

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

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

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

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

Absent: Larry Smith, Jean Just

Others in Attendance: John & Julie Evenson, Scott Ergen, Joel & Sandi Weber, Bernie Miller, Gary & Julie Johnson, Michael Hilbert.

Dircks made a motion to accept the agenda with Byars being tabled until June. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

(Originally noticed for April 2026 meeting but requested by applicant to be held to May 2026 meeting) Requests related to the construction of a detached garage. Approvals required include Variances to construct a 30' x 30' detached garage approx. 25.5 feet from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 feet required) and 4.5 feet from a side lot line (min. 10 feet required) and with a full second level with a ceiling height exceeding 8 feet and a 10/12 roof pitch (max. 6 ft ceiling height and 6/12 roof pitch allowed). Impervious coverage to be approx. 25.7-27% (max 25% allowed) and proposal will not meet 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: Walter Byars and Nicole Byars

Property address: 9463 Jeske Ave NW, Annandale

Parcel number(s): 206000164201

Tabled until June meeting.

Requests related to the partial replacement and replacement of an existing dwelling and attached garage. Approvals required include Variances to construct a two-story dwelling/attached garage addition approximately 3.5 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 feet required) on a parcel at approximately 35% impervious coverage (max. allowed 25%).

Applicant and Property Owner: John and Jolene Evenson

Property address: 6523 117th St NW, Annandale

Parcel number(s): 206043001020

Present: John & Jolene Evenson

Evenson: What I want to do is what I've sent over to Ben. We want to improve the property it's already had a few remodels done to it over the years, and we would like to extend the garage to the south. So when you look at that garage and come towards the front of the garage.

We'd like to make it bigger because one thing that's bad about the house is there's no storage. There was a remodel where they turned that old garage into a family room and they added onto the new garage. What we would like to do is to make construction easier, we would like to take that family room and extend it to the north, towards the end of the house. We'd like to make a rear entry, and a spot to come into the side to get into the bathroom from the pool area, and extend the garage so we can get our stuff in the garage. It's a little taller than the first part of the house just so we can make storage above and I would put my office in on top of the garage that butts up to the new family room. We'd like to redo the front entryway. We just want to improve the property so it looks better from the outside and the front. I know the things that I've talked with Ben online about, like the square footage of the home and the impervious coverage and then also the lot line. Basically, everywhere we're doing the addition already has impervious coverage. At one time, I'm assuming, must have been okayed either by the county or whoever did inspections back in the early 2000s or before that when they did the first house and put the pool in that and all the concrete in and stuff like that. I gave Ben some ideas of what we can do is try to at least reduce our impervious coverage as we're doing construction. In the back there's some concrete we can remove. I know I'm close to the lot line, but I've talked with my contractor and we wouldn't really be getting closer to the neighbor. My neighbor is actually here.

Oleson: The variance would be the side yard setback. They're at three and a half feet now and that's what their proposal would be. Also, it would be going up to a two-story garage, a house addition instead of the single that's there now. Expanding the size of it, both towards the road and towards the back. Then the other one is that this would increase the impervious coverage, although he's mentioned that he's planning to reduce it, creating that reduction on the lot. The issue with the impervious, is that it appears from the aerial photos in the past that this site went over the 25% limit, fairly recently. When you have non-conformities or things that don't meet today's standards, there is legal non-conformities that were there before the rule went into effect so they were legal at the time they were done. And then, there's the illegal ones that were not permitted or allowed, at least that I could tell from previous permits from the county.

And the third one, as I looked into it more, was the building coverage limit of 15% when they're adding more building for the garage and the house addition. Also, for the entryway that's over here, and then, you add that to the other buildings on the property, anything with a roof basically counts in the building. By my estimates of the existing impervious before anything is done, just what's out there today, I had about 35.7%. That's actually probably a little bit low because I wasn't including this pathway, which I believe is some kind of graveled or rock.

Evenson: It's just a loose stone, we put that in because it's a steeper hill, just so you don't slip when you're walking down. Basically, it's like, grass, when it rains, it's soaking into the ground. If you get a heavy rain, just like if there be grass there, it's going to flow down the hill. What's going away is the cheap little sheds. The ones that are up by the house that are sitting there, they don't show them, right, on this one. They're sitting on concrete. I think it's, like, an 8 by 7 or a 7 by 7, something like that. Then the other one is an 8 by 20.

Guck: What is the building coverage at then?

Oleson: The building coverage that I have has 11.1% now, and then 18.4%, as proposed, that was including Rubbermaid sheds and that is going to be gone. I noted eliminating all three portable sheds would eliminate about 269 square feet. You would have to eliminate 960 square feet to get down to 15%.

