

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION/ BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
SEPTEMBER 9, 2025

Corinna Town Hall, 9801 Ireland Ave, Annandale MN 55302
(or via web/phone conference – see last page for instructions)

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

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

Absent: Jean Just

Other in Attendance: Al Evavold, Robin Montague, Randall Hamborg, Joni & Greg Selle, Carol & Rick Kannianen, Bill Guck, Bob Shadduck, Larry Smith, Bob & Marsha Koch, Russell Newman, Jasmine Lee.

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda; Niklaus made a motion to approve the agenda, with deletion of item 4. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

1. Remove Stauffer from Agenda.
2. Correct #4 a, from Robert to Roberta.

Public Hearings

(Tabled from August 2025 meeting) Requests related to the reconstruction of an existing dwelling. Approvals required include Variances to construct an approx. 924 sq ft dwelling with walkout basement and 11' x 18' open deck approx. 5.7 ft from both side lot lines (min. 15 ft required) and 4 ft from Indian Lake (min. 100 ft required). Lot currently exceeds the 15% and 25% building and total impervious coverage limits and will continue after proposed construction.

Applicant and Property Owner: Roberta Montague and Randall Hamborg
Property address: 10902 Gulden Ave NW, Maple Lake
Parcel number(s): 206045000130

Present: Robin (Roberta) Montague & Randall Hamborg

Hamborg – Little bit smaller home 894sqft, the lot is full of challenges, we've agreed to turn the house more in line with the lot line, so we get the most separation we can. The home is a walk out rambler with a 1 bedroom loft up, a kitchen, living room and garage on the main floor, and an unfinished basement. Looking to put a 248sqft deck on the property. I think the way it fits we have enough room for a septic tank. That's about it.

Oleson- This one was tabled before so they could try to make it a little bit smaller, to get closer to the limits for impervious and building coverage to meet those limits. Looked at possibly sliding it back a little bit from the lake for the septic. It's a real tight lot. Up on the screen is the new plans for the unfinished basement, the main floor and a loft where the bedroom would be. They don't have any revised site plan. Today I'm going to try to summarize the impervious and building coverage. This is the survey of existing conditions, part of the issue here is, the ordinary high water level is the heavier black dash line, so you can see part of the house and the deck and a decent share of it is below ordinary high. So when the surveyor calculated the

impervious it was only for these things that were above the ordinary high. So when we are comparing the old house size and deck size to the new one, it matters whether you're talking about that part that is just above the ordinary high or if it's the whole house, even the part that is below the ordinary high. This is the existing that was given by the surveyor that was just the part above the ordinary high, almost 21% building and 32% impervious, their first proposal moves everything back above ordinary high, and so it sort of inflates these numbers a little bit. They were going to remove a couple sheds, a retaining wall, and some patios. These numbers are a little different than what you have. They're roughly in line. Their current proposal is still 21% building and 34% impervious. So I guess the question is given the constraints of the lot and everything and what their proposing, are you satisfied that they have met what you've asked them to do? Or are you looking for something else?

Niklaus- Ben, could you review what all the variances would be with this now?

Oleson- Obviously the lake setback, they are technically in the lake right now with the house so they would be sliding that back to get above the ordinary high, you're looking at 2 feet from the ordinary high, is that what you said?

Hamborg- No, we would be sliding it back, it originally said 10-12 ft, go back 14 feet from the present location. The existing home floor is 4 feet above ordinary high water. The existing floor. That would be the basement floor.

Oleson- This has not been updated to the new plans. This is what they had last time. It shows the red outline on what they were going to do. So sliding it back, it's the lake setback variance, side yard setback variance, normally 15 feet on the sides. It's closer to that on both of these sides.

Hamborg - But if we turn the angle so it matches the sidelines more. We should be able to maintain 6 feet on one side and 8 feet on the other.

Oleson - So 6 feet on the South side and 8 feet on the North. They're set back to the septic tank will actually be 11 feet, it's a minimum 10 feet. So it's the side yard setback, the lake setback variance, the impervious and building coverage issues and they are proposing a large enough dwelling, that it meets the 800sqft minimum. So those are the basics and we received one comment.

Guck -OK, do you want to read the one that was online?

Oleson - Do you want to speak on your own?

Leverenz - "Ben, I'll have you do it, I'm out of town and just looking at the screen.

