

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MARCH 13, 2025

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 –Al Guck, Dick Naaktgeboren, Linda Dircks, John Dearing, Barry, Cathy Gabriel Planning and Zoning Administrator Ben Oleson; Heidi Eckerman and Steve Niklaus via web conference.

Absent: None

Others in Attendance: Timothy Johnson, Ann Porter, Josh Veit, Cory Grunewald, Becky Potter, Catherine Modrow, Lisa Petersen, Jan Dixon, Paul Mielke, Jane Hurley, Courtney Schleppenbach, Greg Wensmann, Peter Zielsdorf, Dakota Zielsdorf, Juli Zielsdorf, Rich Riesgraf, Melissa Riesgraf, Julie Kreitz, Kay Hickey, Diane Vance, Nancy Guddal, Jess Daniels, Kimberly Anderson (one unreadable name)

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

Public Hearings

Requests related to the operation of a vacation rental. Approvals required include an Interim Use Permit to continue operating a private/vacation home rental served by a holding tank septic system.

Applicant/Property Owner: Ricky and Melissa Riesgraf

Property address: 11847 Gulden Ave NW, Maple Lake

Sect-Twp-Range: 1-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206086001150

Present: Ricky & Melissa Riesgraf

Oleson: We had three conditions last time. One was the time frame of it, which was three years. Second is they have to submit their records for tank pumping, which they've been doing. Third was submitting annual registration, marking property lines and things like that. We have not had any issues. You're free to approve this for really any length of time that you're comfortable with. It could be one year, it could be 20 years, and it's up to you. When we first adopted this ordinance, I think we were doing two years. I think three years has kind of been what we've been looking at. But you're free to do whatever you're comfortable with. They do live right next to it. A lot of these don't have the operator or the manager of it that close.

Guck: Any questions or concerns from anyone?

Niklaus: No Concerns, suggest 5 years.

Gabriel: No Concerns/ was thinking 3 years but, 5 years is good.

Dircks: Signage accomplished? Yes. Permanent Residence? Yes.

Schultz: No concerns/ Alright with 5 years.

Dearing: Good with 5 years.

Naaktgeboren: They have been good role models, 5 years is good

Guck: No complaints - 5 years is good.

Motion was made by Dearing based on the findings of fact to approve Interim Use Permit to continue operating a private/vacation home rental served by a holding tank septic system with the following conditions:

1. The interim use permit shall expire five (5) year(s) from the date of approval or sooner if another triggering event listed in the ordinance occurs prior to that date. Upon expiration, the applicant may re-apply for a new interim use subject to the requirements of the Township ordinances at the time.
2. The applicant shall meet all applicable requirements of Section 781 of the Corinna Township Land Use Ordinance including, but not limited to, submitting required septic records, clearly demarcating the boundaries of the property with a fence, signage, landscaping or other method as approved by the Zoning Administrator.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Requests related to the rebuilding and expansion of a dwelling and detached garage destroyed by fire. Approvals required include a Variance to construct a 1,336 sq ft one-story dwelling over an existing basement (expanding the main level from 904 sq ft) with an attached approximately 28' x 30' garage to be approx. 7 ft from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required), 0 ft from a road right-of-way (min. 20 ft required), 46 ft from a road centerline (min. 65 ft required) and possibly within the required 100 ft lake setback pending survey documentation.

Applicant: Joshua Veit

Property Owner: Joshua Paul Veit and Cory Grunewald

Property address: 7987 Griffith Ave NW, Maple Lake

Sect-Twp-Range: 25-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206017000012 and 206017000013

Present: Joshua Veit and Cory Grunewald

Veit: On December 14th we had a fire. It started in our garage, and then it spread to the house and up into the attic, and they charred and burned the trusses. So when we went out with our contractor, he suggested that we bring the whole house down. The original house was built in the late 60s, and it's just a standard 900 square foot cabin. They lifted it back in about the 80s, built out the foundation, which is now larger than the cabin, then they sat it back down on the foundation. There's this area where there's this flat roof. So what we're wanting to do is extend the floor trusses all the way out to the edge of that foundation, so we would gain about 300 to 400 square feet of living space. Then we would like to move the garage closer to the house and attach it to the house, where the garage is now.

Oleson: Variances are road and side lot line setbacks, possibly the lake setback. It's hard to measure on a peak and map exactly where that high water mark is. It might be just over the 100 foot setback and maybe a little bit underneath it, but it's not obviously going any closer than what the existing structure is now. You're going to leave the existing foundation right?

