

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION/ BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
AUGUST 15, 2024

Corinna Town Hall, 9801 Ireland Ave, Annandale MN 55302

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

Roll Call: Planning Commission Members in Attendance – Chair Al Guck, Steve Niklaus, Barry Schultz , Linda Dircks, Dick Naaktgeboren, Planning and Zoning Administrator Ben Oleson; Deputy Clerk Heidi Eckerman.

Absent: Larry Smith

Others in Attendance: Steve & Michelle Rasmussen, Scott Peddycoart, Vance D Naaktgeboren, Kathryn R Brevik, Bernie Miller, Al Evavold, Paul & Melanie Pattee, Walt Byers, Will & Anita Brannan, Jim & Gina Henkemeyer, Dawn Salden, Lynn Walker

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda: Motion was made by Dircks to approve the agenda. Motion seconded by Schultz. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

Requests related to the construction of a partial second story dwelling addition. Approvals required include a Variance to construct an approximate 28' x 38'3" second story addition to an existing dwelling on a parcel with 30.9% impervious coverage (max. 25% impervious coverage allowed).

Applicant: Jim Henkemeyer

Property Owner: Jim Henkemeyer Rev Tr & Gina Demm Henkemeyer Rev Trust

Property address: 11693 89th St NW, Annandale

Sect-Twp-Range: 19-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206062000050

Present: Jim & Gina Henkemeyer, Bernie Miller

Henkemeyer: Indicated they bought the cabin on Pleasant Lake and hoping to build a partial 2nd story addition, to accommodate a couple extra bedrooms and a bathroom.

Oleson – Two different things going on, one they're expanding the house, it meets all the setbacks from the side lot line. All set backs are met except for the bluff and it's not quite 30 feet from the top of that, so that requires a variance. The lot is over the 25% of the impervious limit about 30.9% so this also requires a variance, they are proposing to keep that the same as it is.

Miller – Addition will be built on the road side, not the lake side. Long skinny lot driveway and a lot of the impervious is the driveway.

Niklaus – Would like Ben to expand on bluff

Oleson – House that is on a bluff and adding a 2nd story to it, is sometimes required to have an expert to verify the extra weight of the building on the bluff can be handled by the foundation and by the soils. This addition is to the rear of the house meets the 30ft setback.

Guck: We've taken a pretty hard line on impervious with just about everybody that has come to us, he believes this needs to be done to get to the 25% to be approved.

Henkemeyer – Just to right of the front of the house is landscaping rock he could take out, and make it all grass.

Naaktgeboren – Is the foundation sturdy enough for the 2nd level?

Miller – Matt Bronder looked at it and doesn't anticipate it being a problem. We don't 100% know yet.

Henkemeyer – Could trim down the driveway, Jim said it could get trimmed back. Bernie - could cut 200sq ft off the oval area. Jim small flower bed off the end of the deck, 20 sq ft of the wall could come off.

Guck - if they get down to 28% could they do it?

Oleson – Yes.

Henkemeyer - Part of the driveway and retaining wall, & some of the oval area.

Dircks – Foundation isn't that deep to support a 2nd structure we need to know that the foundation will support the 2nd story. Interested to see where we can change the impervious.

Schultz - Is there foundation underneath the garage? His only concern if there is a slab foundation that it isn't going to carry it.

Henkemeyer – Will talk to his architect, to see what kind of resources he has.

Niklaus made a motion to approve the variance to construct an approximate 28' x 38'3" second story addition to an existing dwelling approximately 26 ft from the top of a bluff (min. 30 ft required) and on a parcel with 30.9% impervious coverage (max. 25% impervious coverage allowed) 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, wetlands, road right-of-way or onto adjoining properties. 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.
3. Current and future property owners shall be responsible to identify and comply with all other local, state and federal regulations applicable to their proposed use and alteration of their property.
4. The applicant shall reduce impervious coverage on the lot to no more than 28.0%.

Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Requests related to the placement of a storage building. Approvals required include Variances to replace an existing storage shed with a 12' x 22' one-stall garage approximately 2.3 ft from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required), 17 ft from the road right-of-way (min. 20 ft required), 37 feet from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required and 59 feet from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required). The lowest floor elevation of the proposed shed to be at approximately 993.62 (min. 997.7 NGVD29 required).