Oleson - Original plan showed a side lot distance of 5'7" I just received a new plan from Robin this afternoon without a survey but she estimates it will be 6 feet. The new plan has a second story which further restrict light to the lake home cabin sitting just 6 feet away from the structure. I'm the only neighbor objecting because the adjoining owner has put up this home for sale due to changing family circumstances. I know the occupants are doing their best to minimize the adverse effects 6 feet is just not enough. The original plan was to accommodate ADA and senior home entry, it has no main floor bedroom, and now potentially 3 bedrooms. I acknowledge that 15 foot setback is nearly impossible but 6 foot is just too little. Set back requirements have a purpose and would like to see a better attempt to take them into consideration". Marilyn Leverenz

Hamborg - I would like to comment to the ADA. The concept with the single garage is that the designer said it can be finished for an end of life bedroom, in that area that is the garage. The ADA remains a critical piece, there can be a door that's why there is a slop sink in there when that becomes necessary. The windows on the deck for a garage you wouldn't normally need those, but if you were in there in a bed you would like them.

Guck - Any other comments from anyone?

Montague- The neighbor that is selling on the other side of us said that he doesn't have any issue with anything that we are doing and he may not actually be selling. But we won't know that until Sunday. He was going to be here tonight but I told him I don't think you need to be here.

Niklaus- Could you clarify the building coverage, now with this proposal, is it 20%?

Oleson - 15% is the standard for building coverage. 25% for total impervious

Niklaus- 25% for total impervious, where this proposal is for 34%? Then the lake set back is?

Oleson - Normally it would be on this lake it would be 100 ft, which obviously it's not possible to meet but they're proposing 14 feet.

Hamborg - 14 ft further back. So that would be actually about 19 feet.

Oleson - Then you were at 4-5 feet last time, oh sorry I misunderstood. So all of this will slide 14 feet further back. Your septic tank will be back here. 11 feet away from the back of the house.

Guck - Solid red line is the new footprint? Then the dotted line the deck?

Hamborg - That is the old plan we wanted to expand it more. Basically it's kind of that but only squared up with the lot lines to maintain the existing setback. The lot gets narrower as it goes back.

Oleson - I know this is going to be really rough and not to scale. But it's going to be about 8 ft from the line.

Hamborg - 8ft is at the porch, maybe just a little lighter. Only not quite that far back, because that's too close to the septic.

Naaktgeboren - Where is the septic going to be? It's going to be a holding tank, right? Where's that going to be?

Hamborg - It's going to be as close to the existing one as we can legally have it.

Oleson - Like this far back?

Hamborg - yes

Guck - Anyone else have any comments/questions?

Selle- Greg Selle. I just have question for Ben. The size of this lot, is that to water edge or high water?

Oleson - That is high water.

Selle - If the at water reseeds, and goes down 5 feet, all that land that was previously land and part of the lot, which I live on Indian Lake as well, is that just kyboshed? Obviously it could be very reasonable that it will, can it be added in later?

Naaktgeboren - we go by high water mark. Because you don't know if the water is going to go up or down, because it's done it forever.

Selle - So what if it goes down 8 feet?

Naaktgeboren - That would be back to 1950. That's why these are built like this.

Selle - Ok 5 feet? 6 feet? All of sudden you have 10 more feet of lakeshore that you didn't have because of high water. What is that considered?

Naaktgeboren - Lakebed.

Schultz - DNR sets the high water mark.

Selle - That doesn't make sense to me.

Oleson - That is my understanding, the DNR sets the high water mark, you know I suppose theoretically they could modify it and lower it, if they felt it was justified, but I think they tend to go based on decades of timeline rather than what's happened in the last 5 years 10 years. As far as I know everything below ordinary high is basically state public land.

Guck - Dick as long as you're talking you can start out.

Naaktgeboren - Why couldn't you move your holding tank back further? You're going to replace it so why not go back further?

Hamborg - Well if we ever have to put a well in, I would like to stay 50 feet away from the holding tank, per the guidelines. Right now we have a shallow well.

Naaktgeboren - Where is your well right now?

Hamborg - It's on the neighbor's property on the back side of the shed, it's partially on his property.

Naaktgeboren - Can you give me an idea where it's at? You might be within 50 feet right now of it.

Oleson - To the North or the South of it?

Hamborg - It would be the neighbor's house to the North, go to the retaining wall. It's on the back side of the shed.

Naaktgeboren - What is the measurement from the retaining wall to the septic tank?

Oleson - Somewhere around there?

Hamborg - It could be on the back, it's definitely on his property we have an easement on his property for the well.

Naaktgeboren - What I'm trying to say is I don't care where your well is right now, you aren't going to make your holding tank there according to this. You're going to have to move your holding tank back further to the end of the lot to the west. According to these figures.

Dearing - Where's the neighbor's well, to the south? That all matters and it should have been down on this survey.

Naaktgeboren - The survey is not really complete I think. That's an issue, I look at where this tank is right now, and you've got to move it back further to the end of your lot.

Montague - How far does the well have to be to the septic tank?

Naaktgeboren - It's got to be 50 feet.

Montague - Is that a new rule that was made?

Oleson - It's been around for a long time, at least since the early 90's. This is the latest septic inspection.

