

CORINNA TOWNSHIP  
MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION/ BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
OCTOBER 14, 2025

Corinna Town Hall, 9801 Ireland Ave, Annandale MN 55302

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

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

Absent: Jean Just, Cathy Gabriel and Steve Niklaus

Other in Attendance: Scott Ergen, David McNeil, Allyson Freeman, Karin Howard, Jay Konz, Roberta Montague and Randall Hamborg online.

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda; Dirks made a motion to approve the agenda, Dearing seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

#### Public Hearings

(Tabled and revised 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 approximately 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: Robert Montague and Randall Hamborg  
Property address: 10902 Gulden Ave NW, Maple Lake  
Sec-Twp-Range: 12-121-27  
Parcel number(s): 206045000130

**PRESENT:** Roberta Montague and Randall Hamborg online.

**Hamborg** - Adjustment made are, a new site plan, an updated survey, including a below high water mark. They determined there was a deep well on the lot at least 50 ft from the current holding tank, they are also working with a septic designer on a new holding tank, we are unable to put in a drain field because the size of the lot. We can put in a 2000 tank that we are willing to do.

**Oleson** – This is the existing conditions on what they have shown us before and this is the updated site plan to move the house back to, to get it out of the lake, above the high water mark, they would still have the deck here, their proposed driveway here, the two strips here leading to the garage, keep their impervious down to what they can, but they are at the 35% impervious. Still a very small lot that we are dealing with, the existing wells are marked on the neighbor's property, they don't have a well on their own property. The variances are the lake setback, side yard setback, impervious, building coverage and expanding the house on a holding tank. You haven't made any changes on the house itself?

**Hamborg**- No just slightly pulled it back a little bit further to make sure it was completely out. It's less impervious than it is existing. 2 feet back probably removed 18 sq feet of impervious. We are waiting for drawings and waiting for septic drawings on where he has relocated the tanks.

**Oleson** - Could you move the house and the tanks further back?

**Montague**- Yes, we did that. We're just waiting for the drawings to come back, we thought we would've had the plans by the meeting tonight. It is all drawn out on the physical property.

**Oleson**- So this is showing where the existing septic is and the existing tank.

**Montague**- So by moving the house back we can shorten those strips also.

**Audience:** None

**Naaktgeboren**- What we are looking at right now or will this change?

**Hamborg**- That has been moved back 2 1/2 feet.

**Naaktgeboren** - What is the building & impervious coverage?

**Oleson** - 35% impervious and 33% building coverage. Like I noted before it's hard to compare apples to apples, because part of the house and the deck in the lake, below ordinary high, so that's not technically part of the property when you're looking at that so the question becomes; Are you wanting to compare these as they are all above the lake currently and look at the current house size verses the proposed or are you looking at it like whatever was below ordinary high, before doesn't count.

**Naaktgeboren**- Hate to look at property under water.

**Oleson** - It really comes down to whether you think there is some reasonable way to reduce the size of the house or the size of the deck or driveway to get closer to the 25%.

**Naaktgeboren**- Can you move the house back further.

**Oleson** - Actually the building coverage is 20.7%. That should be at 15%. The total Impervious is supposed to be at 25% it is at 35%

**Naaktgeboren**- Can we move the house back further?

**Montague** - I don't think so because of the holding tank. Then there would be no place to park.

**Naaktgeboren**- There was a stake out there, it was in front of the little shed close to the roadway, and it said holding tank on it. Stake is 40ft from the wells. So you wouldn't want to have it there.

**Montague** - I heard someone was moving the stakes around. Not sure if they are still in the correct area.

**Hamborg** - The current designer said that he wouldn't be going anything closer than 50 feet to the well. He did say that he wants to keep it as close to the road as possible, for pumping purposes, he knows exactly where the wells are. He said his locations would not violate the 50 foot setback from the deep wells. The current tank is over 50 ft he did put a tag on that.

**Naaktgeboren**- Can you have a tank under the drive strips?

**Oleson** - No, it wouldn't be advised. You're not supposed to be driving on top of the tank.

**Dearing** - You've got one under the turnaround. The cover was made special.

**Guck** - Move it back and your impervious would be less.

**Naaktgeboren** - Not a lot less, just the 2 strips. Lining up with the neighbor's house is way back, so that would help with the view. The house to the North is ahead and the house to the south is behind.

**Guck** - Ok we'll move on to Linda.

**Dirks** - I Think Dick has covered most of it. If the holding tank could be moved so the house could go back further, not a very big house, maybe the deck has to go.

**Hamborg**- The further the house goes back the narrower the lot is. The setbacks get a little tight. On Marilyn's side there is the bunkhouse.

