

CORINNA TOWNSHIP  
MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
JULY 14, 2026

Corinna Town Hall, 9801 Ireland Ave, Annandale MN 55302

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

Roll Call: Planning Commission Members in Attendance – Barry Schultz, , Dick Naaktgeboren, Al Guck, Linda Dircks, Larry Smith, Steve Niklaus, Dean Flygare, Ben Oleson Planning and Zoning Administrator; Jean Just Deputy Clerk

Other in Attendance: Tony Rieger-Borer, Michelle Smith, Ethan Smith, Dave Stumpf, Jim Martin, Brad Lantto, Mary Lefebvre, Dani Lefebvre, Marty Lefebvre, Randy Lefebvre, Jerry Liebhard

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda; Smith made a motion to approve the agenda. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Public Hearings

Requests related to the rezoning and eventual subdividing of property. Approvals required include a rezoning from the current General Agriculture AG zoning to a zoning district that would allow for three residential dwellings (Agricultural/Residential A/R with a Rural Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district.

Applicant and Property Owner: Anthony M Rieger Borer

Property address: 11988 Jarvis Ave NW, Annandale

Parcel number(s): 206000032200

**Present:** Tony Rieger Borer

**Rieger Borer:** Would like to do a minor subdivision for family. I would voluntarily put 31.1 acres into a permanent MN land trust. This legal arrangement ensures the permanent protection of the property's native prairie, wetlands, and rural character.

**Oleson:** Currently zoned AG, which under current zoning it is only one building. Looking to rezone it to AG/Residential with a PUD overlay which would limit the size of the lots. A concept that would allow for 3 homes. We or the county does not get into land conservation, we are just looking at the rezoning to AG/RS to a PUD so that he can then apply for the subdivision. We are only recommending to the town board, Wright County would make the final decision. This has come before us in the past, we have recommended approval at the time, and the county did not.

**Rieger-Borer:** The land trust will not do it without getting this done first and feeling confident that we will be able to do the subdivision. Would like to keep it in the family and give my children the option to build a home on the property.

**Audience:** Jim Martin: Why did Wright County turn you down?

**Rieger Borer:** It was 3 in favor & 4 against and I feel it was because I did not have the land trust solidified.

**Marty Lefebvre:** We were at that hearing and it seemed to me it was because it was spot zoning. I do not have any issues, but the county has a land use plan to preserve agriculture and now you looking at doing spot zoning. I feel the township should not be in favor. **Danielle**

**Lefebvre:** Just want to touch on what he just said. We own one parcel that is 25 acres so what is stopping us from doing that. **Ethen Smith:** I farm and we need to keep our land for AG. It is tough to be a farmer and we need to watch what we are doing.

**Niklaus:** This is the only one that the staff report recommends we deny, why is that?

**Oleson:** It's how it fits into the land use plan with the county. Corinna has taken a different approach and we were looking at making changes. This one is an area with some unique circumstances sometimes where they are not good farm land, or because it is surrounded by DNR does that make it unique.

**Niklaus:** I guess that is why I support this request as do feel it is a rare & unique circumstance. It is not quality farm land and they are surrounded by DNR land. I do not feel that the addition of homes will not harm the farm operation. What was the information regarding the driveways.

**Oleson:** PUD overlay will give it the flexibility to preserve open space.

**Niklaus:** In terms of spot zoning, I get that, but you are preserving many acres for years to come.

**Rieger-Borer:** This can be contingent on the land trust getting completed.

**Oleson:** So the most homes he could have 5 based on ordinance and he is asking for 3.

**Smith:** I heard that you are not in a big hurry, and Wright County is looking at redoing the comprehensive plan in 2027 or 2028. Not sure if this is an area that would be considered or not. I feel you should have a right to do what you want to do. Why is this unique that will change their mind. They will look at that.

**Schultz:** I understand what the residence are talking about. Your plan seems open ended and I'm not in favor of that.

**Naaktgeboren:** We have had a hard time getting Wright County to update the land use plan. It would be nice to wait until they have the land use change. Question is the road frontage, is there enough?

**Oleson:** PUD does not have a minimum – we generally want to see some road frontage, the lowest is 33ft wide to preserve the farm land. The PUD would be decided later after the rezoning is done.

**Dircks:** I like they plan and you have done a lot of work to preserve the land. With Barry's concern it would be an iron clad agreement. I would feel differently if it was farmed.