Veit: Yes, the contractor and the insurance company said this foundation was fine, so we will reuse the foundation, and then the floor trusses will just extend out over the block.

Oleson: So those would be the variances. As you can see on the aerial photo here, this was before the fire. These are approximate property lines. We don't know exactly where they are. I know they've been working on getting a survey.

Veit: Talked to him today. He said he was going to be in contact with you on it. So that was my communication with him.

Oleson: So, my understanding is the survey was out there maybe a couple times, and kind of was running into some confusion about how wide the road was. It was planted out at 66 feet on both of these roads, but he was finding a different number and some of his measurements. So we're kind of awaiting on that distance to the side lot line in particular, and to the road and the lake and everything to know exactly what we're dealing with. But they own both of these parcels. They've applied to combine them into one. When you combine the two, their impervious coverage is fine. Their building coverage is under the limits. But like he said, they would like to attach the garage when they rebuild, and then make the garage a little bit wider than it is now.

Schultz: So it would be close to the lot line?

Oleson: It would not be closer to the lot line. It would be further away. We are waiting for the survey to confirm. Along with where it is in relation to this road right away because obviously it can't be in the road right away. If it's being rebuilt it could be grandfathered in so to speak, but we wouldn't want to continue that, if we can help it. That is the basics of it, rebuilding basically on top of this existing foundation for the house, and then trying to attach the garage and getting it a little bit further from the side yard property line. I'm estimating, I think seven feet or so to the line. But again, that's just estimating, so I don't really know with any certainty where that is without the survey. I did ask Veit about could the garage be moved to the other side of the property. He had some reasons that he can explain better than I can, but having to do with the road set back and egress windows.

Veit: So there's egress windows on the left side there. Those would have to be relocated to the other side and the well could be an issue. The windows on that side are also in good condition so we don't need to replace either of those. There is also the plan of a deck coming out on that side. We would like the deck there because it has the view of the lake and of our other lot, versus looking at a garage if the deck was on the other side. Plus the mechanicals and where everything hooks up. The contractor said it makes it easier if the garage is on the right side of the house.

Oleson: They do have a septic system that's on that west side also. It's pretty far over, so planning just continue using that. Obviously, fire did spread to the neighboring property a little bit too. And so there's been some concern expressed about that in the conversations with her, and I think she's maybe here tonight, but you can get to that during the public comments. I'll just clarify too. As you know from other discussions we've had about variances in the past, they would have the ability to rebuild the same size and location as they have now without a variance under that state law that allows people to do that with these non-conforming structures. So the only caveat to that, I would say, is that if they were rebuilding and it was in the road right of way that might be something that we could make them shift it over. But I

again, I don't know if it's in the road right away or not, but in relation to the side lot line the lake, everything else they're allowed to rebuild right where they want to, if they don't expand, but they're going to be expanding the house, as he said, out towards the lake. It's not an expansion of the foundation, but it's an expansion of the house itself, and then the garage will be changing its location. So that's the reason we had to require the variance on this one.

Audience: Please raise your hand give us your name before speaking.

Guddal: My question would be, how is the property going to be with the new garage? How far over is that going to be? Is it going to be as far as the current pattern? So it's going to go up against the house. And then how many feet.

Veit: We are asking for 30 feet from the edge of the house.

Guddal: That'll be straight then?

Veit: Yes. I marked it. You can see right there. It does not go as far out as the current garage pad. The dotted line is the current garage pad, so you can see the new garage attaches to the house and doesn't go as far over.

Guddal: Okay. So what does the rule currently in place for the footage from a property line to the next actual building? So say, because the way the lots are shaped, they're shaped very funny. That the lot that they have initially was never to be built on and probably mine wasn't either. But we know that corner one was not because it's actually noted on the original documentation and it was meant for something else. It's an easement thing. It's not, it was not a buildable size lot the way it was designed in the original plot. So they changed that obviously and got a variance. At some point they decided they wanted to build another one there. But we have a lot of property in that community in general that is really, really tight. With that in mind, after all of this and experiencing a fire right in the community. I've been there for 22 years. My husband's been there for 40 so we've probably seen more things than the majority share of the people in the room, because they just didn't live there. But we've had in our neighborhood, your property at one time was on fire before you were there, and then Louise was on fire, and then obviously the property next door was on fire. In all it is like three houses in very close proximity to our home, and we had another very large explosion down the way. So we have an issue in general experiences, and how many variances are we putting out there, not just specific to this situation, but in general, because once you've been hit that many times by fire, and have a situation where you know it was frightening for all of us, and thankfully, we had a great neighbor who was watching his son's dog and sought and reacted appropriately for him, because I can assure you, I wouldn't have known, and they wouldn't know. I mean, he actually had to go and get those guys to come out of the house if you had a fire. The time allotment for the fire department was a concern to him that night, because he called and he felt it was forever. I said, well, you know, they're in volunteer fire department. It takes time to get here. He then came and got us, and we moved our cars, and, you know, did all the things we could do, but literally, we had to wait a long time before water was ever even put on the property. It was because we're a volunteer situation, and having houses close to each other and a lot of variances in a very tight space, which we clearly do have, because if you look at the road on the other side of their property, both houses are super, super tight.

