

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MARCH 12, 2026

Corinna Town Hall, 9801 Ireland Ave, Annandale MN 55302

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

Roll Call: Planning Commission members in Attendance – Al Guck, Larry Smith, Dick Naaktgeboren, Cathy Gabriel, Steve Niklaus (online), Ben Oleson Planning and Zoning Administrator; Heidi Eckerman

Absent: Linda Dircks, Barry Schultz, Jean Just

Others in Attendance: Rory Norgren, Any Gilchrist & James Gasper

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda – Oleson said he had a few items and he'll do it under his Zoning report. Smith made a motion to accept the agenda. Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

(Tabled from January 2026 meeting) Requests related to the construction of a dwelling, porch and detached garage addition. Approvals required include Variances to construct an approx. 5.5' x 26' porch and 18.5' x 22' dwelling addition to a home approx. 3.4 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) and a 10' x 23' garage addition approx. 33 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required) and causing building coverage of the lot to exceed the maximum 15% allowed and not meeting the requirement for 15 ft of fill around all structures to an elevation of 996.7 NGVD29. All construction is subject to minimum lowest floor floodplain elevations.

Applicant and Property Owner: Amy Gilchrist

Property address: 11000 118th St NW, Annandale

Parcel number(s): 206014000400, 206000052203 and 206000061104

Present: Amy Gilchrist, James Gasper & Rory Norgren

Guck: Any additions to add?

Gilchrist: I did the survey that you asked, and I also did a septic design.

Oleson: You had asked for the survey to show exact property lines and setbacks to their proposed addition, impervious coverage, elevations and all that. So this is what that survey is showing. Their addition would be 5.2 feet from the property line on the side and on the existing side, the existing side there is 3.4, and they have 31 feet to the center of the road. The addition for the garage would be within the road setback as well. Other changes are, they are taking off the porch and then building one back. They want to square off the roof line. That all meets the lake setback it's just being added onto the house that doesn't meet the side yard setback. Impervious is 23% existing, going up to 25%, building coverage would be 15% as well. 24.71% is the total impervious, 15.38% is the building coverage.

Naaktgeboren: So the building is still 120 feet over. So part of that was the lot size went down.

Oleson: The 2017 Survey lot 13,970 and the 2025 survey 14,092.7. The reason I was surprised is this survey was done to the shoreline at the time, and when he looks to see what they had for

elevation from the high water mark it seem that it was actually high at the time. 991.3 was the high water elevation. The other thing the survey showed was the lowest floor elevation of 997.2 the requirement is 997.7 and this again was different from the 2017 survey. After talking with Gasper there is a crawl space underneath, so the crawlspace is actually the lowest floor elevation that they were supposed to use. So for flood plain purposes the existing house doesn't meet that. The old survey showed that it did meet it. So what that means from a standpoint of the floodplain ordinance is that you can make modifications to that expansions provided exceed 50% of the value of the building. It's going to be over 50% of the value, right? So what that means is that you are to elevate the entire new and existing house. That's what we're dealing with according to the flood plain regulations.

Gasper: The flood plain says we need to be 4 feet above ordinary high water with the lowest level?

Oleson: That is when not a mapped flood plain elevation. Clearwater Lake we actually have a mapped flood plain elevation.

Gasper: Right, so it's got to be 4 feet to the floor.

Oleson: It's got to be 1½ foot above the base flood elevation. So the base flood elevation is 996.2 so a 1 ½ is 997.2. It's normally 1 foot for most rivers that you have to be higher, but for Clearwater it's 1 ½ feet because of the way they did the flood study.

Naaktgeboren: So that's 5 more inches. Is that right?

Oleson: From what they've got now?

Naaktgeboren: Yes

Oleson: Well the 997.2 that they have now is to the top of their main floor.

Gasper: That's to the top of the foundation it says.

Oleson: Ok to the top of your foundation, but then your crawl space is below that right.

Gasper: I understand yes, but the top floor is above.