**Montague** - Not an issue with the site line on her house. Maybe the bunkhouse and it is used for sleeping.

**Schultz** - Move it back a little bit and change the tank I would be fine with it.

**Dearing** - Still against the lot coverage. We turn down other ones, how can we give this one? I don't understand when they buy a lot you better have it surveyed before they buy it and now they want us to fix it? I'm against it.

**Guck** - My thoughts are. Where did the impervious start? Was it over 35%. So you didn't go down much.

**Oleson** - The calculations I have in the staff report are based on whatever was above ordinary high. Before it was 20% building and 33% total. If you look at it on how the house size before forget the fact that it part of it was under water. Then those numbers change. There actually reduced some.

**Guck** - The next guy coming in it's a precedent that's going to be tough to tell them no.

**Montague** - 35% when you look at the size of the lot. How many lots do you find that are this small?

**Hamborg** - Initial calculations didn't include the stone wall. Which he did correct and added to the new plan. So the numbers were higher.

**Oleson** - The existing above ordinary high Total building 20.7 Impervious 31.8 Their first proposal that came in was 24 & 38. Now they are at 20 & 34. Reduced from the original proposal. I believe this is the current one. The retaining wall is out of there and the stairs are out. All the sheds are out.

**Guck** - Is this a summer home?

**Hamborg** - Right now yes.

**Guck** - Do you really need a garage?

**Montague** - If we get rid of the shed we would not have any storage. We designed it to age in place. The bedroom is upstairs and possible could change the garage into the bedroom. Then be able to live on one floor. That's why we designed it that way.

**Dearing** - Where are you going to park? Because the Township put up a sign "No parking on the road"

**Hamborg**- On the driveway strips, we don't get much company.

**Naaktgeboren** - Are you parking on the road or the road right of way? Its two different things. If you drive through there everyone is parking on the road right of way. The neighbor to the North he put in a retaining wall and he's got a granite parking area 95% of the parking area is in the road right of way.

**Montague** - Most everyone does that, it could be enforced.

**Dearing** - The last time I was through there, there was only one lane. I had to back up to turn around because there was boat trailers sticking out in the road. That's why the sign went up.

**Naaktgeboren** - I think that's a distinction people need to realize, that you don't park on the road driving surface. Pretty much everyone is parking on the road right of way, because there is no other place to park. You're kind of doomed here, so I would make it better than what it is. One is getting out of the lake and the other is getting the holding tank in the right place and putting up a structure that is going to work. I don't see how you're going to get to the 15 & 25%.

**Montague** - With that size of a lot, I don't either. I think we've said from the beginning that our intention was to be in that cabin but once we got in it and understood the erosion issues and fact that the sides are slanted, I mean you can't live in there, and we can't rebuild in the same

location. So we have done the very best that we can do to accommodate the Townships requests given the size of the lot. Did we plan it this way? No. Did we buy that cabin thinking oh we'll tear it down and build it new and spend all of our retirement dollars on this house? No that was not the goal to spend money. But in order to have a reasonable place to live this is what we have to do. It's not ideal. But if we don't, we can't live in the cabin, so what do we do then? John, I understand what you're saying that it violates the rules. This wasn't out intent but this is where we were headed, otherwise we tear down the cabin and we have an empty lot.

**Dearing** - You have to see our point also if we give it to you we have to give it to everyone.

**Oleson** - Normally we would allow people to rebuild what they have, right? In this case we can't do that because it's in the lake. So if they were to rebuild it to the same footprint but move it back. What would their option be if it was denied? What options would they have since they can't build where there at? Would it be rebuild it and push it back so it's out of the lake? That will be higher impervious than what it is now.

**Guck** -Do we need to wait until we know where the tank is going to go?

**Oleson** - Well that determines the setback and if the driveway can get shorter but it's not affecting the size of the house.

**Dearing** - The driveway getting shorter isn't going to save the square footage.

**Naaktgeboren** - 260 square feet to cut back 10 feet, no big deal. You could cut off 100 feet off the deck and it would help a little bit.

**Oleson** -So this is the existing condition this part of the house that's behind this black heavy dash line is below the lake level. If it wasn't the lake issue they could rebuild this. I'm trying to envision this, if we just deny the variance where does that leave them? To me they still need a variance, because they are moving it from where it is now to get it out of the lake.

**Guck** - Is there a hardship, because the DNR will deny them building right there.

**Oleson** - That is my understanding. So we had the other one on the point across the lake. That one was a smaller lot. Where basically the entire house was in the lake. That house had to come down, and there was less room than this, no room to do anything. In that case they needed a variance to put up a RV for the summer. That's the worst case scenario, I guess if they can't build their house, then all they can have is their RV?