Applicant: Scott Peddycoart

Property Owner: Ralph F Peddycoart Rev Intr Tr

Property address: 11355 Lawrence Ave NW, Annandale

Sect-Twp-Range: 6-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206019000011 and 206000064102

Present: Scott Peddycoart

Peddycoart – Has a small family cabin on Clearwater Lake. His proposal is to tear down the existing shed/garage and foundation and replace it with a slightly larger shed/garage.

Oleson – The current shed is 1.6 ft away and 2.3 ft away from the property line. New shed will be 2.3' all the way along, they did rotate it a little bit and moved it closer to the road, which gets it closer, even in that road setback. That helps to keep the property under that 25% limit for impervious. Most current calculations are left is existing and the right is proposed, it is just a little over the 25% now. Because were going into the gravel. Side yard setback Variance, road setback Variance, and it's still within the 75 ft lake setback, even though it's quite a bit further back than the cabin. This is at the end of the road, narrow in there and not a lot of traffic.

Michelle Rasmussen (neighbor) – Land surveyed just wants to understand if it changes anything. There is a double line 5ft wide that goes to the Peddycoart land and an acre on top is what the Rasmussen own. Doesn't have a problem with the building if it doesn't affect their land.

Niklaus – Reducing the impervious that is a big plus. Can they put the shed any place else on the property? Move it further away from your neighbor to the north?

Peddycoart – He doesn't think so being the landscaped area is the holding tank. He has to be able to walk on the side of the garage to get to the sidewalk that's being left.

Oleson - To let everyone know this is in a flood plain. In order for him to get it above flood plain it would take about 3 ft of fill.

Niklaus – Where is says landscaping that means landscape rock with fabric underneath. Does it serve any purpose? Peddycoart commented that the holding tank is not all the way in the ground it tapers up to it. Moving it 4-5 ft would be on top of the rock. If it could be moved further from the line that should be considered.

Dircks – Rasmussen's & Peddycoart are good with the property lines. Echoing from what Steve said to move it from the property line.

Schultz - Agree with Linda & Steve. If they could put the sidewalk on the North side of the shed.

Naaktgeboren – Move it 5 ft from the property line that is 3 more feet than what you have, he was out and measured & Flood vents.

Guck - Echoed previous thoughts. Move the shed 5 ft., 10 is the required normal.

Naaktgeboren made a motion to approve the variances to replace an existing storage shed with a 12' x 22' one-stall garage 5 from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required), 17 ft from the road right-of-

way (min. 20 ft required), 37 feet from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required and 59 feet from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required). The lowest floor elevation of the proposed shed to be at approximately 993.62 (min. 997.7 NGVD29 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 structure must be constructed to meet all local and state requirements related to building below the regulatory flood protection elevation.
3. Current and future property owners shall be responsible to identify and comply with all other local, state and federal regulations applicable to their proposed use and alteration of their property.
4. The reconstructed shed shall meet a setback of at least 5 feet from the side lot line.
5. The shed shall be constructed to meet all floodplain requirements for "wet floodproofing" including the installation of flood vents as required by local, state and federal law.

Requests related to the adjusting of a common lot line. Approvals required include a Variance to adjust a lot line between two shoreland parcels that would reduce impervious coverage from approx. 36% to 30% (max. 25% allowed) on one lot while increasing lake frontage from approx. 80 ft to 107 ft (min. 150 ft required) and increasing impervious coverage on the other lot from 14 to 15% and reducing lake frontage from 204 ft to 177 ft. Resulting lot sizes would be 18,896 sq ft and 34,726 sq ft (min. 43,560 sq ft required).

Applicants/Property Owners: Paul and Melanie Pattee/Walter and Nicole Byars
Property address: 9469 and 9463 Jeske Ave NW, Annandale
Sect-Twp-Range: 16-121-27
Parcel number(s): 206000164202 and 206000164201

Present: Paul & Melanie Pattee & Walter Byars - All parties have been satisfied with new agreements. Now the property is solely owned by Mr. & Mrs. Byers and their family. In satisfying Mrs. Pattee portion of interest in that property it was agreed to accept some transfer of property interest which is the hashtag area on the map. That would give her more lakefront both on the big lake side and the bay side, so it would go through the peninsula, unfortunately what they are missing at that point is the description of the property line. He has been in put in a request with Paul Otto dated back 6 weeks, trying to get the survey complete. He has signed off on a work order to get the survey done.