**Flygare:** Are you farming?

**Rieger-Borer:** No, it has been prairie grass and flowers since I owned it.

**Flygare:** What is the land trust, do they own it.

**Rieger-Borer:** It is a trust that is monitored by the state that regulates what is done with the land based on what is agreed to. So it would say that the wetlands will stay wetlands & the prairie grass will stay and it cannot ever be built on.

**Flygare:** Is there any way that this land trust could dissolve. Just curious since I had something like that happen to me.

**Rieger-Borer:** It is in perpetuity so it is forever.

Niklaus made a motion based on the findings of fact to recommend approval to the rezoning and eventual subdividing of property. Approvals required include a Rezoning from the current General Agriculture AG zoning to a zoning district that would allow for three residential dwellings (likely Agricultural/Residential A/R with a Rural Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district).

Smith seconded the motion.

**Linda:** Does the motion include putting the acres in the land trust.

**Niklaus:** Amended the motion to include in putting it in a land trust.

Approved 4 – 1 with Shultz opposed.

Requests related to the rezoning and eventual subdividing of property. Approvals required include a rezoning from the current General Agriculture AG zoning to Suburban Residential R-2.

Applicant and Property Owner: Richard D and Rachelle A Naaktgeboren

Property address: None

Parcel number(s): 206000123202

**Naaktgeboren:** It is 11 acres and about a year ago they changed the way the property was assessed and the taxes doubled. I talked with Wright County and they said I could go to the township and do an administrative order to create a lake lot so I did that. With the remaining 8.3 acres I would like to split that in half. It is in the land use plan to become residential large lot. So that is what I am asking to do.

**Oleson:** Currently zoned AG, there are some others near there that are smaller, and the land use plan currently shows it could be residential large lot R2. Point out that it is on a county road and they said they would allow for one driveway so they could have one off of Hart and one off CR 123.

**Ethen Smith:** Just concerned again with happening to the farm land. I am to the south and I have a grain bin right there. Concerned if I want to expand will I be limited on where I want to put the barn. **Michelle Smith:** To the east and farm. Question what the other ones around there are. Adding more homes and now were not AG anymore, were becoming suburban. **Josh Mol:** We have livestock and that is going away and setbacks from feed lots and will it meet that, just want to make sure they are not pushing us out will it fit the setback? **Erin Dickie:** Our family owns a few parcels in the township and are we setting a precedence for others to develop their land.

**Schultz:** Setting the precedence, we run into this at every meeting. I understand the feed lots.

**Oleson:** Reviewed the feed lot information and the set back is 500ft according to email from Wright County.

**Niklaus:** What is the relevance of that?

**Oleson:** The relevance is that if a home is built then will it limit the farmer with what they can do if expanding.

**Niklaus:** It is upon the person that buys and builds the home. So if someone builds 500ft from the feed lot it would limit where the farmer could expand.

More discussion regarding feed lots and distances.

**Danielle Lefebvre:** It seems to me we are changing the zoning, and accommodating and honoring what people want to do and the hardship falls on those that are already there.

**Smith:** This one is different it is in the land use plan and it is where the county was planning on further development so I feel you should be able to act on that.

**Niklaus:** what are the sizes?

**Naaktgeboren:** Its about 4+ acres

**Flygare:** Is it being farmed now?

**Naaktgeboren:** Yes

**Dircks:** Asked where his property was from there. So there is a lake lot off Gulden. So you're not looking at selling the lake lot?

**Naaktgeboren:** Yes, I am looking to sell that.

**Dircks:** So it is being farmed right now.

**Naaktgeboren:** Yes. It is in the future land use plan and that is why we have one.

**Guck:** My comment on it is that it is in the land use plan.

**Dircks:** Only other concern is the pressure to Indian Lake. However, it is in the land use.

Niklaus made a motion based on findings of fact to recommend approval of the rezoning from the current General Agriculture AG zoning to Suburban Residential R-2.

Smith seconded.

Motion approved 4 – 1 with Dircks Abstained

Requests related to the construction of a porch addition over an existing open deck. Approvals required include a variance for the construction of a 12 ft x 16 ft partially enclosed porch over an existing open deck approximately 58 feet from Sugar Lake (min. 75 ft required) and attached to a dwelling that is 60 ft from the lake and 2.4 ft and 14.8 ft from the side lot lines (min. 15 ft required).