**Schultz** - If they went on the same footprint and added a second story?

**Oleson**- That doesn't change their impervious issue, but it changes the septic issue. That is what they are asking for now. Normally we would not allow expansion on a holding tank. It is a small house. This is not a huge house.

**Naaktgeboren** - I'd like to see where the tank is going to sit, in relation to can the house get moved back a little further and look at taking the deck off. I'm open to doing something, but I can't until I see all the plans. We've put the tank on the roadway.

**Oleson** - The tank is only going to affect how far the house can move back, so the tank has to be at least 10 feet from the property line.

**Naaktgeboren** - We've allowed on road right of ways.

**Oleson** - Parking was brought up, normally we want at least space up to 1 vehicle typically to be parked off the road right of way, typically at least 20 feet. I guess that would be one extreme is to somehow to fit the tank in here and keep the house 20ft away from the right of way. That would move it back quite a bit, it's not going to change the impervious that much. Because all they have here is 2 strips anyways.

**Naaktgeboren** - They're going to end up in the right of way, not on the road surface.

**Oleson** - I don't know if it's reasonable to look at it like, what is a minimum square footage you think a person needs to have for a house? Or the deck? Maybe it's a case by case.

**Guck** - I think we need to see the final plans, with the septic. If you give them a variance for a trailer then you don't have a garage, if you give him a house plan without a garage that's 341 sqft that you're going to save. So I don't know what that does impervious brings it down a little bit, plus if you move the house back, your gaining, you're making an effort, you have 3 levels so you have storage in the basement for all you're stuff.

**Naaktgeboren** - I'd make a motion if you cut the deck back and move the house back.

**Dearing** - The only way I would go along with it is get rid of the tank and the deck, and move it back.

**Oleson** - Gravel and strips are 200, 20x30 square it off. That's 800 sq ft. You're saving 589 and moved it back from the lake your saving another 189.

**Guck** - We have to see where the septic is proposed where it's going to go.

**Oleson** - Minimum 800 sq ft for a house. Max bldg. coverage 15% is 650. So if you want to stay at 15% it will be 650 for the house and garage.

**Guck** - Is this something that would work for you?

**Montague** - I don't think so. Would you guys live in a 650 Square foot house? There's no storage. If we build a walkout and put in a staircase.

**Oleson** - 18% you could go up to 850 sq foot minimum house size. If you want to do it this way you could say approve it for these figures then they can move things around if they need to.

**Montague** - Yes that's not livable.

**Hamborg** - I'd like to hold off and get some other advice, and get some other people involved.

**Guck** - Yes, talk to your builder maybe they can come up with something.

**Schultz** - Made a motion to table this.

**Dirks** - Seconded the Motion. Motion passed unanimously.

(Tabled and revised from August and September 2025 meetings) Requests related to the construction of a dwelling addition. Approvals required include a Variance to construct an approx.. 8' x 14'3" addition to the side of an existing dwelling approx. 3-4 ft from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) on a dwelling previously approved by variance to be partially within a bluff setback and a side yard setback.

Applicant and Property Owner: Isaac and Stephanie Stauffer

Property address: 9644 Kramer Ave NW, Annandale

Sec-Twp-Range: 18-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206000181413

**PRESENT:** Allison for Rosen Builders

**Guck** - What has changed?

**Allison** - Last time we were considered to build an addition on the west side of the property and now we are looking to build a stairwell on the east side of the property. This would not go past the deck structure. This is to bring the stairwell to building a stairwell to compliance. It is currently out of compliance.

**Naaktgeboren** - It will be 3 stories?

**Allison** - Correct.

**Guck** - Ben, what do you have to add to this?

**Oleson** - Variance's would be side yard setback at 3 ft, instead of 15 ft, this house was approved previously to be built like it was within the bluff setback so that would be part of it as well.

Lake setback it being met. The impervious is well over the limit to.

**Allison** - There are ideas to move the gravel from the property in hopes to help with the impervious coverage. The survey is a little bit outdated, for instance the hot tub is not on the property any longer.

**Oleson** - Just a reminder that the Stauffer's are new owners. The history is with a different owner at the time. It wasn't approved to be at this high of impervious level we've approved the garage and the house and it was supposed to be at the 25%. It basically comes down to all this gravel was not what we approved to be there. It's grown up but there is gravel all through next to the garage. I believe the plan was to just have a short little driveway.

Allison is representing the Stauffer's, she is the builder on the property. Jeremiah with Rosen Builders is online along with Isaac & Stephanie Stauffer

**Jeremiah** - Mr. Gamache brought it upon himself to bring in all the gravel which raised the impervious percentage. We can remove as much as needed, just to have a narrow access to the garage. In the prior meetings we brought up parking. The prior variance parking we had parking on the streets, on the south side of the garage as well as the garage. So we still have room for parking access to the garage while returning the rest of the landscape back to grass or natural impervious. Whatever the Stauffer's want to bring it back to.