Naaktgeboren - Well even this should've shown where the wells were.

Oleson - I guess at that point when they're doing a compliance inspection their not really checking for setbacks like that, their just checking the water distance, and things like that. This is the original 1995 septic permit.

Guck - So the well is just a shallow 2" or 2 1/2"

Hamborg - Yes, it's the same as a shallow well.

Naaktgeboren - If you could move it back further, I think it would help you because you could move your house maybe back further. I'm looking at, how can we make this thing better than it is right now? That is one to move that tank back further, so you can move your house back further.

Hamborg - If we move our house back further than we get into parking problems and all kinds of other stuff. How does that help the well?

Dearing - Well you can't get a building permit if the septic isn't 50 feet from the well.

Hamborg - Well we don't know that. You keep going back to the shed, I think it's further over on the neighbor's property. I don't have a location.

Dearing - We need that.

Hamborg - So, we'll have to find that location. The township must have records of that, right.

Dearing – Whoever put the well in should have it. Because they are supposed to register it with the state. But maybe they drove it themselves, who knows. That happened a lot around the lakes.

Naaktgeboren – What is the 50 feet you're seeing on here?

Oleson – This is the neighbor to the North. It says, "No well at the time of inspection" on their lot. This must be the road, so this must be the further neighbor to the North. When I looked at the neighbor to the south they didn't have any indication of where wells were. This is pretty old records.

Naaktgeboren – Where's is Marilyn's well? Marilyn's sewer is across the road?

Hamborg – Yes

Naaktgeboren – Where are the wells are and could you move the tank bank further. If there's any way getting the building back further. I don't have a problem with the 20%, but the impervious, if you could still knock that down, I don't know how you'd do that. Maybe cut the deck back or something. That's my concern.

Niklaus – I admire the work you put in to try and make all of this happen, to try and upgrade the house and have a new house on that lake. But the big problem is you have too small of a lot, it's just too small. The break point for me are the building coverage and impervious. Those, we have held very firm on and in the past couple of years turned down many people because of those standards haven't been met and that's why I do not approve of the plan as you have it.

Montague – Steve when you're holding firm on the 15 & 25%. Have you run into lots that are this small, or is it that people are overbuilding lots that are bigger than ours?

Niklaus – It's all of the lakes in Corinna Township that bought properties and we hear that they want their retirement dream home but the home that they bought is too small. We need more room or sheds for storage, or room for the grandkids that come over and very reasonable ideas but if we don't hold to a standard of building coverage and impervious, all those lakes will also decline and there quality and that's the basis of it all.

Montague – Which I understand, but again I go back to there are the tiny lots like ours? We really are in a pickle here.

Niklaus – You are, and I'm very sympathetic to that, but if we begin going down this path again we will be here month after month facing the same things. Other land owners in particular Indian, Mink & Somers & Sugar. I'm sorry but that's just my opinion.

Schultz – I remember you from last time and I do appreciate trying to set it back. Correct if I'm wrong Ben, but they could build right where they are at, right?

Oleson – No, not when there in the lake like that. They are below the ordinary high. That would require approval of the DNR. So my understanding is the DNR will let you do some minor change like reroof. But as soon as you hit 50% of the value then it has to be moved.

Schultz – I guess in my opinion you're trying to better it and I really like that and I'm somewhat for it. It sounds like you should table this until you find out where the other wells are. I know with the septic system we have had that septic guy from Kimball come out and we've approved building next to a septic tank much closer than what that is. The well is going to be your big concern.

Dircks – We need to know where the well is, and I think you would want to know where the wells are so that you can have a safe septic system. I sympathize with your problem I understand you bought a cabin, you thought it was going to be a cabin and want it to be a home and unfortunately your lot is kind of small for that. So I think if you can work on getting it down to some numbers that are low or more reasonable, figure out where the wells are and put in a safe septic system then maybe we could relook at it then.

Gabriel -Nothing more to add.

Dearing -I'd stay at the 15% and 25 coverage and will not budge on that.

Guck - Do you feel comfortable trying to build this knowing that, that lake can go and adjust? Have you seen the lake high?

Hamborg - Yes, I've lived it to looking at the historical lake levels. I think for some reason it's a little artificially high right now, It's maintaining a higher level, and I think that is why the Hydrologist is spending more time out there.

Guck - It's wet normally for the lakes. That lake is going to be substantially higher.