Oleson: Ok so the top floor might be a little bit higher, maybe that's the 998.1 that the 2017 survey had. The way the flood plain regulations work is you consider a crawl space a basement the lowest floor.

Guck: Is it a full crawl space?

Gasper: Yes, the whole foundation.

Guck: It's concrete?

Gasper: its cinder block, and then it has dirt with poly and foam, it's insulated.

Norgren: If you bring the addition up how much does it have to come up like 7"? Can we bring the addition up then coming on the existing floor and then step up to the new part? Instead of being flush just go up the new addition.

Oleson: What they are trying to get at is, if it is a relatively minor change then they are ok with it.

Gasper: Google says, in noncoastal areas if the addition does not significantly alter the existing structure.

Oleson: Flood Plain gets kind of complicated. There are different items say different things. Oleson showed them what they are looking at.

Guck: Are there utilities down there? Could you fill in the crawl space?

Norgren: You mean if we added dirt to bring that floor up?

Guck: Yes

Smith: What if you do the project in phases, to avoid that cost?

Oleson: Well they get you on that to, because you have to wait like a year.

Oleson: This is the Flood Plain Ordinance, get to the section on Non Conformity Continuance you can continue it and then get down to Substantial Improvement talks about the 50% value.

Norgren: Is that just the house or the whole project?

Oleson: The whole project. This is a process, estimate the market value of the structure, I have the accessors market value. This is like if you were damaged in a flood. So then you estimate the cost of the project, it has to be at market rate of all the materials and labor. Compare those two and that determines whether it's a substantial improvement or not.

Gasper: What's it valued at?

Naaktgeboren: \$79,100.00

Oleson: That's low, it's a higher number.

Guck: How big is the crawl space?

Gasper: 4 feet

Oleson: Pulled up email from the Assessor. He said the old value was \$79,100.00 the current new value is \$121,500.00. So you get about another \$60,000.00 to work with.

Naaktgeboren: That is your assessed value. This is the newest assessment.

Oleson: The 50% is based off our current ordinance which is based off of the County Ordinance. When we adopted it in 2024.

Gasper: Obviously prices have gone up.

Oleson: Yes that's why I asked the DNR is this unusual enough where you would decrease that value? I don't know if they could do that I think they are tied by FEMA.

Guck: Just looking at the optional part the cantilever on there what are you talking in dollar savings there? The whole addition if we're looking at dollars & cents.

Oleson: You'd have to fill in the crawl space to the main floor.

Gasper: You can move all the utilities as long as there a foot above the floodplain, you can use it as storage only.

Oleson: There are some provisions for doing something like that.

Gasper: Correct, non-structural such as detached garages and sheds are exempt from this exclusion. Again, this is just me going off of Google.

Norgren: If we got the utilities out of there are we ok?

Gasper: So if I was to move the furnace and the electrical panel all to the main floor, one would think it would be excluded from the flood plain exemption. But the Township can also grant a variance.

Guck: But your garage is in the same situation.

Gasper: It's detached.

Oleson: The garage is a separate matter, but that is below the flood plain too. The previous owner built it, the requirement of the approval was that they put in flood vents. Because that allowed for accessory buildings where you can let it automatically flood. Things have to be elevated like electrical and mechanical. But as far as I can tell they didn't do that.

Gasper: But this is just common exemptions and exclusions. Detached accessories and it tells you garages and so forth.

Oleson: Well they don't have to be at that same elevation but, then you have to do other things.

Norgren: Well it would be simple enough to do the flood plain into this existing. Or you can put the flood doors in to do that.

Oleson: For the garage that would work, except, you're proposed addition makes it over the size limit that is allowed. That size limit is a 576 square feet.

Gasper: From what I understand is the actual structure which is the home, the detached garage is not a part of that structure.

Oleson: Ok so here is the accessory structure section. You could do this wet flood proofing, which is the flood vents, can only be 576 square feet, one story in height, can only be used for parking and storage, 2 openings for the flood vents.

Naaktgeboren: It would be about 730 feet down with the addition. Right?