Guck: To answer your question on the property line. The required setback now is 15 feet.

Guddal: Technically we don't know where the property line is.

Guck: All of them were built before the planning and zoning was even around. So I can imagine the roads got to be figured out, and lot lines.

Guddal: It was it was plotted, but the road was put in incorrectly at one point. We all let that go, because it would have cost us as taxpayers a lot more money to you know, have you redo

the road so the road is skewed where the placement is. If you're surveying from the center of a road, that is going to be off, and that's normally how they would do it. Obviously the road wasn't in the original place. Now they are checking on the original plot.

Guck: They're actually going to be further away from the lot line than what they are now.

Guddal: But the lot line, that lot line is still in question still. So we don't know how if that is really.

Guck: But structurally they will be further from where they were.

Guddal: Yes I know, but that was already on, partially on the easement.

Dearing: But it could move towards yours too, and you'd be closer.

Guddal: I am close to it. I'm on it.

Naaktgeboren: Your garage is totally on the right of way.

Dearing: Your garage was built without even a permit.

Guddal: What? No, it wasn't.

Naaktgeboren: Yes it was

Guddal: No, It had a permit.

Dearing: They wouldn't have given it to you in the right of way

Guddal: That was before my time.

Naaktgeboren: That's what we're trying to tell you. Griffith has got an issue from day one, because you can go up and down Griffith and half of the properties up to the corner are on the road right away, or past the road right away. And that's a problem.

Guddal: We have that issue. So my concern is, how close are we? How many variances are we putting in because of a fire concern in general? I mean, it isn't an isolated fire situation. We've had other fires, and we don't have the means.

Guck: We understand the fire situation. Yes, ma'am, but the thing is he's moving further from what than what was there. So we're going to continue on. This other gentleman has a question.

Audience (no name): The structure is going to be further away than it currently has been. So if you're worried about fire, they're actually going to be further away from your property.

Guddal: No, I'm worried about variances in general.

Audience: (no name): It sounds like your property has a variance issue anyway. So I wouldn't worry about it.

Guddal: All of us do.

Guck: Okay, Anyone else?

Zielsdorf: I've been back on the lake for 25 years and I have dealt with variances several times. Everything in our community is a variance. That's part of the lake community and the way the properties were built back then. Nothing was built to squares. Everything's built in triangles and abstract figures, and it's a part of what we have to do with where we're at, and it's normal.

Grunewald: One of the main reasons why we want to do this is because this could be our retirement home, so we are have a little bit of a concern, like not going outside the house in the winter time and stuff like that. So that is, again, one of the main reasons why we do want to connect the garage to the house.

Veit: We put a lot of handicapped accessible things into the new plan, because we have handicapped parents. We also have some various health issues and stuff. So that's one of the main things. So when we have winter storm, we don't have to outside to get in the car. It is a safety also.

Naaktgeboren: You're going to attach the garage to the house outside. I would move the garage further back to get it off the road right away. Get it back, plus for parking. There's plenty of room from where the road is right now to your garage, you're still on the road right away. If I'm

going to try and improve something that area, we have to start taking properties and keeping them off the road right away, because it's a problem all the way up that road. This is the first step you got room, push the garage back a little bit.

Grunewald: Like align with the back?

Naaktgeboren: Towards the lake.

Grunewald: Align the back of the foundation?

Naaktgeboren: I don't go all the way back, but I would go back further than what you have right here in your plan.

Dircks: So you are saying towards the lake.

Naaktgeboren: Yes, get it off the road right away, because now is the time to do it.

Veit: So like, how far three feet, five feet?

Dearing: I'd like to see it five feet.

Naaktgeboren: As much as you can. Five would be good. Are you adding a bedroom to this by chance, or is this going to be the same with what you have now?