Naaktgeboren - It's been high since 2012-2013 it started coming up more and more. Back in the mid 80's it was way up. 2018 & 2019 within the 20" of the ordinary high. That was the highest it was in my lifetime. My dad says the mid 20's was the established ordinary high, because it was higher. Then you go back into the 40's & 50's then it was 10 feet lower than it is right now below the ordinary high. So yea it's a yoyo. 1984, 85 & 86 were real high. Then we had a couple years of drought it dropped 5 feet in 3 years. It can go up 5 feet in 2 years it did that in 2016-2020. I personally look at what you had, I'm going off the 20% & 31.8, some of these people say they can probably deal with it and some say they can't. I keep looking at the size of the lot. Could you come up with something that's close to where it was when you bought at 20% & 31.8? I just look at the holding tank, put it back further. We don't even know that we have to find out where the wells are.

Montague - I just wanted to respond to Linda. We bought that place thinking that it was going to be fine for us, but it's eroding, and we did not know that, and were going to have to do something. Because if we don't it's just going to collapse, so we have to do something. Can we build in the same place, the DNR won't let us, and can we move it back, sure. Ok we move it back further, we put in a new holding tank, but we have to have a place that's reasonably large enough to accommodate people. So that's what we're trying to do. So we can figure out where the well is? We can certainly accommodate the request of the requirement for a holding tank or move it back if that's what we need to do.

Naaktgeboren - That's going to depend where the well is. Your neighbor to the north must have a well somewhere?

Dircks - I think you should identify where both of them are. Yours, the Neighbor on the North and the one on the other side.

Naaktgeboren - I can't understand why Olen Meyer didn't have it on there. Anyway to 20-31 is there a way to get closer to that? What do you cut back, deck one side a foot or two?

Montague - We can't make the garage any smaller the car won't fit in there. I don't know, we've looked at this and it is really challenging. We appreciate you giving us advice and trying to work with us here.

Guck - You've got some other issues you've got to get on paper.

Montague - Ok we get all this stuff done and we come back here, are you going to make us shave the rooms? The rooms are pretty small.

Schultz - Can the deck cut back to some degree?

Linda - Can you take the deck back, there are a lot of other things that count against your impervious like the steps. Maybe you look at the landscaping.

Hamborg - we have shaved the deck and took the steps out. The deck is smaller than the one that is there already. We squished the house in so it isn't as large as footprint.

Oleson -The last column here is zeroed out of what they were going to take out. So what's left is the house, deck.

Hamborg - We were going to take out the gravel but then there is nowhere to park.

Guck - What about the pavers with grass in between?

Oleson - By ordinance we have to count the pavers also.

Guck - But it's not as much as solid concrete.

Naaktgeboren - If you have grass in between is that 50% or what is that? Any way to cut the deck down?

Oleson - No credit for that. Not if it's a driving or a parking area.

Guck - Homework needed. You've got to get the impervious and building coverage.

Schultz made a motion to table for additional information.

Montague - We'll have to hold it to November, we won't be here next month.

Oleson - Just to clarify this is your concrete?

Montague - Yes

Hamborg - The one strip has to be that wide for ADA and the other one is already narrowed down as much as it is supposed to be for a drive strip.

Oleson - Then your 105ft is back here?

Hamborg - Yes

Montague - If you know of any other surface we could put in for parking that would certainly help.

Motion seconded by Dircks. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests related to the continued use of property and buildings for a private event center. Approvals required include the renewal of an Interim Use Permit for an event center and private golf course involving private gatherings such as company picnics, weddings, reunions, golfing or other similar events.

Applicant and Property Owner: 'Tween Lakes 2020 LLC

Property address: 8948 STATE HWY 24 NW , ANNANDALE

Sec/Twp/Range: 21-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000211101, 206000211100, 206000164402, 206000222200, 206000222202 and 206095001010

Present: Bob Shadduck & Marsha Koch

Oleson - This is an event center that was granted a few years back. We allotted for a certain amount of time after it added a Certificate of Occupancy and the COA had some issues that delayed it technically, they have been running the event center for a while and had a number of events, I have not received any complaints or comments and is an Interim Use Permit and it's going to expire and he's looking to renew it.

Guck - Any comments or questions?

Audience: None

Niklaus - Have the neighbors been notified that this is on the Agenda for tonight?

Oleson - Yes

Gabriel - No questions or comments.

Dircks - It's an awesome place, not heard a single complaint or traffic issue, it's a facility that is much needed in the area. Bob runs a nice operation out there.

Schultz - Big concern was no turn lane when first brought it up, now has not noticed traffic being a problem.

Naaktgeboren – Questioned parking in the beginning, parking is not a problem, fantastic facility, and well run and happy with the way it's been run. Good design.

Niklaus – When proposed initially there was concerns with some of the neighbors and I have no doubt they have been watching and been looking for maybe challenges and the fact that there are none says it all. I think it's been fantastic for our area. How long to request permit?

Oleson – He's requesting 10 years.

Dearing- Beautiful building, I'm for it.

Guck – The only question he has it says changes to the building, all permits were done?

Oleson - All permits were taken care of.

