

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION/ BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
NOVEMBER 10, 2022

Corinna Town Hall, 9801 Ireland Ave, Annandale MN 55302

Call to Order: Chairman Al Guck called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Planning Commission Members in Attendance – Chair Al Guck; Vice-Chair Steve Niklaus; Barry Schultz; Larry Smith; Linda Dircks; Planning and Zoning Administrator Ben Oleson; Town Clerk Mary Barkley Brown. Cathy Gabriel was in attendance, as an alternate in training.

Others in Attendance: Mark Welter; Sharyl Schultz, Pete Schroeder

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda: Motion was made by Larry Smith, seconded by Barry Schultz, to accept the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

(Tabled from August 11, 2022 meeting) Requests related to the construction of an addition to an existing detached garage. Approvals required include a Variance to construct a 6' x 12' one-story addition to the west side of existing detached garage approx. 58 and 62 feet from the centerline of two township roads (min. 65 ft. required) and attached to a building that is currently 25 feet from the centerline of a township road. Resulting building coverage to be approx. 15.9% (max. 15% allowed). Impervious coverage to be reduced to below 25% from current exceedance of that amount.

Applicant/Property Owner: Warren and Sharyl Schultz

Property address: 7958 Irvine Ave NW, Annandale

Sect-Twp-Range: 27-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206077001150

Present: Sharyl Schultz.

S. Schultz: I would like to propose a compromise. I understand the variance is for building coverage. Right now we have a 25 by 19 foot impervious surface at back of garage which is 475 sq. ft. of impervious surface. We would remove the 475 sq. ft. of impervious surface and replace it with 72 sq. feet of covered building.

Guck: I guess we can discuss this but we did asked for a survey.

Smith: What is the total impervious coverage now?

Oleson: Just under 22 %, and proposed would be up to 23 %. They have done some reduction already. They were over 25% and are now under.

Guck: Do you gain that much with a 6 by 12?

S. Schultz: We would love it larger. But for what we are looking to store - it will be fine.

Barry Schultz: Would you extend the roof line?

S. Schultz: No. The upper level would remain the same.

Oleson: There's a variance request related to the road setback. It was more about the building coverage being over 15% by my estimate. That was a concern. My estimate is not as accurate as a survey would be.

S. Schultz: Neighbor's shed actually goes over our property line. The area gets bizarre there.

Audience: None.

Smith: I still struggle with going over the maximum building coverage. I don't think this is one that we should allow to go over 15%. This decision would set a precedent.

Barry Schultz: I appreciate the fact that you are trying to compromise. I guess I am not totally against it, but I see where Larry is coming from.

Dircks: I am disappointed that you did not get the survey. It might have gone in your favor.

S. Schultz: Surveyors said it would be inaccurate. Wanted to use the neighbor's pins. I got very disgruntled.

Dircks: I am new on this committee, however, I have heard multiple times that we stand pretty hard on the 15%. I am going to stand by that.

Niklaus: I agree. Too overcrowd in an already crowded area. Bring us the evidence of the professional survey. Stick with 15% maximum.

Guck: Would have been nice to have a survey. That is my opinion. We try to stick with 15% building coverage.

S. Schultz: Impervious can be anything, cement, rock, etc. Can I change the 475 ft. of impervious surface to concrete instead of rock?

Oleson: As long as it was there before and you do not increase to over 25% you could switch to concrete. Fence can go right up to property line. There are two options here. You can deny this outright or you can approve the setbacks and indicated they must stay under 15% building coverage. Then they would be approved for the road setback variances. Variance would be good for 3 years.