Oleson: Right, so we can allow up to the 576 it used to be 500, then it got bumped up to 576 and the County went along with that. Now that DNR has bumped it up to 600, but when I asked the County if they are bumping up to that they said they don't have plans to at this time. But either way they are above any of those numbers with the addition. Then your option is to elevate it with fill. Or you could build a separate standalone 1 story garage.

Guck: Well does that make you want to refigure or I mean the owner has to have some say in this.

Gasper: What do you think we can get done with what they are proposing?

Norgren: Well with your garage you're at 7 so you couldn't do anything with the garage. You could do the addition towards the road that's about it.

Naaktgeboren: How big is it to raise the garage to put another block underneath it?

Gilchrist: We're not doing that.

Norgren: That would be a lot, then we would have to bring that floor up too, you'd have to bring that garage up and that would be too much.

Naaktgeboren: That's a lot lower than the house now.

Norgren: Well, not the lower level.

Guck: Then trying to find room for all the utilities.

Norgren: Yes, we wouldn't put them up there anyway.

Oleson: So, as far as I know the options are either jack up the house and fill in the crawl space and build a new crawl space on top of it.

Norgren: But that would be too expensive then you're running into the problem of runoff to the neighbors, the whole landscape.

Gasper: I mean this place has never flooded ever, even in 1983 when the bridge got blocked, never flooded.

Gilchrist: When I bought it, the water was high there, in August and it even rained, never once did it come up past the shore.

Gasper: We have a sump basket in there and it never ran.

Guck: How was the garage, did it ever get wet?

Gasper: The garage never gets wet.

Naaktgeboren: 1982, 1983 and 1984 and 2002, 2003 and 2004 were the bad ones. Seven years ago it was pretty high.

Gilchrist: I read about it and there was no reported flooding in that area.

Gasper: They say that the flood was caused from the river.

Naaktgeboren: And the bogs. Plugged up the bridge.

Guck: Our hands are pretty much tied, for this then, right?

Oleson: Yes, my understanding is because we're dealing with the Federal and the State rule on that lowest floor elevation, we can't really grant a Variance.

Niklaus: Can you look at your report page 4a-7 it's gets into the logic behind the flood plain thing, and the biggest rational was to make sure the Township property owners maintain eligibility for the National Flood Insurance Program. If individual property owners don't meet these standards they run the risk of higher insurance costs.

Oleson: I think it would take a lot for them to take away flood insurance from everybody in the Township. But theoretically that's the kind of threat the DNR throws out there, which is, if

you're not enforcing your flood plain regulations the Flood Insurance program can go away for everybody.

Niklaus: That would be a disaster for Clearwater Lake.

Oleson: I think it's less of a benefit to have that initial flood insurance because the rates have been going up so much in the last few years. It used to be a big benefit because it's the only way to get flood insurance.

Guck: So what you're saying is if we grant the variance for one it could affect the whole lake?

Oleson: That is how the DNR says it. I don't know if they would take it away for one, but you know, if you start not enforcing things like that, then that's the threat that they have given.

Gilchrist: If it's not up to you guys, but it would be up to you to allow me to just take the \$60,000.00 and do a back bedroom. At the end of the day all I want is to have my kids come and sleep over, that's it, I have 1 bedroom and we need our own space.

Naaktgeboren: I understand that part.

Gilchrist: At the end of the day, like I said, I just want to be able to have my kids come and sleep over and enjoy the lake. I love Clearwater Lake, I've had the best winter out there fishing, and that's what I love to do, and my kids love to do it and I just want to pass that on. So if that's what it's going to take is just \$60,000.00 for me to add a bedroom on, skip the bathroom, that's what I want. That would make my heart happy.

Gasper: I'd like to say along with that, I know that you guys have granted many variances along that lake, you can go down Kraemer, 118th, and you'd see them all. So I guess that what we can end up with.

Norgren: What would it take to do just the addition to the East? Proposed to the house.

Naaktgeboren: Bedroom?