**Guck** - What kind of percentage are you looking at?

**Oleson** - They should be at 25% or less, anything above that is going to be Variance.

**Guck** - The area that is going to be removed are they going to need that? I suppose you'll have to grid it out.

**Oleson** - Is the Sauna removed? Has anything else been removed?

**I Stauffer** - Sauna removed and the 2 sheds were removed.

**Audience:** None

**Dirks** - Removing all the granite do you know what we're going to come down to? The proposed building is within the 15%.

**Naaktgeboren** - My calculation to remove 1900ft of gravel. I went out and measured it, that's what it is. You got to remove 1900.

**Oleson** - The house is 568 and the garage is 639 building, and the addition is 112.

$568+639+112=1319$  divided by  $8912 = 14.8\%$  building coverage. If you take the 8912 lot size 25% of that is 2228 - 1319 buildings it would be 909 sq ft left. Stairway to the lake 397 so that's 512 left, and the front deck is the roadside deck. Rear deck to keep the same, so that's 285 left. Rear deck keep and the front deck keep retaining walls 130 left entryway awning overhang 114 sq ft left.

**I Stauffer** - If we were to go to a grated tread, all the stair treads are like an expanded metal covering the ground? Are we going turn it back into impervious?

**Oleson** - I don't think I've ever had that question before. Let me find a picture to see if this is what you're talking about.

**I Stauffer** - Leaves and dirt will pass right through. It will look more residential than industrial looking.

**Oleson** - I don't have any particular problem with that from my standpoint, clearly have less water through. As long as it's not a pretty dense weave.

**I Stauffer** - We would have to make something that is soft to the foot and safe, comfortable and residential. Have it be more mesh. Like at a playground.

**Guck** - Linda? You're done ok. Barry

**Schultz** - Nothing to add.

**Naaktgeboren** - You have a nice stairway, I would look at how to get rid of as much gravel as you can.

**Dearing** - Get down to the 45% coverage.

**Guck** - Well you have to get to 25% right?

**Oleson** - Back with the previous owner they didn't have a survey.

**Guck** - I'm ok with the addition, if they stay down to the impervious I'm fine with that.

**I Stauffer** - What were the numbers again?

**Oleson** - If you took all the numbers that we talked about, you would have 114sq ft left. So if you're leaving the front and the back deck and the stairway, and going with the expanding house and the garage the way it is, that's all that's left is 114. So that assumes that the sheds are all gone and the sauna is gone.

**I Staffer** - So we're below what we need, correct?

**Oleson** - You would have a 114 left to work with. That's no driveway left.

**I Stauffer** - Bring it back to the natural soil. There is room for 2-3 cars there.

**I Stauffer** - We might use it for parking if there is a storm or something like that.

**Oleson** - Is this a year round home or a seasonal?

**I Stauffer** - Year round.

**Guck** - Remove the tree and move the door to the other side. That would be your 114ft.

**Oleson** - If you're going to stay under the 25% and provide us with a survey.

**Naaktgeboren** - What if they put in one of the hill climber?

**Jeremiah** - They're pricey, I think we we're quoted \$100-\$110 for it. We have to find a creative way to get there. It would be less intrusive. In the end get a survey and find a creative way to get to the 25% that is going to allow a normal sized entrance in and out of the garage.

**Oleson** - Do you want it to be tabled so we can make sure that all works? In case it doesn't it's still an opportunity to give a variance otherwise were approving it on that condition then they come back and say that's not reasonable then they have to reapply for a variance again.

**I Stauffer** - I think if I'm understanding correctly that we have the flexibility to come up with a creative way to get to the impervious limit, I think that's ok I'm comfortable with doing that whether it be a mix of removing some of the gravel and doing something with the stairway, but I think if we have flexibility to figure out a way to come to that impervious limit and do a review afterward.

**Oleson** - Approve it on those conditions today and you'll make it work.

Naaktgeboren made a motion to approve the variance to construct an 8' x 14.28' addition to the side of an existing dwelling approx. 3 ft from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) on a dwelling previously approved by variance to be partially within a bluff and side yard 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 reduce impervious coverage on the lot to no more than 25%.
3. The applicant shall not exceed 15% building coverage of the lot.

4. The applicant shall provide an as-built survey after the construction of the addition showing that they have met all building and impervious coverage and setback requirements.

Dircks seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Requests related to the reconstruction and relocation of a water-oriented accessory structure and lakeside stairway and landing. Approvals required include a variance to reconstruct and relocate a 12' x 17' water-oriented accessory structure on a parcel with 32.7% impervious coverage (max. 25% allowed).