Guck – I think 10 is a little bit long, I'd like to see 5, and we haven't had any Continued Use for any longer than 5 years. Just my opinion.

Niklaus made a motion based on the findings of fact to approve the renewal of an Interim Use Permit originally granted in 2020 for an event center and private golf course involving private gatherings such as company picnics, weddings, reunions, golfing or other similar events with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide a current compliance inspection report for the septic system, demonstrating compliance with state and local requirements, within 60 days of interim use permit approval.
 2. The applicant shall cause an inspection of the septic system to be conducted by a licensed septic inspector on an annual basis to ensure the septic system is operating as designed and of an adequate size for the size of gatherings.
 3. The applicant shall not allow the gatherings to cause unusual noise, traffic congestion or other nuisance characteristics to nearby property owners or motorists. Should such nuisances occur on a regular basis, they shall be grounds for revocation of the Interim Use Permit.
 4. The interim use permit shall expire ten (10) years from the date of approval.
- Dearing seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-1 with Guck opposed.

Requests related to the construction of a dwelling and attached garage addition. Approvals required include a Variance to construct a dwelling and attached garage addition that will expand an existing dwelling that is located approx. 54 ft from Bass Lake (min. 75 ft required). The proposed addition by itself will meet all required setbacks.

Applicant: Alex Evavold, CAP Custom Homes

Property Owner: Kristi Kline

Property address: 11865 Jeske Ave NW, Annandale

Sec/Twp/Range: 4-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000042204

Present: Al Evavold – Cap

Evavold - Addition on the property on Jeske. 600 sq ft with a 700 sq ft attached garage. The variance is because the existing cabin does not meet set back to the lake. Everything were doing does meet lake setback. We're not adding anything into the setback everything is behind that. Currently there is an old cesspool holding tank. We're going to get rid of the old septic and will be putting in a new septic system. Our impervious coverage is at 15.2% after all the additions

that does include the concrete back patio behind the garage, existing house has a side entrance, and we are changing the entrance to the road side next to the garage. The left elevation, on the bottom left of your screen is the existing front door. What that is calculating is that is now going to be used as a patio door to go to the patio.

Guck - What is the building coverage?

Evavold - Impervious is 15.2% is the existing driveway and with a whole new gravel driveway it would be at 23.6%. They are not planning to do that, however, wanted that number just in case.

Oleson - Building coverage is about 10%. Because this is in addition to the existing building that has a basement need to make sure the lowest floor elevation requirements are being met. Bass Lake does have flood plain now, so we have to watch that when doing an addition. However, the survey he submitted apparently is showing they are fine.

Evavold - 998.98 is the existing basement elevation. Bass Lake is showing 994 for flood plain elevation.

Oleson - Assuming we find nothing then there is no issue. The addition itself meets all the setbacks but it's enlarging the building that doesn't meet the setbacks, that's the key to the variance.

Audience: Bob Cook- I live on Jeske. Jeske is not a road it is my driveway. I'm all for their addition, I could care less about the addition. Last time Kristi was up there and she lived there in the winter, I had to bring in 14 tons of rock to redo my driveway, because of the plowing, my concern is my driveway, and you probably don't care about the driveway. I've wondered are they going to build in the winter, are they going to be driving down there? What are the precautions? I've taken a couple of pictures, I don't want to have to redo the driveway again. There's another cabin next to mine, so there's an easement that goes down to our cabin, the next cabin and then Kristi's cabin. It's just a little dirt path. So I guess I need to know.

Guck - Can you add anything to that? I imagine you have to get your trucks and concrete trucks down there.

Evavold - Correct, so our plan currently how it states today, if we were to hit go, freeze up at the moment is the time to start construction. Over the winter months is the plan to start.

Cook - How are you going to get down there? I mean are you hoping for no snow?

Evavold - We will have to plow it. Is it a privately maintained Township road?

Naaktgeboren - Is it a road for the property owners only?

Dearing - They all must have an easement.

Cook - Correct it's an easement for us. If you look on the map you can see a skinny little line that is my driveway. On the plan they show my road driveway. On an old plan they show it way back further.

Naaktgeboren - They put the road where it was most convenient because nobody really cared.

Cook - You got it. It used to be a farm and field. Again I'm all for them putting an addition on, I'm really worried about the road.

Naaktgeboren - You're going to have to plow. Is there a way to plow to the east? I'm saying plow towards the east not the west, because that's where you're going to cause more problems.

Cook - Again, the plowing for me is the problem. The last time they came straight down that driveway and they pushed the snow right into my yard, and then it turns 90 degrees and everything washed out and ended up with basically no driveway.

Evavold - Do you live there in the winter time? Nobody does, that's the thing, when the plow comes on the dirt road he just plows that road closed.