Veit: The only thing we're adding is a half bath. We're going to have a primary suite with an attached bathroom.

Naaktgeboren: Okay, I'm just looking at for sewer.

Veit: It's a three bedroom house now, and it's going to remain a three bedroom house.

Grunewald: If we move the garage back there, would it be possible for us to do a tuck under another garage? Would we need another variance for that? It would double our garage space. It would just be a tuck under with, like a single stall garage that we could store shed type of things.

Naaktgeboren: Like a precast floor with something underneath? Or what are you talking?

Veit: So it'd be like a two story garage.

Naaktgeboren: So down below you'd have a walk out. You'd have a walk out underneath, yeah?

Veit: Like a workshop.

Guck: Would you make it narrower so you are away from the lot line?

Veit: That was not the initial plan, but could be an option.

Schultz: Would you go the whole garage size?

Grunewald: That was the intention of kind of like do that, and then get the stairwell that goes down from the main garage to the downstairs, yes, and then put a single stall garage as the walkout.

Dearing: They don't need another variance for that?

Oleson: No, not as long as it's attached to the house. If it's detached then we get into some limitations on sidewalk where those walkouts can sometimes be affected by that. But if it's attached, then we don't have that.

Naaktgeboren: You just end up going deeper with your footings and foundation. You have to ask span create floor of some kind.

Grunewald: We aren't sure we're doing it, but I wanted to check.

Oleson: Just for everybody's information. You've got a couple windows planned on that side. It looks like the garage, right?

Veit: Yes.

Oleson: I will have to confirm this with the building inspectors that the township contracts with. But my understanding is that when you get close enough to a property line, then you're not allowed to have windows for the fire purpose.

Veit: I was going to ask the architect to remove them.

Oleson: I think there, are some requirements in the fire code for when you get too close to a property line and that there be some extra protection to slow down the spread of fire, not that it's going to prevent it entirely, but it will slow it down anyways, is my understanding. That's not my expertise, but that's something that we should double check with once we know what that building setback is to the property line.

Guck: Does that include a service door?

Oleson: I think it's any openings, is my understanding. But again, we will have to talk with the building officials.

Naaktgeboren: An opening to the garage would be a type B, and that's supposed to be fire rated, correct?

Oleson: That would be building official requirement to review.

Naaktgeboren: That's what I'm thinking. That any garage door or into the house doors supposed to be a fire rated door, so I don't know.

Dearing: I am fine if you move it back at least five feet. Or there's a basement window there. You don't want to block that so going that far.

Veit: If you see where the office is, because we're dealing with two roof lines, because there's a bump out, that's why they're there. It's kind of U shaped there. That's the back the front of the house, I think it's the first slide right there. We have the porch and then to the right of the porch, to the right is a bump out. So there was some roofline things, which is why he put it there. But I can check with architect and see how far back he can go without altering the footprint inside.

Grunewald: So maximum space might be just from the bump out to the existing garage.

Veit: Yes the front of the garage will probably just have to be pushed to that bump out to move it back, which is still probably, 3-4 feet.

Oleson: Ben pulled up and asked where they were looking at.

Grunewald: Yes, it would be aligned with that. That's probably the maximum we could go with.

Gabriel: Every time I looked at this I come back to we didn't have the survey, and even if you push it back it looks like we're going in a triangle here. It looks great, but I don't know where that line is, and it seems it's a legit issue. As far as rebuilding and not getting closer, great. I don't have any issues. However feel we need the survey.

Schultz: I agree. Need to have the survey first, but I think it's good that we're giving them some ideas, so that when they come back with the survey, we know more exact how much they could move that garage towards the lake.

Niklaus: What was the size of the previous garage?

Naaktgeboren: 24 by 30

Niklaus: The garage that burned down. How large was that?

Oleson: I'm going to go to the assessor's sketch here and they have 24x22.

Niklaus: I think the real positive thing of this property is you have so much room on the as we look at it, on that left side, that solves all the impervious issues. And also I think it really raises the question, is there really a need to crowd the neighbor that much when you have all the property on the other side, you know, I can understand the windows as an issue and stuff, but if you're willing to look at a tuck under and everything else on the right side, I just think the answer is to put this garage on the other side of the house. And you are going with quite a bit larger garage.

Grunewald - There would be no way for us to put a tuck under in that position because of the location of the septic.

Niklaus: But if you just have this garage that you're looking for. Or just 28 by 30. Does that get into the septic issue?

Grunewald: Yes, where you want us to move the garage. It is over on our extra property there, and there are tanks, but the maintenance tanks are over there.