Applicant and Property Owner: David Alan and Lisa Anne McNeil

Property address: 11107 Hollister Ave NW, Annandale

Sec-Twp-Range: 2-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206056001050

**PRESENT:** David Allen & Lisa McNeil – Jerry Konz J & K Landscaping

**Alan** – The stairs that go down to the existing shoreline, they are at the end of life, they are wood and they are deteriorated. The existing shed that is at the shoreline has some safety issues as well. The last 2 years the ice has come within a foot of hitting the shed. Basically there is no walkway to the shed so it's kind of hazardous. I would prefer to replace it where it is at and safe. I would like to push it back off the shoreline and if we do that we can also simplify the stairs move it and reduce the coverage by moving it over to where the existing landing is now and go to the top of the boathouse and have another set of stairs that go down to the shoreline. So kind of driven by some safety issues but as we looked at it, we thought well it might make more sense to actually move it and simplify things and reduce the amount of coverage. We bought this place in 2021, I'm not sure what the previous resident did to get variances because we are above the 25%, we're directionally trying to move in the right direction and have a new set of equipment that is safe.

**Oleson** – The existing boathouse is over here a bit closer to the lake, they're going to move it over here to meet their lake and side yard setback of 10 feet for both of those. Meet the maximum 10 foot height that is allowed, the stairway will get changed. The boathouse will be the same footprint and the same size as it was before. So in terms of the building and impervious coverage, current building coverage is 15.46% and will stay the same, and Impervious is 32.7% to 32.1%. Short retaining wall will get replaced. Everything is shifting around a little bit. If they just wanted to replace the shed where it's at, they could do that. It's very close to being a bluff but it's not quite a bluff. The only reason for the variance is because they are moving it to a different location.

**Alan** – We are reducing the amount of impervious by moving it.

**Oleson** - Correct

**Audience** - None

**Dearing** - So how are you going to get the impervious down, you have to get it down more than that?

**Alan** – To get to 25% I would have to knock down the garage, I'm not doing that. I'll just stick to it as it is. I'll just replace the stairs 1 board at a time.

**Oleson** – The problem with reducing off street parking could potentially create more on street parking for your guests right?

**Allen** – We also push our snow in there. It's not going to get it to 25%.

**Dirks** – I'm fine with the new structure, agree with John on the impervious.

**Alan** – I was trying to simplify things from the top of the hill down.

**Dircks** – I know you inherited this, if you can just look at some creative ways.

**Konz** – The parking area at best guess is probably only 250 square feet. It's possibly going to reduce it a percent. I don't know if that is enough?

**Naaktgeboren** - 218ft is the parking.

**Schultz** – I like what your plan is but I agree with John we would like to have your reduce the impervious.

**Alan** – Not sure what that means what do you want me to do? Knock down the garage? That doesn't make sense.

**Naaktgeboren** – Moving it and raising it so you're out of the ordinary high water is good, reducing the stairway. I measured if you went from 4 ft to a 3ft stairway you gain 43 feet, if you put grass between the garage and the road is 218ft and then the area on the other side of the garage that goes to the house, 228 ft up to the overhead garage door. Those are ways to get it down.

**Konz** – If you go to a 3 ft wide stairs and a rail on both sides, some municipalities have a minimum width for stairs that would be a question for you Ben.

**Oleson** – We don't really have a minimum. Unless the building code requires something minimum, from a zoning perspective it's just maximum 4 foot for stairways.

**Naaktgeboren** – The two areas that I'm talking about are just under 450 square feet. Then 43 feet if you went to 3 feet on the stairway. Makes it almost 490.

**Oleson** – Then it would get you down to 28.9%.

**Naaktgeboren** – So what then does he take his garage out or what?

**Alan** – At that point I'll stay at 35%

**Guck** – To me it's the lesser of two evils, are you going to keep the boathouse where it is? That is the worst of all evils because your stairs are not good.

**Alan** – The one thing worse than an old house getting hit by an ice heave, is a brand new one getting hit by an ice heave. So I'm not putting a new one there.

**Guck** – I don't have a problem with the plan if you can get it down to 29-30%. That's a give and take.

**Konz** – The parking area will get you down to around 30%.

**Guck** – I don't know if you can pull it back any further? But that shortens your stairs.

**Naaktgeboren** – You will be back further with the new one won't you?

**Alan** – Yes, we did go back 10 feet.

**Konz** – To get that 10 ft setback from the OHW we pulled it back, we'll have to do a small retaining wall house or street side of that structure to keep the water from flowing right into it.

**Guck** – That's my thoughts this is different than some of the others because were trying to make things better.

**Alan** – The alternative don't do anything.

**Guck** - You're doing better than what it was. You're still at 32.7%.

**Alan** – which I don't need a permit for.

**Oleson** – You'll have to get a permit, not a variance. Normally they would be able to rebuild but because of OHW they can't.