Dircks - Is this resident going to live there year round now?

Evavold - No not now.

Naaktgeboren - Is someone actually plowing it in the winter time now?

Cook - No

Naaktgeboren - Just when someone is working down there?

Evavold- How is it maintained.

Cook - I have an easement and we share the responsibility.

Naaktgeboren - If you wreck the road you fix the road.

Guck - Take pictures of it before you start.

Niklaus- Is this an issue for the board?

Gabriel - The issue isn't the road itself it's the damage it's causing from plowing.

Cook - It's two paths coming down the road and when they plow they take 100 years of driveway and then tear it apart. Then when it rains or melts it all runs down into my yard. We bought 14 ton of rock and redone the whole driveway in front of our house.

Oleson - You built it up a little more? Nobody else has done the same?

Cook-Yes

Schultz - Is it possible for you to talk to Kristi about making it right?

Evavold - I'm sure that she would as well. To me I look at it doesn't look any different than any other job we do, we have to clean up as we work our out.

Niklaus - I don't have any issues with this.

Dearing - I don't either.

Gabriel - Just the lake setback we need to address. Didn't seem that anyone had concern that.

Dircks - I'm good.

Naaktgeboren - Where the drainfield goes are you going to remove the trees?

Evavold - There is only one in the pressure bed.

Naaktgeboren - Going over the pressure bed. Nice plan. Anytime you're on the bottom of the hill, you get the bulk of all the stuff coming down. If you can work it out with the contractor.

Cook - When nobody disturbs it, we don't get any wash out. It's when it's disturbed. Nobody drives on it in the winter.

Dircks -The road would have to be built back up. If somebody lived back there in the winter the whole road would have to be built back up. It's when she sells it, what is the next people going to do.

Guck - I'm ok with it. We've had other additions to the backside of lots and I don't see a problem with this one.

Schultz made a motion based on the findings of fact to approve the variance to construct a dwelling and attached garage addition that will expand an existing dwelling that is located approx. 54 ft from Bass Lake (min. 75 ft required). The proposed addition by itself will meet all required setbacks 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 lowest floor of the existing basement must meet an elevation of at least 998.4 (NAVD88). If it does not in its current condition, the applicant must raise the floor in accordance with all building code requirements to meet that minimum elevation or the variance approval shall be void.

Dircks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests related to the placement of a storage shed. Approvals required include a Variance to place a 12' x 16' storage shed approx. 2 ft from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required).

Applicant and Property Owner: William Guck
Property address: 9201 Kilbury Ave NW, Annandale
Sec/Twp/Range: 17-121-27
Parcel number(s): 206030001220

Present: William Guck

Al Guck recused himself from the hearing.

Niklaus - We have a request for a variance to approve a 12 x 16 storage shed, were 2 feet from the side lot and 10 feet is required.

W Guck - Basically is about 2 ft off of my neighbor Jen Storms lot, the reason for the shed is because I have kids. Shed was on a lot down the street and they were going to demolish it, they took it to a cul-de-sac, it matches our siding. Just wanted to go through the necessary steps to put it on our side of the pine trees. It's just a matter of having a shed.

Niklaus - This is a portable storage shed and you intend to put in 12x16 concrete will become a permanent shed.

W Guck - Yes, were going to make a floor for it.

Niklaus - So everybody recognizes where you are going to do with it.

W Guck - Yes

Niklaus - And you don't have a survey to quantify a distance from your neighbor's property.

W Guck - Everything that I went off of was apps essentially. Everything is running on my side of the trees is still Jens lot. I have an email from her stating that she approves of the build 100%. The line just goes kind of on our side of the pines. So if you can zoom in and for whatever reason that's how they drew it up.

Niklaus - This is a line based on beacon, which we have noted that sometimes it's accurate.

Oleson - Given to where the road is here, in to relation to that it's probably shifted more to the east here.

W Guck - So it could be on the opposite of the trees.

Oleson - But I don't know that for sure.

Schultz – Usually the telephone box would be the indicator.

Naaktgeboren - I looked way in the back and there is a steel post back there in the corner.

W Guck – It's a bird feeder.

Naaktgeboren – The pedestal should be on the line and I'm wondering if the bird feeder is a marker also.

Niklaus – I think it's pretty clear, the request is for the variance. Ben do you have anything further?

Oleson – No, I think the main question here is, if you're concerned and you want to know exactly what that set back is, or to make sure he's on his property you would need a survey, but if you're fairly confident he's at least on his property and not so worried about the exact measurement then you can go ahead with the approval. Or you approve it with the condition that he get a survey.

Audience: None

Gabriel- Your neighbor is on the same page?

W Guck – Yes 100% she sent me an email. I had asked her initially and she said that she was 100% on board and I asked her to send me an email.