Norgren: Yes

Oleson: If you kept that under the 50% value and it was elevated by itself to the right elevation, then that's what we could allow. In terms of the Flood Plain regulations, there are all these other things like setbacks they have to approve and Impervious and Building Coverage.

Smith: Ben when did all this new flood plain come into effect? Is this the newest one that they came up with last year?

Oleson: You mean of the flood elevations?

Smith: Yes

Oleson: Yes it got updated, but Clearwater Lake didn't change, the main change was Bass Lake and that was mapped.

Naaktgeboren: So, if they just put the bedroom on, what are we dealing with Flood Plain there?

Oleson: If they stay under the 50% they can do whatever they want.

Naaktgeboren: So they have to keep it under the \$60,000.00.

Guck: Bring that addition up to Flood plain regulations.

Naaktgeboren: So if they just put the bedroom on, what are they dealing with as Flood Plain there then?

Smith: Nothing if they keep it under cost.

Oleson: If they can stay under 50%, they can do whatever they want, just stay under 50%.

Guck: Bring that addition up to flood point regulations.

Smith: No, it's up there I think, doesn't that meet it on the top floor or do you need to come up 6 inches or something like that?

Oleson: So if you just elevate the addition on fill, that works. You want to elevate it some other way stilts or whatever that becomes a little more complicated, and there wouldn't be a crawl space underneath it right?

Gilchrist: No

Oleson: So if market rate, labor and materials stays under \$60,000.00 we can do that.

Gilchrist: Isn't the assessed value, I thought MN Statute it was something like 90% of the actual value? Has that changed?

Oleson: The Assessors valuations? I kind of heard something like that, but I don't know enough about it.

Guck: So is our option to table this for new plans?

Oleson: The only way we can table it, because we are up against the 120 day limit that we have, is if they sign a waiver. Otherwise we have to make a decision one way or the other.

Smith: I think we can make the decisions it's just up to them to meet that number.

Oleson: So you could approve, you could say we're approving an addition that is a non-substantial improvement and you'll have to figure that out. If you want to explore other options and talk to the DNR Flood Plains staff and see if there are any other options. Then you kind of have to sign the waiver, otherwise we have to make a decision and then you would have to reapply.

Smith: Me being on the Board, I'm not going to go against the DNR. We generally don't.

Naaktgeboren: You have a holding tank now, correct?

Gasper: Yes

Naaktgeboren: You going to upgrade the holding tank so you can have two bedrooms?

Smith: It's adequate.

Oleson: You were just going to leave the holding tank that you have now?

Gasper: We have 2500 gallon one so yes. No were not moving the holding tanks. We had the designer come in and there is no possible way to put a drain field on our lot.

Oleson: In the report we received he tried to fit a drainfield in but couldn't do it.

Naaktgeboren: I thought I saw somewhere in here that it was going to get moved to a separate location.

Gasper: Originally you guys asked us to reach out to the neighbor and purchase some property.

Guck: Well then the proposal is to stay underneath the 50% value and just the bedroom addition.

Norgren: We're going to keep the same size that is there.

Smith: Garage is cancelled at this point.

Gasper: Unless we put in flood vents?

Norgren: Well you can't be over the 576.

Oleson: So this is basically 500 square feet. Plus or minus a little bit.

Gasper: Ok

Oleson: Still do flood vents.

Gasper: So we still keep garage, ok.

Naaktgeboren: So is the garage, since the other guy didn't do it, so they have to do it now.

Gasper: It's grandfathered in, we didn't do it.

Oleson: I know it's not your fault.

Gasper: Why did you just let him do it in 2017?

Norgren: I hate to cut holes into the side of it and then, there is a service door.

Gasper: There is 2 doors one in the front and one in the back, let it flow.

Oleson: That is the common question I get. Why can't I just leave the garage doors open?

Gasper: It did not have an electrical inspection, and I'm an electrician. How did it pass?

Oleson: That is the question I ask the building inspectors, because it was on the notes. It was in my approval letter, it was handwritten on the building inspector's review of the plans. So I don't know how it didn't happen.