**Guck** – All the area where the stairs are, what's that going to be?

**Konz** – Seeded. So I think I could work with you to achieve that 30% if you're ok with that?

**Alan** – Well I cannot knock down my garage. Well right now there is grass growing in the gravel.

**Konz** – I think they're talking about removing the gravel and planting seed.

**Oleson**- Your concern if it might not grow grass.

**Alan** – It's shaded 100% of the time it might become a mud pit.

**Konz** – Put a beautiful mulch fill with Hostas.

**Alan** - don't want it to turn into a mud hole.

Naaktgeboren made a motion to approve variance to reconstruct and relocate a 12' x 17' water-oriented accessory structure on a parcel with 32.7% impervious coverage (max. 25% allowed) with the following conditions:

1. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.
2. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of rainwater from the lot prior to it flowing into the lake, wetlands, road right-of-way or onto adjoining properties. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, establishing or maintaining a buffer of native vegetation along the shoreline, or other acceptable best management practices. Once approved, the plan should be implemented at the time of construction or within a reasonable time period after construction is completed and maintained indefinitely.
3. The total impervious surface coverage on the lot shall not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the lot area. No additional impervious surface of any kind shall be constructed, installed, or placed on the property in the future unless equal or greater amounts of impervious coverage are reduced elsewhere on the lot.
4. The proposed changes to the lot, including the building size, location, and site layout, shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan and application materials submitted by the applicant except as modified by the conditions herein. Any significant deviation shall require an amendment to this Variance.
5. The accessory structure shall not be used for human habitation and shall meet all applicable requirements for lowest floor elevation, lake and property line setbacks and height.
6. Grading or filling on the steep slope shall be limited to the minimum amount required for the installation of the stairway and accessory structure foundation only. No other alterations shall be allowed unless they meet all applicable requirements of the Township ordinance for land alterations.
7. Upon completion of construction, the applicant shall submit an as-built Certificate of Survey to the Zoning Administrator confirming the final dimensions, setbacks, and total calculation of impervious coverage on the property.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried with Dearing opposed.

Requests related to the construction of a detached garage to replace an existing detached garage and garden shed. Approvals required include a variance to construct a 24' x 30' detached garage with 9 ft sidewalls and bonus storage trusses with 6'10" ceiling height and 8/12 roof pitch (max. 6 ft ceiling height and 6/12 roof pitch) to replace an existing 16' x 20' two-story garage and 8' x 12' garden shed approx. 50 ft from the centerline of a road (min. 65 ft required) and increasing impervious coverage on the parcel from approx. 24.3% to approx. 26% (max. 25% allowed). Minimum floor elevation of new garage may need to be raised approx. 1 ft. to meet floodplain regulations.

Applicant: Ergen Exteriors

Property Owner: Karin Howard

Property address: 11824 103<sup>rd</sup> St NW, South Haven

Sec-Twp-Range: 7-121-27

Parcel number(s): 206042000150

**PRESENT:** Karin Howard & Ergen

**Ergen** - The garage she has there now doesn't have enough clearance to pull her truck into it. There is no other garage on the property. There is storage above there and we'd like to use the same footprint as below. Take down the garage and replacing it with a 24x30 garage with bonus storage trusses, not finished off, just a floor in for storage, with an access door on the top side since it's built into the hill. It will be block on all 3 sides. We went 9' block since we went with a 8' overhead door. We didn't have any plans since she just purchased the property, we didn't have any survey done. We wanted to see what we can build before we have the plans drawn.

**Oleson** - Road setback and the impervious. So you're not sure of the roof pitch either, right? replace what's there and build a bigger garage.

**Ergen** - No, I was going send whatever plans we had or what was approved to Litfin. You can't have more than a 6' 11" finished ceiling height which is not finished. If we have to drop that down a little bit, so be it. It is up to Litfin on how to build the trusses for the storage area.

**Oleson** - You'll need a variance to go over the 6' ceiling height. We don't have a survey so this is not exact, but I'm estimating 24.3% now and going up to 26%.

**Guck** - I bet you know what questions we're going to ask.

**Ergen** - All tar driveways are in and established, we're going to bring it out towards the front so some of that tar is gone, now it's covered so you're not sacrificing anything. It will be coming out towards the road. We can't go back any further because the drainfield is up on top of that hill back there and the tanks are off to the left side of that garage, so that's why the side setback is pretty close but we can't go to the left at all because the tank is there, we could go a couple feet that way if we have to help us stay away from the side line. But we would like to stay as far away from that as possible.