Motion was made by Niklaus to approve request based on finding of facts variance to construct a 6' x 12' one-story addition to the west side of existing detached garage approx. 58 and 62 feet from the centerline of two township roads (min. 65 ft required) and attached to a building that is currently 25 feet from the centerline of a township road. Variance to allow for building coverage to exceed the 15% is denied with the following conditions:

1. The applicant must provide evidence that the proposed addition will not cause the property to exceed 15% building coverage or 25% impervious coverage. This evidence shall be in the form of a certificate of survey prepared and signed by a surveyor licensed in the State of Minnesota and indicate total lot size and dimensions and the footprint of all buildings and other impervious surfaces.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

(Tabled from October 11, 2022 meeting) Requests related to the construction of a second level dwelling addition and the construction of a detached shed. Approvals required include Variances to construct a dwelling addition to a building located approximately 33 feet from Clearwater Lake (minimum 75 feet required), 4.9 feet from a side lot line (minimum 15 feet required) and 46 feet from the centerline of a township road (minimum 65 feet required) and which will cause building coverage to increase from 14.9% to 18.3% (maximum 15% allowed) and total impervious coverage to increase from

29.6% to 33.0% (maximum 25% allowed). Also variance to construct a small shed on PID 206000064411 within the minimum required road and side yard setbacks.

Applicant/Property Owner: Robert and Mary Ayd
Property address: 11053 Lawrence Ave NW, Annandale
Sect-Twp-Range: 6-121-27
Parcel number(s): 206019000180 and 206000064411

Present: No one in attendance.

Requests related to the construction of a dwelling addition. Approvals required include a Variance to construct an approx. 30'5" x 42'6" second story addition to existing one-story dwelling, add an approx. 5'10" x 10'1" entryway addition on the main level and an approx. 10' x 20'4" addition to the main level for a main level garage on a lot which exceeds the 25% impervious coverage limit. Additions to be approx. 10 ft and 14.5" ft from the side lot lines (min. 15 ft required) and approx. 56 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required).

Applicant/Property Owner: Peter and Lisa Schroeder
Property address: 10829 Lawrence Ave NW, Annandale
Sect-Twp-Range: 7-121-27
Parcel number(s): 206034000151

Present: Peter and Lisa Schroeder.

Schroeder: Looking to put on additions to a property we purchased two years ago. Turn the lower two bedrooms into a garage and put bedrooms upstairs. Coming out 10 feet to add just add a little more front entry so we can get the stairs.

Oleson: Addition would come out over grass area. This would not have a second story. The variance related to Lake Setback, it does not meet lake setbacks now. Side yard setbacks 10 feet and 14.5 feet, 15 required. They are 56 feet from lake, 75 feet is required. They are over on impervious. Showed pictures of dwelling exterior. They are proposing a reduction of impervious. Patio area would be removed, boat ramp want to leave, the fire pit would come out and both would go back to grass.

Niklaus: What is current impervious?

Oleson: They would go from 35.4 to 35.35 impervious, so slight reduction. They do have a long driveway and there is an easement for the neighbor. Question regarding the 2nd stall being in the grass area.

Schroeder: Using as a one car entry.

Audience: None

Niklaus: I would like to see impervious reduced further. The building coverage and impervious are touchiest area. You are very high already.

Schroeder: This is not a large lot and the neighbor has easement which cuts into our impervious.

Niklaus: Not a problem with side yard setbacks. I have a problem with the impervious.

Dircks: When driveway is a shared driveway does all the impervious have to go against the Schroeders?

Oleson: Yes, the impervious is for property it is on.

Dircks: How large is the board ramp? The retaining wall?

Schroeder: I understand it has been there forever.

Dircks: I am ok with the setbacks just concerned about the impervious. All the decking counts as impervious?

Oleson: Yes.

Schultz: Agree with Linda, boat ramp do you need that much concrete?

Schroeder: We could take a look at that.

Schultz: Steps all the way around? Maybe you could cut back on the steps?

Schroeder: I would prefer to keep steps if I took out part of boat ramp. I would be afraid of people falling off.

Smith: I would like you to go back and rethink what you need. If you want an addition you need to give up something. We need to get this number to a lot less.

Schroeder: We don't have a lot to begin with. Clearly our neighbor got away with a lot in the past. With the fact that we are going up and just adding ten feet to the front. I don't feel it is a huge ask. What we are looking to reduce with taking off first two stages of boat ramp that is a lot.

Guck: Footprint of the house is already forward to the lake. In the past we have had variances where people have been willing to move back. You knew you had a tiny lot when you bought it. Impervious is really a stickler. We don't want to make a bad situation worse. What purpose does boat ramp serve if there are accesses all around the lake?