Niklaus: My point is, I don't see the need to crowd your neighbor and crowd the road when you have so much property on the other side.

Grunewald: I see your point. But that wouldn't be possible for us because we would have to move our septic.

Oleson: So this is the record I have on the septic from 2005 there's a map in here, when I get down far enough.

Niklaus: The other thing is putting an attached garage on with a smaller size, the same as what was there would not crowd the neighbor the road quite as much.

Oleson: Showed the house and the tanks and the drain fills up by the road. So I think if you were to move on the west side, it's potentially going to be closer to the lake and possibly closer to the road, but we needed survey and everything to know that for sure. And then they mentioned their egress window concern.

Grunewald: There is a very steep hill there.

Guck: What type of slope?

Oleson: Pulled up map; its flatter up top, and then it gets steeper as you go down. So each of these lines is two foot drop as you go down. So from here to here, there's two foot a drop.

Naaktgeboren: You know, it would be nice. We're guessing on that footage would be nice to have a survey so we could actually say your X amount of feet now you're going to move over so many feet from the neighbor's lot or whatever. Otherwise you're playing games here.

Veit: So my understanding is too, it's more the garage that is the issue. My understanding is, if we got the same slab, we could rebuild the garage?

Oleson: The same size Okay. Again, as long as it's if it's on the right away, that's a little bit more, but later, we'd have to make it move it off.

Veit: But the foundation.

Oleson: You don't even have to get the foundation you're just allows you to rebuild completely in the same location to the same size.

Schultz: But it would be better if they could attach it, right?

Naaktgeboren: Would you ever consider cutting your garage down a couple feet on that side you got a 30 right now, I believe you're going to go. If you went down to 28ft?

Veit: Yeah. So if you look at it. Part of it is because when he's joining the roof lines.

Naaktgeboren: You got 30 on your plan here. So what if you went down to 28 still a lot of garage.

Dearing: Then move it back so it's even with the front at that bump out.

Oleson: Somebody was saying, the further you move back, it looks like it might get closer to that side property line, too, a little bit. But, you know, without the survey again, it's hard to know.

Naaktgeboren: Do you have one in the works right now?

Veit: Yes, we've been dealing with them, for six weeks, and now he says there's an issue with the road. He was supposed to have it done today and it's not done.

Oleson: This is your driveway kind of loops between both roads, right? Yeah. So in terms of parking, you're not coming straight in here. Parking both ways.

Schultz Made a motion that we table this until you get the survey and you can work with your designer a little better and downsize the garage.

Naaktgeboren: Move it back and downsize it.

Veit: Okay, but that's going to put us off by a month now.

Naaktgeboren: Well that's the flip side, it's hard to make a decision here when we're guessing at the numbers.

Veit: But the other option is if we drop the garage completely and rebuilt it exactly where it is. Then the house would be approved to do the addition.

Naaktgeboren: Yes, that's what Ben said, but I would recommend not doing that.

Veit: But this statue would allow us to do that.

Oleson: If you came in, I'd probably have to ask for the survey to know where the right of way line is, but absent that, yeah, you can apply for a garage, and I would have to issue it based on the statute if it's the same size, not any taller, not any bigger footprint.

Dearing: But it still cannot be built on the right away.

Oleson: Yes, I would still need the survey to make sure it's not in the right of way.

Schultz: But you can go ahead with the house, right?

Oleson: That's up to you guys. If you want to approve the house portion of the variance and table the garage portion, I guess you can do that.

Veit: At least everything else approved would be appreciated, so that we can start the demo.

Oleson: You can start demo whenever you want, I don't think that depends on the variance notification.

Veit: But the addition of the main floor is going to be fine.

Oleson: Any concern from you guys, you haven't really talked about that.

Naaktgeboren: No, I don't. It's on the same footprint.

Schultz: I'm changing my motion to go ahead with the addition on the house, and hold up until we get a survey with the garage, and then look at what, how you can better it even from where it's at. Dircks seconded the motion.

Guck: Is there any other comments questions?

Guddal: I have just one more question, just about the water issue. So if they're going to start the demo, can you guys just make sure that they double check when they have to do any grading or anything like that, that it is actually going away, because currently, we've already had a major issue between the two houses and the water flow right down the property.

Grunewald: Whose property is it going through?

Guddal: Right down the property between the two houses.

Naaktgeboren: In the staff report, if we put staff report number one, two, and three on it that takes care of the water issues.