Gabriel - If the board wanted you to do it closer to you house off that line are you on board with that.

W Guck - I have a little bit of a driveway going to the left of the garage. I guess where we had it staked, were going to push it back to the pines, and if we're looking out our kitchen window we really don't want to see the shed, we would like to keep our line of sight clear. We can't have the best of both worlds but at the same time, there's really no other logical spot to put a little storage shed. In the back it's all kind of septic and we don't want to mess with the integrity of the back yard.

Gabriel – It's already intact.

W Guck – Yes it's already built.

Dircks – It's a good logical place to put it. No other trees have to be removed. Other houses are far enough forward. It doesn't disturb the integrity.

Barry – I'm on board with it.

Naaktgeboren – You have plenty of room you could move the shed toward the tar. Or you could turn the shed the other way. Move the 12 toward the neighbor, you gain footage about 5-6 ft off of the house. Otherwise your stakes are over 4 feet from the tar. Slide it over then you could go 5-6 feet from the lot line instead of 2. I'm looking at it there is no reason you couldn't do that.

W Guck – I kind of right there with you, I'm like do I face that shed essentially how that garage is looking in the same direction. I'm at a tossup myself.

Naaktgeboren – So if somebody made a motion, you could turn it that way?

W Guck – Sure

Naaktgeboren – I just look at 5-6 feet. You can do it easily and it would really not change anything.

Dearing – I go along with what Naaktgeboren says.

Niklaus – For me I have a little trouble with it, you got a lot of space there, usually people are forced to look side lots because they have no space and you have quite a bit of space there. You could put it anywhere.

W Guck - Logically if I ever wanted to get power to it, that's the only spot I want to do it. I don't want to put it by the kitchen window. I don't want to touch the back yard. It just messes with the integrity of the lot on backside.

Niklaus - Guess were down to where you want to put it needs a variance or where you could put it anywhere, many places.

W Guck - You got to see the lot.

Niklaus - I did I drove by it.

Naaktgeboren - If you went parallel with the tar, and moved it over toward the tar. That way you're gaining 6 feet or more. Your gaining 4 ft by going up to the edge of the tar, plus if you turn the shed the other way around. You're gaining 4 feet there.

W Guck - All for that suggestion.

Naaktgeboren made a motion based on the findings of fact to approve the Variance to place a 12' x 16' storage shed approx. 6 ft from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required) with the following conditions:

1. The proposed structure must no greater than 200 sq ft in size and built to be portable (i.e. on skids rather than attached to a permanent foundation).
2. The proposed structure must meet the required minimum 65 ft setback from the centerline of the traveled road surface.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests related to the operation of a commercial horse stable and riding academy.
Approvals required include an Interim use permit to operate a commercial horse stable and riding academy.

Applicant: Jasmine Lee

Property Owner: Steven Waisbren and Bernadette Ann Groh

Property address: 10448 Gulden Ave NW, Maple Lake

Sec/Twp/Range: 12-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000123201

Present: Steven Waisbren, Jasmine Lee, and Russell Newman

Guck - You want to train people and horses.

Waisbren - I own the property and they lease from me and are also going to run the business.

Oleson - Southwest side of Indian Lake Waisbren owns it. It is zoned AG. Waisbren owns the property and Jasmine rents or leasing the space in the house and barn to use for the horse stable and training. There will be no trails?

Lee - It will only be in the indoor and outdoor arena.

Oleson - Normally we would treat this like a home business but she's not the occupant of the home. Normally something like this were looking at traffic patterns, is it going to cause issues with noise, traffic or parking. One comment received. "Looking at the big picture of the request, we see this as the owners leasing/renting their property to a non-resident to open and operate a business, this is far different than property owner opening and operating a business. In addition does this set precedence for future requests that will allow leasers/renters to open and operate" From Diane lives on Gulden Ave.

Oleson - It's not really a home occupation. Running a horse stable requires an Interim Use Permit. It doesn't tie it to owning the house or having it on the same property as the house.

Naaktgeboren - It is not uncommon in our area. A lot of farmsteads that have empty buildings, they aren't farming any more they are leasing it out to other people.

Schultz - Treat as a home business but she is not the homeowner. Large lot and a lot of slope to it.

Naaktgeboren - Look at the topography most all of it runs to Sugar Lake. All the stuff to the South and the West all goes to Sugar. Have a place for manure. She did her homework. I'm the neighbor and if it is not going right she will know it.

Schultz- Only concerns is the manure.

Dircks - How many students will you have ride in the arena.

Lee - No more than 2 at a time. Because I only have 1 lesson horse. I have 9 horses on the property at one time. 3 being mine, 6 of them other people's horses. They come during the business hours of 9:00am - 8:00pm they come based on their schedule, they come out 2-3 times per week.