Guck: Do we need to go around and get an opinion from everybody?

Gasper: So the assessment was \$180,000.00? Is that what I heard?

Naaktgeboren: No \$121,000.00. I said wait 2 years and it will be \$180,000.00.

Gasper: I might just do that.

Oleson: The variance is good for 3 years.

Niklaus: I think the big concern I had was with the flood plain and losing that national insurance option. Otherwise no, I'm good.

Gabriel: No more concerns

Oleson: If they find a way to move their utilities and do all that. I think the main thing is that they have to let their crawl space internally flood automatically. If they can do all that are you ok with their full plan here? Do we want to address that scenario?

Guck: Well the dollar figures are the biggest thing right?

Oleson: No, then they would meet the flood plain regulations and they'd have more flexibility.

Guck: Will they have to fill in the basement?

Oleson: What I'm saying is if your approval said they have to meet all flood plain regulations. Then it is a matter of how they want to do that.

Niklaus: Then you don't need a Variance.

Oleson: Will still need a variance for the side yard setback and the road and the building coverage if they're going be at 15.38 instead of 15.

Guck: So you're saying put the louvers in the house then?

Oleson: I would have to do a little bit more research to make sure I knew what the allowance for that was, but it's basically there was a drawing in that Ordinance about that scenario. These are the options, fill the space, you can do it on pilings, or you can do this flood opening. But you have to keep all your utilities and duck work above.

Gasper: But does that leave the crawlspace as just storage, you don't have to bring it up.

Oleson: Yes, that's what I'm saying.

Gasper: I just wanted to clarify that. All the utilities would run up, it could still remain a crawl space with only storage.

Oleson: You would have to put the flood openings in. So those are all the things I would want to double check. If that ends up the most viable option and it gives you what you want and you're willing to do all that.

Gasper: Well ultimately, like Amy was saying, it's just about having the kids come over. It's 22x22 it's small, so yeah whatever we can get is what we would love to have.

Naaktgeboren: So were looking at a 18 ½ x 22 addition, adding a bedroom, correct? It would be 5.2 feet from the lot line, correct? You don't have to worry about the 15% anymore.

Oleson: Yes if the garage addition is going away then we don't worry about that.

Naaktgeboren: And were 31' from the center of the road. Correct?

Oleson: Correct.

Niklaus: If you look at the Variances that are shown on page 4a-2, 1-8 they would all still apply except for the flood plain.

Naaktgeboren: Right but he's not asking for the rest of it.

Oleson: Number 4 the detached garage addition would go away, right? I put that because that's what the ask was, was to go above 50% of value, but I don't think we can grant a Variance to that.

Naaktgeboren: Do we say they can't go over 50% assessed value price.

Niklaus: Or do they have to meet all flood plain requirements.

Oleson: That if you're approving the bedroom addition only. Assuming they're going to stay under that substantial number, if they decide they want to meet all the flood plain regulations then do you want to approve their full plan? Or do you want them to come back and do this all over again?

Naaktgeboren: I want to make a motion that they can add a 22' x 18.5' bedroom addition on a holding tank, 31 feet from the center line, and 5.2 feet from the lot line.

Oleson: So you're saying only the bedroom addition?

Norgren: Can we say unless they meet all the flood plain conditions. If they raised it up and met the flood plain conditions, would it be granted?

Naaktgeboren: So do I put or meet flood plain requirements? I'm looking at then I think that will be a completely different motion.

Oleson: You don't have to do it that way, I'm just saying, that would give them the option

Norgren: Otherwise it's just hinging on the 50%, because of the flood plain, If he met the flood plain would you grant the rest of it.

Guck: I don't have a problem with it.

Oleson: So then you would be ok with it the 15.38?

Gasper: Yes

Guck: Steve are you ok with that? Anything to add?

Niklaus: No

Gilchrist: The variance is 3 years?