**Guck** - How did you come up with the size of the garage?

**Ergen** - Just going from garage on previous properties. Trying to get it as big as we could. 30ft wide seems like it fits in there fairly well, and coming out to the road. If we are going to raise the garage we could go back a little bit like a foot so there's a little leeway that way. Because it's probably not even 8' sidewall height in there right now. Basically we are going 10 full courses of block.

**Naaktgeboren** - Is the little shed on the side getting removed? The one up in the front.

**Ergen** - Yes. That road is also gone. There is no tar there. It's probably under the 24% that's listed. Not sure if the previous owners removed it.

**Oleson** - Yes the previous owners had to remove it. The Variance was to get rid of the tar.

**Naaktgeboren** - Are you over 180 feet?

**Oleson** - Well, it's all estimates. Based on my estimates 180 feet over.

**Naaktgeboren** - Can you do it removing asphalt somewhere?

**Ergen** - Not moving the driveway doesn't even matchup with the doors we put in. But we didn't make alterations with the driveway, because I knew that wasn't going to happen, so we just left the driveway as is, that is there.

**Naaktgeboren** - Does this have to be elevated for floodplain or are where were supposed to be?

**Oleson** - It does have to be at a minimum elevation, 997.7 probably would have to be elevated, maybe up to a foot at the most.

**Ergen** - I talked to Cronin O'Malley and they can come out to shoot the existing floor height to see what it would have to move.

**Guck** - So without that blacktop area, that was not figured in the impervious?

**Oleson** - It was figured in the impervious, and that's removed.

**Ergen** - By the looks of it, it was a pretty good area.

**Naaktgeboren** - It was removed with the previous variance? How many square feet was that? I thought it was somewhere around 300 feet.

**Oleson** - Yes not sure how much. The line goes through the front of the garage. I think I have something wrong in the staff report. That the 997.7 requirement is in the 29 data, these elevations are in the 88 data, so I'm pretty sure it's 998.3. So it goes there right through the front of the garage. So you might be there already or a little bit low.

**Naaktgeboren** - If you moved ahead?

**Ergen** - If we move it ahead that's where you can't change the driveway it is already established. You don't want to raise it up to high.

**Dircks** - I don't have anything to add.

**Schultz** - What are you going to store in there?

**Howard** - 2 cars, a truck and a car, a side by side, a four wheeler and a lawn mower.

**Oleson** - If raising it becomes an issue the garage could stay lower but than it has to go down to 576 feet or less than you can get flood vents and flood resistant materials and all that.

**Naaktgeboren** - I have a question for Ben. What have we done in the past with 8'12" and 6'10"? Do we give variances for higher? You said 6'10" in side ceiling height have we done that in the past?

**Oleson** - I don't believe we have, I think the only argument to allow it to be higher is that the existing structure has a steeper.

**Naaktgeboren** - So we should stay at 6'. We've had is that the existing structure, not sure if we have approved more than 6'.

**Ergen** - We just did 6'10" so we can get a regular service door in there. We could drop it down to 6'8" without cutting the door down.

**Oleson** - To be direct I don't know if we've granted a variance to be above 6'.

**Ergen** - You could walk around and knock your head on the trusses. It's a Quonset style, so it's to the floor and the sides and goes up to well over 7 feet.

**Oleson** - If you want to justify letting it be higher you would, have to say it is already higher so many square feet, and the new one is not going to be 6'10" for the whole thing.

**Ergen** - No, usually when they do there bonus design it comes up 3-4 feet and then it angles with the pitch in the roof until you get your ceiling height. It's just down the center basically is that 6'10" you know we could drop it to 6'8" you know a couple inches, and then we could still get a service door in there.

**Oleson** - So what I'm saying is there is a certain amount of volume of space here that's over 6' ceiling height already. So if you're saying it's no more volume than what it is now it's over 6'

height, you can sort of argue that it's a replacement not an expansion. Even though the garage as a whole is getting bigger, the second level space that's over 6' ceiling height is not getting bigger.

**Ergen** - We can drop the pitch down a little bit, it's all on Litfin on how they design it.

**Dearing** - Like him to stay at 25% impervious.

**Guck** - They have to be really close.

**Oleson** - If you want it to stay at 25%, the only thing I can think of is alongside of the house, I'm sure you want that for parking.

**Ergen** - It is the only flat spot once you get up there. It's pretty steep to not have asphalt.

**Oleson** - The only way to stay under the 25% would be to reduce the driveway up on top, is to reduce the size of the garage.

**Ergen** - Worst possible case scenario, yes.

**Guck** - Or it might come back in your favor.

**Oleson** - If you are filling in the blank there if you don't want to not exceed 25%, then it all depends on how the survey comes back, and if we're back to the same question about do they just want to work with that and figure that out or do they want to table this, come back with a survey.