Mrs. Pattee - The Impervious now is about 36%. Going to bring it down to 30%.

Oleson - This is the existing conditions, or pre-existing when the house was still there.

Mr. Pattee: So that house and all the pavers removed and the septic tanks in that area were removed. The drain field has stayed the same and that was a septic system that was put in 3 years ago to serve both structures, so now it only serves the one structure with the drain field twice the size as what it needs to be, but there is no plan change.

Guck - Were just looking to approve it without the legal description?

Oleson - Yes, we just don't have the survey which gives us the legal description which we'll need eventually to record it properly and document everything. Question is do you feel you need exact numbers from the survey, before you make a decision?

Naaktgeboren - Can we approve this and hand it to you, and it isn't approved, until you get the actual document.

Oleson - Yes you would just make a condition on approval being they submit a survey, that it basically substantial to this drawing here, so they don't change it to way down here.

Guck - As long as all the parties that are here I don't see why we can't.

Oleson - Or maybe you are ok with moving it as long as all the setbacks are met from the structures to the new online.

Guck - Given the drawing we were presented.

Oleson - Impervious surface coverage will change for each lot but when you add the two together it's the same as it is now either way.

Naaktgeboren - So one gains 27 feet and one loses 27 feet. The way it's set up now.

Oleson - Right. I don't see any particular reason that we have to wait to make a decision

Schultz - Would rather wait for the survey. No problem with the line change

Mrs. Pattee - Ok to approve with the condition requiring the survey.

Dircks - would like to have the actual numbers before making a decision. Smaller over impervious. Is there something that could be done to reduce that?

Mr. Pattee - we went through this 21 years ago with Wright County, and we were required to raise the road 3 ft. and made it compliant with the regulations. The plan as you see it was approved and we are trying to improve the impervious.

Naaktgeboren - Does not have a problem. Does not have a problem to have a condition for the survey. Glad you are coming down in impervious.

Nicklaus - Agree with Dick and feel they are improving the impervious. In favor of approving with the condition of the survey.

Mr. Pattee - we have made improvements.

Guck - doesn't have a problem with the drawing.

Niklaus made a motion to approve variance to adjust a lot line between two shoreland parcels that would reduce impervious coverage from approx. 36% to 30% (max. 25% allowed) on one lot while increasing lake frontage from approx. 80 ft to 107 ft (min. 150 ft required) and increasing impervious coverage on the other lot from 14 to 15% and reducing lake frontage from 204 ft to 177 ft. Resulting lot sizes would be 18,896 sq ft and 34,726 sq ft (min. 43,560 sq ft required) with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide a survey that indicates all dimensions and legal descriptions relating to the resulting lots.
2. That the resulting Pattee lot shall have a minimum width on the lakeshore of 100 feet.
3. That the resulting Byars lot shall have a minimum width of at least 150 feet.
4. All structures on the lots must meet required setbacks to the new property line

Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-1 with Schultz against.

Requests related to the replacement of an existing dwelling and several sheds with a new dwelling and attached garage and the construction of a new detached garage. Approvals required include Variances to construct a new two-story dwelling/attached garage approx. 48 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required), 10 ft from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required), 37.6 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required) and 13.1 ft from a septic drainfield (min. 20 ft required) and with fill around the home to an elevation of 996.7 (NGVD29) for less than 15 feet in all directions. Home to be elevated to elevation of 998.0 (NGVD29) to meet floodplain elevation requirements. Variances to construct new 22' x 22' detached garage approx. 23.3 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required). Garage would be located at an elevation of approximately 992-993 (min. required 997.7 NGVD29).

Applicant/Property Owner: William T. Brannan III and Anita M. Brannan

Property address: 11255 Lawrence Ave NW, Annandale.

Sect-Twp-Range: 6-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206019000070 and 206000064415

Present: William & Anita Brannan, Bernie Miller, Cap Custom Homes

Mr. Brannan: Propose to tear down what is existing on the property and propose to rebuild a permanent year round structure on the property and propose to put a second storage facility on the back lot across the road.