Oleson: Yes a variance once it's granted is good for 3 years. That to me means if they apply for their permit within that 3 years and get approved. They don't necessarily have begun the construction. That permit is good for at least 6 months. So in a sense they kind of get 3 ½ years.

Niklaus: Can we leave it to Ben to ensure that the flood plain requirements are met? Then we don't need to revisit this as a group?

Gasper: Well we would need to come here for the permit so he would know.

Oleson: I think that is the motion as I understand it. You're saying either stay under your 50% which means the bedroom addition, as long as it stays under the 50% and then if they decide they want to meet all the requirements for flood plain and elevate things, put in flood vents wherever they need to, then they can do full plan.

Niklaus: They don't need a Variance then?

Guck: That is an and/or option.

Oleson: They still need the variance, that's why you have to approve it. They don't need a variance from the flood plain requirement, but they need the setback variances and the coverage variances, and all that.

Naakteborne made a motion based on the findings of fact to approve the variances to construct an approx. 5.5' x 26' porch and 18.5' x 22' dwelling addition to a home approx. 3 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required) and a 10' x 23' garage addition approx. 33 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required) and causing building coverage of the lot to exceed the maximum 15% allowed. All construction is subject to minimum lowest floor and other applicable floodplain elevations with the following conditions:

1. If the applicant is to build all of the proposed additions/modifications to the existing dwelling, the applicant must elevate the existing dwelling and the proposed additions to an elevation of 997.7 (NGVD29) or otherwise meet all applicable floodplain

regulations as they would constitute a "substantial improvement" as defined by the Township ordinance. Alternatively, the applicant may reduce their proposed alterations and additions to ensure that any improvements or additions are below the threshold for being a "substantial improvement" and construct the improvements or additions in accordance with applicable floodplain regulations relating to a non-substantial improvement.

2. If the applicant is to make the addition to the detached garage as proposed, they must elevate the entire existing and expanded garage to a lowest floor elevation of 997.7 (NGVD29) as it will cause the building to exceed the 576 sq ft threshold in ordinance that allows for the lowest floor to remain lower than 997.7. Alternatively, the applicant may reduce the proposed addition to 576 sq ft or less (or whatever threshold from the Township ordinance applies at the time of application) and construct it to the standards required by the Township floodplain regulations and be no closer to the road than what was proposed in the variance application.
3. The total building coverage on the property, including all proposed additions, shall not exceed 15.38% of the total lot area. No additional buildings beyond those shown in the approved plans shall be constructed without further Township review and approval to confirm impervious coverage limits are met.
4. The total impervious coverage on the property, including all proposed additions and any new driveways or patios, shall not exceed 25% of the total lot area. No additional impervious surfaces beyond those shown in the approved plans shall be installed without further Township review and approval to confirm impervious coverage limits are met.
5. Stormwater runoff from the dwelling addition within the side yard setback shall be managed so as to ensure that it does not run onto the neighboring property or cause harm to the neighboring property or to the holding tank. A plan detailing these methods must be submitted and approved by the Township prior to construction.
6. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all construction activities and materials remain within the boundaries of the subject property and do not impact neighboring properties without their express written consent of the affected property owner.
7. The resulting dwelling shall not contain more than two (2) bedrooms so long as the property is served by a holding tank only. If a drainfield is later installed to serve the home, this restriction shall not apply and the limit on bedrooms shall be as determined by septic drainfield sizing requirements required by Wright County and Township regulations.

Smith seconded the motion.

Guck: We have a motion and a second, any other further discussion?

Smith: My clarification was that, I want the first part of the motion to meet that under the 50% rule, not sure if that was stated or not?

Naaktgeboren: I stated it when we were discussing how to make this motion.

Smith: Understood. Thank you

Oleson: I wrote it down that way if it helps.

Smith: That's good, I just want to clarify it.

Motion carried unanimously.

Corinna Township Zoning Ordinance Amendment relating to modifying references in Section 611.2 of the Corinna Township Land Use Ordinance to FEMA flood map panels 27171C0085D and 27171C0095D, which are being modified by a Letter of Map Revision to be effective April 20, 2026.