Guddal: On the notes that they sent to me that they say that he didn't think that it would be any but there is already just so we're aware of that. We already have the water issue.

Guck: I'm sure there will be rip rap.

Guck: A motion has been made to table the garage addition and go ahead with the demo and the house construction and the second by Dircks. Motion was approved unanimously. Go get your survey and get it to Ben and we can revisit it next month.

Guddal: I'm sure they'll build a beautiful home. I just don't want us to not take into consideration how many variances and the fact that we have a very serious fire issue, we had to call in two other cities to help with this fire, and they could not stop that fire, okay, because they

didn't have the means to do it. And with us being as close as we are, it is a very serious issue, not really concerning?

Guck: Well, have you ever thought of a remote fire hydrant? It comes out of the lake.

Guddal: It's called, actually, I asked about that, and the fire chief said, No, actually, yes, sir.

Schultz: I was on the Annandale Fire Department. We put in two dry hydrogens. They call them dry hydrogens and it's a pipe that goes right out in the lake.

Guddal: I think the DNR kind of has maybe an issue with that, but I agree that's a great idea.

Schultz: To keep them maintained is almost impossible with a volunteer, because the two that we that are installed are unusable.

Guddal: Well, we have a committee. Maybe they could get on board with that, right, and we'll be fine with that. But that isn't the problem.

Dearing: It would never work in Mink and Somers, there's too much algae and all that in the lake.

Guddal: The reality is we don't have the support system to accommodate too many variances, and that's why I asked the question of them, how many have we put in? How many are on the lake? And we don't know that exactly. It's more important than I'm happy to do the work if I have access to records to find out. But if you've ever been affected by a fire like my family was, it's serious, and that line means something to me, because my lot is 40.

Dearing: We've got people waiting here.

Guddal: I'm sorry. I am so sorry. You guys don't understand that what the words that you say can affect I was not attacking him in any way yet. As I was just attacked for having an opinion about something very serious in our community.

Guck: I'm sorry for interrupting, but we have to continue on to the next hearing.

Requests related to the rebuilding and expansion of an existing dwelling and construction of a new attached garage and open deck. Approvals required include a Variance to construct a 1,216 sq ft two-story dwelling to replace an existing 960 sq ft single-story dwelling, expand the existing basement by 256 sq ft and construct a new 24' x 24' attached garage, 6' x 16' front porch and 16' x 36' open deck and stairway approx. 5'9" - 9'1" from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) and 65 ft from Mink Lake (min. 100 ft required).

Applicant: Wensmann Contractors

Property Owner: Timothy D Johnson and Erin A Johnson

Property address: 6411 85th St NW, Maple Lake

Sect-Twp-Range: 24-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206089000080

Present: Tim & Erin Johnson & Greg Wensmann

Johnson: I'm Tim and my wife, Erin Johnson. We live in Delano. We had this property out here on Mink Lake for about eight or nine years, and have enjoyed spending summers out there. At some point we began to get the imagination and the vision that we would want to spend more time here when the last the kids are gone and graduated this last summer. That necessitated first looking at, could we do something with what was there, make it a little larger? As we talked with different people, it became evident that in order to do that, it really was going to be there wasn't much to salvage there. I've been working with Greg and Courtney and their company for the last year and a half, It certainly drew in conversation with Ben early on as well, and have developed what has been presented to you now, kind of maximizing what our

understanding is of what we could do so it is a little bit of a larger footprint. Add a garage, go up one floor on half of the property, and a deck.

Wensmann: Greg with Wensmann Contractors just a little bit of background around us. We are a general contractor. We do quite a few lake home additions. This is a service that we do provide to the clients, is they contact us, hopefully early on, the clients will give us their wants, their needs, their budgets. We take a look at the site conditions and all the varying things around it. We work with the surveyors and it's our job to kind of dump everything in the basket, consider all the factors around it, around the project, and then when we're done, hopefully we can have a project out that's on budget, buildable, and considers the environmental piece of it, that's always a big piece. And I can warranty it. A couple of things about this project that were a little bit of a unique challenge. It did have an actual foundation under it. A lot of them don't, so it's easy just to remove it and start with a clean slate. I looked heavily at taking the foundation out and repositioning it on the property to better fit this piece of property, and what I kept coming up against is one when I dig foundations, it's a lot of ground. It's more disturbance in the area, a lot more truck traffic. Plus, if you'll see where the well is on the south side, it would have meant a new well, which, of course, you're not guaranteed good water when you drill a new well, but I felt if we were to relocate that well, it would have had possibly current and future impacts to septic's out there. And so right or wrong, we determined to leave the existing foundation where it is, knowing that we're starting out with not enough offset on the north property line, and we ended up with the plan that we have, except the North line setback. It's a pretty modest house. Its 1216 square feet per level. And then added a garage it's 24 by 24.