Schroeder: If willing to get rid of the boat launch and it still does not get us to the number you want?

Oleson: I have the boat launch as appx. 300 sq. feet. Would be down to 33.2%. I have the deck is at 412 sq. feet according to the assessor.

Guck: We are willing to work with you if you want the addition. How can you pull in the deck?

Schroeder: If we were to reduce stairs, remove fire pit, top of boat ramp what are we at?

Guck: Want to get down to around 28%

Schroeder: Not sure we can meet those requirements with removing everything.

Oleson: If you get rid of total boat ramp, deck, fire pit, you are down to 30%.

Smith: What is more important?

Schroeder: What we are looking to gain with this property is a life home. To have ultimately the garage, to have a regular house that we could move to and live permanently. If we remove portion of the stairs, patio stairway area, and boat ramp etc. realistically we could never get down to where it should be. Can we meet in the middle? This property will not ever meet any requirements imposed at this point in time. What is acceptable from your standpoint?

Guck: We have a dilemma with everyone that comes in. Do you need the addition?

Schroeder: Currently it is 12 feet deep with the ten foot addition we could fit a vehicle in it.

Guck: Sewer system verified and checked for 3 bedrooms?

Schroeder: Yes it was replaced when we purchased.

Oleson: Showed where drain field is located and meets setbacks.

Dircks: Does your neighbor have a garage?

Schroeder: She has easement to park one car.

Smith: This lot was never intended to have a big house. We can't fix what your neighbor has.

Niklaus: With the deck off totally, fire pit off, boat ramp totally off we are at 30%. That would be a reduction of 5%

Smith: You need to think about which is more important. Just going up is still an expansion within the lake setback. Consider tabling this so they have some time to think through the process.

Schroeder: Removing boat ramp, deck, fire pit, small patio just to get the addition, doesn't seem like a compromise.

Smith: We are giving you a chance to think about this. It is way over on the impervious. Niklaus moved to table the request. Seconded by Smith. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests related to the installation of solar panels on the roof of existing buildings. Approvals required include a Conditional use permit for the installation of a roof mounted 30 KW AC solar PV system.

Applicant/Property Owner: James Raymond /Mark Welter

Property address: 10150 Ireland Ave NW, Annandale

Sect-Twp-Range: 10-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000104200

Present: Mark Welter.

Welter: We are going to go with solar again. We were close to being paid up when we sold our last home. Warranty is 26 years and includes labor. They monitor every single panel. On your phone you can see individual output per panel. It will sit on the pole shed, trying to keep on the back portion of the shed.

Schultz: When snow covers the panels how does that work?

Welter: With this system it would only shut down an individual panel. I would lose 20% of the panels. They are made to absorb light.

Guck: What do you do with them when they are no longer in use?

Welter: Don't know. Have not had them that long.

Guck: Any set-aside fund to reclaim them?

Welter: No, and insurance company had no problem. Gave additional information as to how the solar system works indicating it will pull power to the shed and feed to the house.

Smith: I'd like to see feedback. It would be nice to get some info back to us.

Schultz made a motion, based on the findings of fact, to approve the Conditional/Interim Use permit for the installation of a roof mounted 30 KW AC solar PV System with the following conditions:

1. The interim use shall be valid for the life of the system, or 30 years, whichever is longest.

Motion seconded by Niklaus.

Further discussion: Guck would like to some type of abatement process or recycling of panels. Niklaus was not sure if that is within our jurisdiction.

Motion approved with Guck opposed.

Schultz made a motion to approve Previous Meeting Minutes of October 11, 2022. Niklaus seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Motion by Smith to table Robert and Mary Aydt. Dircks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report: Nothing to report.

- Permits

- Correspondence
- Enforcement Actions

Other Business: Dircks asked if impervious percentages are consistent with all townships, city and counties.

Oleson: DNR has state-wide limit for shore land of 25% for impervious. Wright County is unique is they 25% for all properties even if not in shore land, and they have added the building coverage limit of 15% for all properties.

Adjournment: Motion was made by Niklaus, seconded by Schultz to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by Mary Barkley Brown, Township Clerk