Oleson- The existing cabin and the 3 sheds would get removed, then they would build a new home and attached garage, 2 story home which would be further back from the lake and would be within the side yard setback of 15 feet that's normally required, road setback variance 13.1 feet from the septic drain field would be the house, that's closer than the 20 feet that is normally required, flood plain on Clearwater Lake so this house is being elevated on fill to meet the requirement, which requires some retaining walls around it to hold the fill in. We're not doing 15 feet of fill around it so that requires a variance also. Garage across the road is also in a flood plain and is not being elevated, it would take quite a bit of fill and would not be feasible to get in it. It would then need to have flood vents in it to be allowed there. But that is within the road setback. This is not a very big piece of land.

Mr. Miller - Plans not to go any closer to the drainfield or the existing house still a good septic system & compliant. There is a pump in the bunkhouse as it sits close to the road, heavy rain floods it out. Hard to change the septic to put the house on the lot. Certifies that it meets the compliance criteria.

Oleson - To achieve the 5 bedroom have to change to septic to Time dosing. The impervious coverage since there is a road going through there, each side has to be treated separately for that calculation, so the lake side the proposal is to go to the 25% limit, and with the garage and with how small the lot is you would have to go up a little bit above 26.8%. The garage is proposed at 22x22.

Evavold - Changing the driveway from the garage of that angle, then we can get some downslope on that garage, because we are now at a 6% slope, but if we came straight off the road with it, that is why the driveway kind of tails around that and then we can use that low spot for a rain garden. I think the 22x22 garage will help to get the storage off of the lake side to the back side.

Oleson - The required elevation for the lowest floor if it was elevated on fill it would be 997.7, it would be 5 feet of fill. Distance 23 to the center of the road, which is less, so any vehicles parked in the driveway will probably hang out. We're you intending that?

Mr. Brannan - We weren't intending to do it necessarily that way but to go back any further you start getting into the edge of the wetland area back there, we we're trying to stay out of that

area. Per DNR standard we can take a little bit of that area back there. But at the same point we were trying to come up with that happy medium, we wouldn't park a bunch of cars on that driveway, I have a different area on the other side where we can park some cars.

Guck - Any questions from the audience or online?

Mr. Brannan - Site meeting today we were talking about the water, talked about a raingarden and using the space where the bunkhouse is now to actually achieve a place for the water to go, which should be mutually beneficial for them also because there low and it does come there anyways and making that more of a purpose filled area for water will help.

Mr. Miller - To be honest you get the count to the edge of the road.

Mr. Brannan - The little jog in there is really messed up on that and a lot of that was fixed, there was a lot of legal stuff that was put in place and verified when we bought it. It was adjusted on the lake side but not adjusted on the back side. We did go to the County to see if we could combine the lots and put the parcels together but then you got the road in between but it would have achieved us getting under the 25% across the board and that was the challenge we were running into.

Oleson - Not including the road it drops down to 3072, this is the number we would typically use as we would ignore the road as it doesn't count for or against them, that's how it's been done in the past., that's how you calculated the numbers, so, 22x22 shed or 484 sq ft divided by 3072 is how you get the 15.7, maximum is 15% for that, so to get this down to 15% is about 24 sq ft less. 20 x 22 would work.

Evavold - It would make more sense to make it 20 x 22 then it would be 2 feet further off the road. Reduce 20x22 driveway will get narrower.

Mr. Brannan - Can we have different driveway material? They make non impervious material.

Evavold - You can have concrete drive paths so you would have grass in between, your tire tracks is the driveway.

Oleson - There is two things going on; 1st the 15% building coverage limit is not going to be affected by your driveway, so to get under that you would have to reduce by about 24 sq feet and to get under the 25% you would have to remove 56 sq ft. Say you went to the 20x22 then your driveway is going to get narrower.

Mr. Brannan - What's the Boards opinion about going to the County to talk to them about combining the 2 lots? If Cannot do it. Why not go up? Make a 2 story garage?

Oleson - Cannot do a 2 story because of the size of the lot. Would be limited 12 ft side walls, a 6'12 roof pitch and no more than 6 ft ceiling height, on the second level, you could elevate it a little bit for storage.

Mr. Brannan - Were definitely open to that.