Guck: Okay, Ben, what can you add to this?

Oleson: Two variances here the lake setback should be 100 feet on Mink lake and there within that about 68 feet to the deck anyways, and then side yard setback on the north side, supposed to be 15 and it's about 5 almost 6 foot to 9 feet as you go back. So that was actually a different drawing that they had initially.

Wensmann: I'm not sure which one you have, but the existing cabin is 6'6 and following that same building line, the deck distance from the side yard property would be 5'10". I think it says 5'8.

Oleson: I think on the first try and when I drafted up this notice I was scaling things. I'm measuring to the deck, which does have to meet that set back to the well. It gets further away as you go back.

Wensmann: Just a quick side note, ee do meet Department of Health requires three foot clearance from the well, and we have that on the roof edge.

Guck: I think ours is more than that, isn't it?

Oleson: No, we go with the Department Health. Its three foot from the overhang.

Wensmann: So, there's quite a few that are less that we have encountered. I think the building itself, considering this site, it's a pretty good plan. Ben, if you don't mind, if I'll just bring this up and I have to apologize. We work in multiple counties and jurisdictions, and some of these numbers fluctuate a little bit. Doesn't Corinna have in their zoning ordinance, the deck is allowed 15% closer to the water than what the building structure is?

Oleson: There is a provision on that, it has to do with pre-existing houses. I think it limits it to the fact that you're tearing the house down sort of brings that into question, whether we can apply that or not, being that you're coming in for a variance anyways, I didn't actually, spend too much time thinking about that discussion. They were very close to that 25% limit on this

one. I know I had asked about making sure you included the stairs, which they did, and the size of this driveway. I noticed that this driveway is changing a little bit too with the sewer.

Wensmann: We've worked with Bernie quite a bit on the septic in the driveway to really squeeze it in, it's a type four system.

Oleson: I don't know if he didn't have calculations on here. I don't think impervious, but does that still stay under the 25%?

Wensmann: Yeah, he still stays under. That was my requirement to him, it had to be under 25% and so the numbers that I have on the architectural drawing, which I believe the board should have, were coming up at total impervious, 24.8%.

Guck: Any comments questions from anybody? Anybody online? We'll start with John.

Dearing: I'd like to see him stay down building coverage at 15% they're at 16.

Oleson: That was their existence. They're proposed this, 14.62%.

Wensmann: It's under 15. It said 14.62 both the building coverage meets 15 and total impervious meets 25 I don't find many zoning or planning commissions that are willing to budge on that unless it's in a really extenuating circumstance.

Oleson: This was what they had on their surveys. So the 16.5 was their total hard cover. So that was my mistake in the staff report.

Wensmann: That was the existing.

Oleson: They're proposed is 14.6 so they're getting close to the 15.

Wensmann: It's very close. That is part of what I have to try to do to the amenities they are looking for. We're down to a two bed.

Oleson: So you've already downsized a deck, right? You are going to go 16 feet out?

Wensmann: Yes, right. It's currently at 14. So again, it's a little bit of split in hairs, but depending on the drawing you're looking at, if you're looking at sheet A11, it's 69.2 from the OHL, and that's to the stairs. Ben, do you calculate from the stairs or from the structure? I know the stairs are part of impervious.

Oleson: We would not address a setback to this stairway. It would be a little bit further away than that.

Guck: Okay, you good?

Dearing: No, they're too close to the lake. They have to cut back the deck a little bit. I hate to go to 10 feet, because that isn't very wide, but go to 12 feet on the deck.

Guck: Okay, Dick

Naaktgeboren: I was going to go to 10 feet. Seriously, it's a lot of deck. I would have said 10 feet. John says 12. But yeah, too close to the lake. From what you're at right now, you're bringing it out further

Johnson: So if that picture backs up a little bit, or pans out, are there considerations that as you look at the proposed deck, we're still back significantly from both of our neighbors. So both of our neighbors would continue to be even closer than what our existing proposed deck is.

Naaktgeboren: How they got it, I have no idea. Some of these people got stuff that they never came to Planning and Zoning, and it was before Planning and Zoning, like you just seen earlier.