Oleson reviewed the changes with the planning commission. We're amending our Ordinance to reference updated Floodplain map that FEMA has come up with. This will match the county and will update the maps.

Gabriel made a motion to approve the changes. Smith seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Smith made a motion to approve previous meeting minutes of February 10, 2026. Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report

Permits

Correspondence

Enforcement Actions

Oleson: There was an auction for tax forfeit land over where the old Sugar acres used to be. Three tiers back there is a tax forfeiture piece that was for sale, he wanted to buy it and put a garage on it. There's a mobile home on it right now that is in really bad shape that he plans on taking down. Then he can use the garage for his lake home. The lot he's buying could have a house on it, but he's just choosing to put a garage on it, and there's a little question on whether we allow accessory structures when they're not tied to somebody's house. So I asked the County about it and they said it was up to us to handle it. It's a buildable lot he could eventually build a house on it. Do we make him show how he would fit all that in with a site plan? We could do an administrative order that ties it to the lake lot. There are two lots and are tied together by an administrative order the county did in 1994. We could say that they cannot have an accessory structure without a home or make them tie it to their lot. Discussion by the board on different options. The reason that cities do not want a shed alone is to make sure someone does not turn it into living space. So do we make them show a site plan on where a house could go? They are limited to the size garage they can build which is 800 sq feet.

Oleson: There is a property across from the town hall and the question is regarding 3 lots that are tied together by an administrative order in 1994. Basically the question is can they sell one of the lots separately. I was thinking no since there is an administrative order, however, when

checking with the county, they indicated they have no record stating they need to be tied together. County said is up to us if we want to allow them to be sold separately. Discussion regarding size of lot and road frontage. County has no record of why. Board is ok with them being separated.

Oleson: A property on the Southeast side of Cedar Lake. There is a house on there, a garage up by the road, boat house down by the lake. **Gary:** This was the original cabin on the property, it is becoming a little bit blighted. The ground is shifting and we can't even open the door. I have talking with Ben for a while. We are looking at replacing it keep the same square footage. I prepared a couple of drafts. Replace it with more rectangular vs L shape that it is. Use it for a guest cottage for the kids, there is no electric or running water, are not looking to add any of that. Just going to be used for storage, sleep overs and card games. It is a little different since we already have a boat house. It was the original cabin and just want to update it. It is about 11.5ft off the property line. **Oleson:** It is basically the rule that you can replace but not expand. It is only about 8ft tall, so it is a replacement but not expansion. The thing that we could not allow is a loft as that would be an expansion. **Gary:** Would like to go at least 10ft in height to match the boat house height. Discussion regarding sq footage and accessory structures. **Oleson:** Normally you are allowed only one water oriented structure, however, this is original cabin or guest cabin. **Gary:** I was coming up with about 12x16 and would like a minimum of 6/12 pitch. **Niklaus:** We would never allow this to be build new, my feeling is you can only replace what is there with 10ft height maximum and not residential. **Oleson:** You're not proposing residential that it is not insulated and no running water. **Gary:** The only thing we are looking to do is using in the summer time and no running water. Guck: wondering if you can do something with the footprint that is there. **Naaktgeboren:** Or just limited to 192 sq ft since that is what you currently have and possibly move it back. **Oleson:** No closer to the lake, no closer to side yard and ok to square it up. No higher than 10ft. Stay 10ft from the lot line and no running water.

Oleson: Over by Sugar Lake and this is a township project. They are looking to move a drainage pipe from one area over to another area. The septic got placed over the top of the drainage pipe and they now want or need to replace that pipe. The question is do we require a variance? Or allow it because it is a replacement. Discussion on how deep it is. **Smith:** It is also under the addition that was built, we took a scope to it last year and it is partially collapsed thinking it is due to age. We would abandon the current one. Board ok with not needing a variance.

Motion was made by Smith, seconded by Gabriel to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously at 8:40 pm.

Minutes prepared by Heidi Eckerman