

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT / PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JULY 13, 2021

CORINNA TOWN HALL
9801 IRELAND AVE NW, ANNANDALE, MN

7:00 PM

Niklaus called meeting to order at 7:00pm on July 13, 2021

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

Absent: Al Guck

Others in Attendance or via Computer: Ken Wurm, Dennis Niemi, Robert Manthey

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

Public Hearings

Requests related to the replacement of an existing nonconforming and unpermitted 2' x 10' scrolling dynamic display sign with a new 2' x 10' LED-display dynamic display sign.

Applicant: Annandale Evangelical Free Church

Property address: 10252 State Highway 55 NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 32-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000321100

Present: Dennis Niemi & Robert Manthey

Niemi: requesting an LED sign instead of a scrolling electronic sign, it would be the same size as the existing. Using the same footings that are there.

Oleson: Did receive one comment in writing. County does not and has not allowed for these type of signs for some time. It seems that 20 years ago or more the scrolling sign that is there was put in, so normally if something is there that should not be there it is considered a non-conformity and basically two kinds, one is a legal kind where it was ok at the time it was put in, but now the rules have changed and one is non-legal meaning it was not supposed to be there when it was put in, however, no one made them remove it. In the past if something was done prior to Corinna Township taking over planning and zoning we would not make it be removed. You can look at it as a use variance, state does not allow you to give a variance for something that is not allowed. So right now these type of signs are not allowed in a commercial district, therefore you cannot allow without changing your ordinance. However, when you look at this being there for the number of years it has you could go with they can replace as it and not expand.

Arendt: When installed it was when Wright County was doing planning & zoning so would consider it to be non-conforming and can be replaced to the same size, shape only non-led sign.

Smith: Feels the ordinance should or could be changed, however, at this time it is not something we should approve.

Schultz: Question regarding if the State Highway Department regulates them.

Oleson: Not when on their own property.

Schultz: Not against a new sign, however, at this point cannot approve.

Naaktgeboren: Personally ok with it, however, until the ordinance is changed cannot approve.

Niklaus: Noted that the City has different ordinances than Wright County and until it is changed we cannot approve.

Arendt made a motion based on the findings of fact to deny the variance of a replacement of an existing nonconforming and unpermitted 2' x 10' scrolling dynamic display sign with a new 2' x 10' LED-display dynamic display sign. Smith seconded the motion.

Discussion: Question if the request should be tabled instead so that they can do additional research or talk with Wright County. Manthey indicated that getting parts and equipment is the issue with the scrolling sign. Would like to it tabled to talk with Wright County.

Motion failed with all opposed.

Arendt made a motion to table the variance of a replacement of an existing nonconforming and unpermitted 2' x 10' scrolling dynamic display sign with a new 2' x 10' LED-display dynamic display sign. Smith seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Requests related to allowing a dwelling-restricted parcel to have a dwelling built on it. Approvals required include the Rezoning of an approx. 20-acre property from General Agriculture (AG) to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) or Suburban Residential-a (R-2a).

Applicant: Kenneth and Betty Wurm

Property address: None (63rd St NW)

Sec/Twp/Range: 35-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000354300

Present: Ken Wurm

Wurm: Request to rezone a 20 acre plot for granddaughter to build a home. There had been a house on the property at one time, the well & driveway are still there.

Oleson: This is a request to rezone from AG to A/R or R-2a. It is currently not in the land use plan and that is usually what the county looks at. There have been other requests in this area, however, they have not gone to the County yet so we are not sure how the County will look at it. The main goal in agriculture areas is how it will affect farming. We are only making a recommendation.

Naaktgeboren: Does not have an issue, however, unsure what the county will do.

Schultz: Not opposed.

Smith: In favor.

Arendt: In favor.

Naaktgeboren: Question on if we would go A/R or R-2a

Oleson: It comes down to lot size, 5 acre vs 10 acre lots. You can rezone the entire property or just a portion.

Arendt made a motion to recommend the approval to rezone from General Agriculture (AG) to Agricultural/Residential (A/R) or Suburban Residential-a (R-2a). Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Schultz made a motion to approve Previous Meeting Minutes of June 8, 2021. Arendt seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report

- Permits

- Correspondence

- Enforcement Actions

Other Business:

Oleson indicated that he received a permit application to replace a deck on Mink Lake that was angled and they would like to square it that is within the lake set back. Question is would that be an expansion that would require a variance. Board would be ok with just squaring off not needing a variance, if they are going to expand towards the lake they would need a variance.

Board had discussion regarding what is needed for moving of earth on the lake side. Oleson indicated that permits or CUPs are needed if moving more than 10 cubic yards and silt fence should be in place.

Board discussed meeting with Wright County, Clearwater Township, Maple Lake, and Silver Creek Township regarding changes in the land use plan. Silver Creek has made a decision to not move forward with making changes. Wright County does not feel there is a need for more density areas. There was talk about the townships putting together a resolution to put some pressure on the County to relook at the future Land Use Plan. Next step would be for the township to have the Township to do a resolution with the reasons they would like to make changes to the land use plan.

Smith made a motion to Adjourn. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously at 8:13 pm.

Prepared by Jean Just