Wensmann: Tim, were you part of what you were talking about? Was that also in relation to, you know, sight lines,

Naaktgeboren: Sight lines. I was out there today. That's the right up against the house. I look to your neighbor with the big pillars and other way. You got clear view each way. Yeah, it's nothing else. I don't know if the shoreline kind of cuts around or what, but it wasn't a problem.

Johnson: What you were saying is that you were questioning more like, where they would like, the deck at the 14 feet. They're not obstructing the sight lines of the neighbors more.

Naaktgeboren: I was looking at your sight lines, right up against the house even on that both of, like you said, they're out further, but right, there's nobody's blocking anybody.

Johnson: So no, you're right. Just that notion, well, you use the term too close to the lake. And so my reference was that statement, which was that, if the issue is close to the lake, even at 14' both of our neighbors are closer?

Naaktgeboren: Do you want to bring up the sins of the past?

Johnson: Well, no, I don't mean it. I'm just simply the existence of right current.

Guck: Cathy

Gabriel: Nothing else to add.

Guck: Linda

Dircks: The deck is getting really close to the property line, even closer than the house. So I hope that can be shortened.

Guck: That brings up what Barry and I were saying.

Schultz: Go back to that picture with the deck. I think 10 feet is too short. I would go with the 12. But if you could notch it in, yeah, at least come across here, so it's no further than the house, so you follow the angle a little bit and parallel to the property line.

Naaktgeboren: Or notch it back so it's safe.

Guck: Okay, Steve, do you have any comments?

Niklaus: No, that's exactly what I was looking at as well, that the current house is already inside the requirements, and this plan moves the deck further inside. The deck shouldn't be closer than anything that's existing. I agree that that's too close to the lake that has to come back some

Guck: Okay, thank you. Somebody want to make a motion?

Wensmann: So, what I think I'm hearing you say, you would approve it based on these changes, and that it would be up to Ben or somebody else down the road to verify the plans to make sure we meet what you talked about?

Guck: It'll be in the minutes.

Naaktgeboren: That goes to the building inspector.

Wensmann: So I just remember that I don't have to waste your time and vice versa.

Naaktgeboren: I like that.

Oleson: Not necessarily, before you make your decision, but if you approve it on the condition that I get revised drawing, and I'm just verifying that it meets what you said, and it meets the 25% impervious and 15% building coverage.

Naaktgeboren: In this motion. You have to also add for the sewer too close to the road and too close to a lot line. Those are two more variances.

Oleson: Yeah, so that was what I emailed out this morning.

Wensmann: That's a good point. Can that be acted on in this meeting?

Naaktgeboren: Yes.

Oleson: Basically zero feet to the right, that's the property line next to the road, the existing drainfield is actually out in the road right away. Then your driveway is going to be somewhat narrow, so you're going to have to basically back out onto the road. Not a whole lot we can necessarily do about that.

Wensmann: It's not a super busy road back there.

Naaktgeboren: I can't make a motion, otherwise I would. Only going to add is the sewer and then the 10 foot deck, or 12 foot deck, and I'm not lying on the deck. No closer.

Dircks: Facing a 6x12deck.

Naaktgeboren: That it could be out 12 feet from the house, and it couldn't be any closer on the north side than what the house is currently.

Oleson: It is staying under 25% I assume they're not asking for that Variance. We're not granting it. So they got to stay under 25% which reduces the deck will help.

Schultz made a motion based on the findings of fact to approve variance to replace a 24' x 32' single story dwelling with basement with a new two-story dwelling with basement that consists of a 24' x 40' section and a 16' x 16' section (1,216 sq ft) and an attached 24' x 24' garage and 6' x 16' front entry porch to be approx. 9.1 ft from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) and 82.2 ft from Mink Lake (min. 100 ft required) expanding the existing basement under the entire dwelling. Also to construct a 12' x 35'4" open lakeside deck with stairway no closer to the side lot line than 6.6 feet and approx. 69 ft from Mink Lake. Variance to construct a septic system 0 feet from a road right of way and 4 feet from a side lot line 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.

Dircks seconded the motion.

More discussion regarding the septic being in the right of way and noting that the driving surface is a log ways away from where the septic will be.

Motion passed unanimously.

Naaktgeboren made a motion to approve previous meeting minutes of February 11, 2025.

Dircks seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Oleson: Zoning Administrator's Report – Nothing to report

- Permits
- Correspondence
- Enforcement Actions

Motion was made by Dircks, seconded by Dearing to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously at 8:13 pm.

Minutes prepared by Heidi Eckerma