**Ergen** - We would like to work with it, instead of tabling it.

**Guck** - So then you're ok with 25%?

**Ergen** - Yes, if that's the last resort.

**Schultz** - How long is that driveway in front of the garage?

**Ergen** - About 12-14 feet maybe. Keep in mind we're bringing that garage out a little bit. You can park it in the driveway.

**Dearing** - Well part of that tar is on the right of way. They don't count that anyway.

**Oleson** - Can you build your garage closer to the existing garage and use that?

**Ergen** - No because the septic is right there. Also with the landscape right there, there is no way you can get an overhead door on that side without a huge retaining wall. Was the impervious accounted for taking that other shed out of there also? The one that is down there?

**Oleson** - For taking that shed out? Yes.

Naaktgeboren made a motion to approve the variance to construct a 24' x 30' detached garage with 9 ft sidewalls to replace an existing 16' x 20' two-story garage and 8' x 12' garden shed approx. 50 ft from the centerline of a road (min. 65 ft required). Minimum floor elevation of new garage may need to be raised approx. 1 ft. to meet floodplain regulations 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. The total impervious surface coverage on the lot shall not exceed twenty-five percent (25%). No additional impervious surface of any kind shall be constructed, installed, or placed on the property in the future unless it is offset by at least an equal amount of reduction elsewhere on the lot.
4. The proposed development, including the building size, location, and site layout, shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan and application materials submitted by the applicant except as modified by the conditions herein. Any significant deviation shall require an amendment to this Conditional Use Permit.
5. The lowest floor of the replacement structure must be certified by a licensed professional to be constructed at or above the Regulatory Flood Protection Elevation (RFPE) of 997.7 NAVD88.
6. The existing 16' x 20' detached garage and the existing 8' x 12' garden shed shall be entirely removed and properly disposed of prior to the issuance of a permit to begin construction on the new structure.
7. The replacement detached garage and bonus storage area shall not be used for human habitation, nor shall it contain kitchen facilities.
8. Grading or filling on the property shall be limited to the minimum amount required for the installation of the structure foundation unless such work otherwise complies with Land Alteration Permit requirements of the Ordinance.
9. Upon completion of construction, the applicant shall submit a certified "as-built" survey to the Zoning Administrator confirming the final dimensions, road setbacks, and total calculation of impervious coverage on the property, clearly showing compliance with the approved maximum.

Dircks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**Oleson** - Could I clarify, what did you say about the roof pitch?

**Ergen** - So 6' and 6' 12"

**Oleson** - So meet the normal requirements?

**Naaktgeboren** - Correct, and I know they can do it.

**Ergen** - Does it matter what the heel length of the truss is? If they stay under the 6 foot interior height, and 6 foot roof edge? Out on the eve. If you have an 8 inch heel and a 6'12" pitch, or if you bring that up 3 feet and now you have a 6'12" foot pitch, you know just to get your clearance, you know the 6 foot ceiling height is going to come over so far before it hits the pitch of the roof.

**Oleson** - You have a maximum 12" sidewall height.

**Ergen** - Yes that's basically what it would be.

**Oleson** - So you're increasing your sidewall height? Up to where the wall meets the truss.

**Ergen** - Is the heel of the truss considered sidewall height? Yes but what about above that?

**Oleson** - I'll have to draw it out to make sure we are talking about the same thing. There's a definition of sidewall height.

**Ergen** - We'll do it as minimal as possible but we'll see what the design comes back as, to see how much space we actually have to work with.

**Oleson** - You guys don't care if the wall height goes up to that maximum 12" height?

**Ergen** - Well it's not really a sidewall height, it's basically the eave height is what is going to get raised not the sidewall because we're only doing 9'. If you build your truss up where it sits the plate, your heel is going to get brought up, so that brings the roof up itself just to get more height. But we'll keep it as minimal as possible.

**Oleson** - Here's the definition. Vertical distance between the exposed floor and the point where the wall meets the roof truss.

**Ergen** - The ceiling height doesn't change, the trusses are where they are. It's better to get it drawn out.

Schultz made a motion to approve the minutes of September 9, 2025. Dearing seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

#### Zoning Administrator's Report

- Permits
- Correspondence
- Enforcement Actions

**Oleson** - Rick Seagraves, we granted him a Variance to build a big shed out there in the cedar acres May 2023 so a variance is only 3 years which is May of 2026, his Variance is to build 2400 sq ft garage. Back surgery recovery is for about year, 2<sup>nd</sup> surgery in the same spot for a longer recovery time. Ben will talk to him. Variance is 3 years.

Ben will talk with Rick and tell him to come to the Planning & Zoning Board closer to the time frame of March or April 2026 if you still need it. If he needs the extension it is 56 months, and if he needs another extension to come back in and apply for it.

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

Minutes prepared by Heidi Eckerman