Dircks - Do they ride in the arena?

Lee -They ride in the indoor and outdoor arena, we do have rules in place and posted.

Dircks - Looks like a great plan.

Gabriel - No concerns.

Dearing - No problems with it.

Niklaus - No problem, I really like that you did all your pre-requisite work on this.

Guck - Has a 1 year lease with owner. Looking for 5 year on interim.

Oleson - In number 1 you could add if Lee is not the operator or the lease then it expires. The Interim Use Permit is issued to Waisbren.

Niklaus made a motion based on the finding of fact to approve the Interim use permit to operate a commercial horse stable and riding academy with the following conditions:

1. The approved interim use permit shall expire five (5) years from the date of approval, or upon any other event triggering the expiration of an interim use permit as identified in the Corinna Township Land Use Ordinance.
2. The hours of operation for the horse riding lesson business shall be limited to 7:00am to 8:00pm or sundown, whichever comes first. If riding activities are occurring within the buildings, they may occur up until 9:00pm.
3. There shall be no more than nine (9) horses on site at any one time.
4. The applicant must strictly follow the manure management plan and other practices to prevent pollution of waters as approved by the Wright County Feedlot Officer or other designated Township official.
5. All horse training and riding activities must be conducted within existing buildings on the property or within fenced in areas on the property. No riding activities by students shall be allowed on public roads or adjacent shoulders/ditches.
6. The applicant shall maintain sufficient off-street parking and loading/unloading areas (including for vehicles with horse trailers) on the property. No parking of vehicles related to the business is allowed on public roads.
7. The applicant must provide proof of adequate liability coverage to protect the operator of the facility and their students/guests at the facility.

Dearing seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of amendments to the Corinna Township Zoning Ordinance that would adopt changes previously made by Wright County and to ensure conformance with MN Statutes 394.33. Sections of the Zoning Ordinance to be amended include Sections 3 (Rules and Definitions), 5 (Administration), 6 (Zoning Districts and District Provisions) and 7 (Performance Standards). The amendments would affect regulation of mining activities, require certain land uses to obtain an interim or conditional use permit, address procedures for disputes over sewage treatment regulations, clarify procedures for ordinance violations, zoning amendments and revocation of conditional or interim use permits, address standards for Planning Commission membership, implement restrictions on Energy Storage Systems, add a section allowing for limited raising of chickens on certain property, modifying regulations to allow for limited dynamic signs, and eliminate a requirement for land divisions in the General Agriculture district relating to farmland of statewide importance.

Applicant: Corinna Township

Oleson - This is changes to what the County has made. Clarifying and adding interim uses. More recent changes are the sign dynamics, they can only change once per day. Ordinance changes have to go through P&Z board and then through the Town Board. You have the option to go with the County changes or not make these changes.

Dircks -Should limit the number of signs per property.

Naaktgeboren- Holding tanks on page 132. If Read B, C, E, F, and G it goes along with what we've done the last two months. They cover what we're doing.

Oleson - The other item is they are allowing chickens in R1 area now. We have relaxed our rules on how long the terms are. Our current ordinance says if you don't attend 80% of the meeting the board could remove you. The County is saying 3 consecutive meetings or 50%. So they're a little less restrictive than we are. Still it is up to the Board. You can remote in.

Steve -You can remote attendance, but feel if you remote in you shouldn't be able to vote, be an alternate. I think missing 3 consecutive unless serious illness you probably should be off.

Naaktgeboren - Or do a letter of reprimand.

Oleson - So we are sticking with 80%, and ok with the chickens in R1 zoning.

Niklaus made a motion that we recommend the approval amendments that the Corinna Township Ordinance as presented. With the exception of the 80% attendance rule.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Guck made a motion to approve the minutes of August 12, 2025. Dircks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report

- Permits -

Oleson - Swanson boathouse replacement. If it were a new boathouse it would have to be 3ft above the highest know water mark. He can replace it where it is now and based on our policy he can raise the side wall height a foot and it will be a flat roof. I did get a call from the neighbor that is concerned with it blocking his view. Swanson asked if he raised it to meet the 3ft above the OH could he still increase the side wall a foot. So it

will be about 2 ft higher than it is currently. After discussion by the board, give him the option to elevate it if he wants to.

Oleson - Another boat house, they are wanting to move it over from where it is now, keeping it the same size and the lot is already over impervious. They are putting in new steps. The question is do they need a variance. I have asked them to confirm it is not an increase in impervious. We have allowed a replacement, however, now that they are moving it and building new and over impervious we have indicated they need to get a variance. After discussion by the board, they will need to get a variance.

- Correspondence
- Enforcement Actions

Motion was made by Niklaus, seconded by Dircks to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously at 8:59 pm.

Minutes prepared by Heidi Eckerman