Niklaus - According to the Corinna Township regulations as Board of Adjustment must not approve a variance request unless the applicant proves that all of the above factors are established and their practical difficulties and complying with the initial controls. The factors that have to be established. You don't have a big enough lot for all you're trying to build in here. You're looking to over build the site. You have so many variances here to approve. It's too much for what that site allows. You're going to have to get to 15% on the total building, you're going to get to 25% on the impervious.

Mr. Miller - If Building is 15% & Impervious is 25% are they good.

Oleson - Still have the side yard setback variance, lake & road setback and all those things apply, but in terms of impervious coverage on the lake side there fine with that.

Mr. Brannan - The now it doesn't do the lot justice, if I sell the house today the person buying will be in a worse position, but if I do the right thing and develop this lot properly with respect

to the right way to the area. We want it to be a responsible build, we love the area and want to be a part of it.

Oleson - Here are the numbers, 11.3 building coverage going to 14.2 on the lake side. 23.7 & 25.

Mr. Brannan - it will be out of the flood plain, and we will be doing water mitigation where there's a building right now where it doesn't let the water mitigate. I want to fix it and I want to do right.

Naaktgeboren - It's good you're moving back from the lake. Runoff, rain guard, keep the water off the neighbor to the north, yes. Can move closer to the septic, no. Detach garage, can move it back 5 ft, yes but at what point get in trouble with wetland? Need more space from the road, to get more room for parking.

Mr. Brannan - Will fix that, the setback 15-25.

Mr. Miller - Existing lowest floor elevation is 996.7 which is a foot to low, below the floodplain, we've got to go to 998. Basically were not even going up 1 1/2 ft. to the house being raised up, the fill around the house on the lake side is not as much.

Dircks - Does the Township maintain the road? Yes

Schultz - likes moving the garage further away from the road.

Dircks - Garage not hung up on the 15.7 not concerned, try to reduce impervious including the building.

Guck - Turning the garage and making it higher. He's ok to keep 15 & 25% impervious.

Mr. Miller - When try to turn it to get 20 ft from the road, then it turns in and hits the well. Side of the garage it might not totally be square with the road.

Naaktgeboren - Would like it back from the road at least 20ft, and wants it to be 15% & 25% for coverages.

Niklaus made a motion to approve the variances to construct a new two-story dwelling/attached garage approx. 48 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required), 10 ft from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required), 37.6 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required) and 13.1 ft from a septic drainfield (min. 20 ft required) and with fill around the home to an elevation of 996.7 (NGVD29) for less than 15 feet in all directions. Home to be elevated to elevation of 998.0 (NGVD29) to meet floodplain elevation requirements. Variances to construct new 22' x 22' detached garage approx.. 23.3 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required). Garage would be located at an elevation of approximately 992-993 (min. required 997.7 NGVD29), not to exceed 15% building coverage and 25% impervious coverage 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, wetlands, road right-of-way or onto adjoining properties. 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.

3. Current and future property owners shall be responsible to identify and comply with all other local, state and federal regulations applicable to their proposed use and alteration of their property.
4. The proposed detached garage must be at least 20 feet from the edge of the road surface, 5 feet to rear and side lot lines, and not be located in the wetland.

Naaktgeborne seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report – Nothing to report

- Permits
- Correspondence
- Enforcement Actions

Other Business

- Discussion – Wright County Supportive Care Ordinance (2016) – State passing to allow a temporary healthcare building on a temp basis unless you opt out. Wright County opted out and passed their own ordinance which said public health has to start the review and requires Wright County to notify neighbors & hold a public hearing if requested. My question was where the township fits in and it was indicated that they would notify the township and we could decide at that time. It came up again and asked Barry now that he is in charge and he thought the township would be responsible for sending the notices out. Just wanted to bring it up to make you aware. It is their ordinance not ours but wanted your thoughts if we should be more involved. Township would be responsible for a zoning report, the County would be responsible for the septic & the mobile home for compliance with building code, and the county board would hold the hearing. The county board would ultimately have the say if they could do it and we would be responsible for following up on the removal of it. Not in favor of us being responsible with the removal of it when they are the ones that approve. Cleanest way would be that the County handle everything and we only have the opportunity to comment but not sure how they will respond to that. If they are not going to handle feel we need some type of writing agreement & escrow for the removal of the building.
- Planning Commission – Training Session (None)

Motion was made by Niklaus, seconded by Dircks to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously at 9:00 pm.

Minutes prepared by Heidi Eckerman