Naakgeboren:** good

**Larry:** good

Schultz made a motion to approve the creation of a residential entitlement division of 10 acres (max. 2.5 acres allowed) from a 40 acre tract. The remainder 30 acres to be combined with an adjacent parcel.

Smith seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.



Variance to tear down the existing cabin 39 ft from Clearwater Lake and replace with a new dwelling approx. 60 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required) and 13.5 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) and to install a new septic system drainfield approx. 7 ft from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required) and 15 ft from the proposed garage (min. 20 ft required).

Applicant: Andrew Scheu and Karin Lindquist

Property address: 11856 103<sup>rd</sup> Ave, South Haven

Sect-Twp-Range: 7-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206042000180

**Present:** Bernie Miller, Andrew Scheu & Karin Lindquist

**Lindquist:** We have had property for more than 20 years, we consider the house a tear down, so we would like to make it livable but not extravagant. Part of it is being driven by our family getting older and just not big enough. We love the property and we have maintained a lot of natural areas and mow as little as possible. On the lake side we have a vegetation.

**Miller:** We started this last fall working with home designers, so we have spent a lot of time working on plans that would work with this property. With the way the shoreline runs and run off is, one of the bigger challenges on this property it comes up from the road all the way to the back of the deck and then it drops off. You cannot do a walk out since the elevations are higher on the lake side. We have looked at several designs to make it work with the grade, everything will run away from the lake, 89% of the home meets the 75 ft set back and 99% meets 65 feet. The side yard 99.5% meets the setback. The septic too limited us.

**Audience:** None

**Oleson:** The reason for the variance is the lake setback, side yard, and to the sewer.

**Lindquist:** We have reached out to our neighbors to make sure they are aware of what we are doing.

**Oleson:** I reached out to the DNR and they only wanted to make sure it met elevations and they were fine.

**Naaktgeboren:** If we moved the house closer to the road are we making it tougher for the sewer?

**Miller:** Correct, I spent a lot of time looking at this and seeing what we could do, there are two nice trees if we move the house back further we will not be able to save those trees.

**Naaktgeboren:** If you move it now you're dealing with more contours make since where it is. I'm fine with it

**Niklaus:** I think it is a good plan.

**Smith:** Yea it's good you not in anyone's view, good planning.

**Schultz:** I am good with it.

**Guck:** I am good, glad you moved it back from where you are.

**Taylor:** I'm good, just a note that you are close with your building & impervious, that means no sheds or anything down the road, just be aware of that. Some people want to put in fire pits.

**Miller:** We did account for a patio and a walk way, on the impervious calculations.

**Arendt:** I'm good, it's a good fit.

Arendt made a motion to approve Variance to tear down the existing cabin 39 ft from Clearwater Lake and replace with a new dwelling approx. 60 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required) and 13.5 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) and to install a new septic system drainfield approx. 7 ft from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required) and 15 ft from the proposed garage (min. 20 ft required) with the following conditions:

1. 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 between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.
2. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of rainwater from the lot prior to it flowing into the lake. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, establishing or maintaining a buffer of native vegetation along the shoreline, 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 and maintained indefinitely.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Renewal of previously granted interim use permit to expand a commercial outdoor recreation facility (existing club house to allow for increased dining/bar area) in a General Agricultural (AG) zoning district. Previously approved use includes limited kitchen facilities and space to accommodate up to 80 guests related to golf course patrons or for related tournaments and events, with limited hours and months of operation.

Applicant: Mark Dvorak  
Property Owner: Whispering Pines  
Property address: 8713 70<sup>th</sup> St NW, Annandale  
Sect-Twp-Range: 34-121-27  
Parcel number(s): 206000342204

**Present:** None

**Oleson:** This was issued in 2015, granted for 3 years and they are asking for renewal of the interim for the expansion. There were a number of conditions they had to meet which are listed for you. He is basically asking for a renewal of the interim use permit. The default is that it would be good for 5 after we went with less the first time, he is asking for 10 years. I have had not had any complaints not meeting his conditions. We did get one call regarding parking on the road during Cross Country and some tournaments.

**Smith:** Not an issue renewing, I think 5 years.

**Naakgeboren:** What do other jurisdictions do with interim use permits?

**Oleson:** There are not very many of these. I think it has to do with how long you feel comfortable going.

**Naakgeboren:** I am fine with 5 years.

**Taylor:** How many tournaments does he hold?

**Arendt:** Not sure, however, I have a fiend that lives on the road and I have never seen cars sitting on the road.

**Niklaus:** The cross country race only lasts three hours and he does not charge anything.

**Guck:** I'm good with 5 years.

**Schultz:** Looks good.

Schultz motion to approve Renewal of previously granted interim use permit to expand a commercial outdoor recreation facility (existing club house to allow for increased dining/bar area) in a General Agricultural (AG) zoning district. Previously approved use includes limited kitchen facilities and space to accommodate up to 80 guests related to golf course patrons or for related tournaments and events, with limited hours and months of operation as previously stated for 5 years.

**Arendt:** Seconded the motion.

Smith made a motion to Approve March 14, 2018 Meeting Minutes. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

#### Zoning Administrator's Report

- Permits

- Correspondence

- Enforcement Actions

- Findings of Fact - Previous PC/BOA Decisions; Taylor made a motion to approve the findings of fact. Smith seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

#### Other Business

- Discussion - Erosion protection requirements and enforcement

- Review of previously granted variance requests (if time allows)

Smith made a motion to adjourn. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously at 8:53pm.