Applicant and Property Owner: James R and Sandra L Martin

Property address: 7642 106<sup>th</sup> St NW

Parcel number(s): 206088001070 and 206120001070

**Present:** James Martin

**Martin:** Adding a screen porch over an existing deck. We are not going any closer to lake, no water no bathrooms.

**Oleson:** Variance for adding a porch on a home that is too close to the lake the porch itself will meet the side yard setbacks but added to a house that does not meet the setbacks. They also own the adjacent property.

**Audience** – none

**Smith:** I assuming you have to put footings on there.

**Martin:** They are already there.

**Smith:** It is close to the lake and your good on impervious?

**Martin:** We are over.

**Oleson:** At about 30% but they are not adding more.

**Smith:** Is there a way to get rid of impervious. I would like to get the impervious down to the 25%.

**Martin:** We would have to take out some tar.

**Naaktgeboren:** There is a lot of tar where the boat trailer sits you could take that out.

**Niklaus:** I agree we need to get it down.

**Dircks:** No issue with the addition, would like to get the impervious down.

**Flygare:** Talked about where to take it out, could you square up both sides of the garage and grass it along with taking out the other side then I would be good with it.

**Guck:** We need to try to stay with the 25%.

**Naaktgeboren:** I measured over 16 ft puts you in the middle of widow so what are you doing there?

Martin: We are changing that and putting a door in to the porch. What should I do to let you know on the impervious?

Niklaus: I don't think you have to do anything other than show Ben how you got your impervious down to 25%.

Smith made a motion based on the findings of fact to approve the variance for the construction of a 12 ft x 25 ft partially enclosed porch over an existing open deck approximately 58 feet from Sugar Lake (min. 75 ft required) and attached to a dwelling that is 60 ft from the lake and 2.4 ft and 14.8 ft from the side lot lines (min. 15 ft required) with the following conditions:

1. The partially enclosed porch must not be converted into fully enclosed or conditioned living space in the future or extend closer to the lake than proposed without obtaining a new variance.
2. 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.
3. 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 Variance.
4. The applicant shall reduce impervious coverage to no more than 25% of the lot prior to the issuance of a permit for the construction of the addition.

Dircks seconded the motion. Niklaus: Note that we are ok is that it is already existing and they are not getting closer. Motion passed unanimously.

Requests related to the rezoning and eventual subdividing of property. Approvals required include a rezoning from the current General Agriculture AG zoning to Suburban Residential R-2(a).

Applicant and Property Owner: Shawn W. Lampi  
 Property address: 6799 County Road 6 NW, Annandale  
 Parcel number(s): 206000331102

**Present:** Shawn Lampi

**Lampi:** I have a north east lot that is partial wetland. Land is currently zoned AG, would like to expand a little bigger than 5 acres, partial swamp area, it would be a nice to put a home or two there. I inherited it from my father. There is a fence line along the property that I am not sure but there was a variance in there for some land that I'm not sure who owns it.

**Oleson:** The County has an easement from the road. Looks like the GIS map it is not clear who owns it and that is a question for a surveyor or an attorney. There is no record of it. Request to rezone the 5 acres to and R2a which would be a 5 acre and then your property would be 10 acres. County said they would be ok with a driveway to serve that.

**Audience:** None

**Schultz:** Do we have a Survey?

**Oleson:** We do not need for the rezone;

**Schultz:** I am ok with it.

**Smith:** Good

**Niklaus:** Good

**Naaktgeboren:** Ok

**Dircks:** Good

**Flygare:** Just curious about septic.

**Oleson:** The platting process would look at that.

**Guck:** It is in the land use already, so no issues.

Schultz made a motion based on findings of fact to recommend approval of rezoning from the current General Agriculture AG zoning to Suburban Residential R-2(a).  
Niklaus seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Schultz made a motion to approve the minutes of June 9, 2026. Smith seconded the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report; none  
Permits; none  
Correspondence; none  
Enforcement Actions; none

#### Other Business

Interpretation – Outdoor Storage Kitchen setback requirements;  
Question regarding out door kitchen on patio and it would be within the 75 lake setback, they would consider it a structure and you would have to meet the setback. It is not laid out in ordinance very clear so was asked to bring to the board. Board was in agreement it is not a structure, more landscaping.

W/C request for comment on the rezoning of property in south side township. No comment.

Motion was made by Niklaus, seconded by Smith to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously at 9:13pm.

Minutes prepared by Jean Just