Evenson: How many square feet did you come up with for the existing home? Because I had not

quite 2,700 square feet for the existing home.

Oleson: For the existing home? I think what I used was probably the assessor's sketch,

Evenson: When I did my math, I came up with that says our lot size, based on the survey, was 28,315 square feet. At 50% of the lot size, that's 4,250 square feet the existing home right now is 2719 sq ft without the deck. The demo of the area we were going to demo is 1,161 square feet. The total new area is 2,051. So, without taking those little sheds or the deck into consideration, it's at 3609 sq ft.

Oleson: That's for building coverage?

Evenson: Yeah, that's based on the buildings, the square footage of the house.

Oleson: Want to clarify that the extra impervious above the 25% was done before Evenson owned it. Somewhere between 2005 and 2008 is basically when everything got added. Or at least a good chunk of it.

Guck: No permits?

Oleson: There's no permit requirements for things like patios. I think back then the limit was 120 square feet for buildings that didn't require permits. Now it is 200 square feet and less. So some of that wouldn't have required permits, but it still required compliance with the impervious limits and setbacks from property lines. The side yard setback is for one of the sheds.

Evenson: Yes, we wanted to keep it there. I've talked with Mike the neighbor about it. I'd like to get a variance to just leave that there for right now.

Guck: All of the rock structures down below the fire pit, that's considered to be impervious coverage?

Oleson: There's different things here that were included in the surveyor's calculation of impervious. Wood retaining wall and pavers.

Evenson: Yeah, what those pavers are at the top too, they're basically, like, pieces of stone making a pathway. So there's grass about this much in between them, that's why I wasn't sure if they were impervious coverage.

Guck: Okay, so we're looking at is 34% for impervious coverage.

Oleson: Looking at reducing it down to about 31%. So you have the side yard setback is not worse than it is now, but it's really close to the line and the fact that it is over 25% impervious and we are trying to look at getting it down some since some of this was before Corinna took over zoning or all the way down

Guck: Then the building coverage, we're pretty much right on?

Audience: Hilgert I have the house to the east and was a previous owner and I can say there is no storage in that place, I understand why he wants to build something.

Guck: Can you shed any light as far as the coverage going over.

Hilgert: Anything that was a paver, whether it was concrete around the pool itself, because the pavers were delaminating, we just removed the pavers and put down concrete around that.

Schultz: You said you don't use the deck by your bedroom. Did you replace that window?

Evenson: Explained where the addition would be and how he would redo the deck and the stairs.

Schultz: My other question is on the entryway, it looks like you're going to bring that out farther.

Evenson: Yes, we want to bring the entryway out roughly 8 feet.

Schultz: The one problem with your garage is an extension and I'd like to see it farther away from the lot line. Granted your first garage is that far over.

Evenson: If I go further to the west I will have more impervious coverage and it will change the whole design and in front of the house. Even if we didn't touch it, right now it's still there.

Naaktgeboren: Never assume that somebody approved all that coverage. I'm going to tell you right now, it wasn't. It was just done. We see this all the time.

Evenson: I know the pool was put in, but what I'm trying to do, is improve the house with trying to get rid of impervious coverages that we can and not make any more impervious coverage.

Naaktgeboren: That's my biggest issue is trying to get as close as you can to the 25%. I don't know how you're going to do it. I'm not going to sit and figure it out for you. You've got to figure out how to get down as close as I can.

Evenson: Are we considering, like I said, so the deck is impervious coverage?

Naaktgeboren: The deck is impervious coverage. So if that's one way to cut back then do it.

Dircks: I think your design looks nice. But, again, I agree you need to get down on impervious.

Evenson: It also comes in a cost. This stuff is existing. I'm not asking to put more down. I'm actually trying to get rid of more. So it is kind of frustrating as a homeowner that if I didn't touch anything and I leave and walk away. Why am I getting punished for something somebody else did?

Schultz: The next guy will get punished, too, because it was a no.

Evenson: I don't know if I can get right to the 25%. I plan on removing those pavers in the front and all the sidewalks are coming out.

Gabriel: Just run through one more time the building covered percentage and where we're at. It's just a little different than what I thought I was reading when we saw the survey. Is that an issue then? Eliminating all the sheds, eliminate the 269 square feet. The remainder would have to come from reducing the size of the garage. The property would have stayed under 15%?

Evenson: Well, my numbers I came up with, and I can show you this if you want to see it.

Oleson: I can't say definitively right now. I'm trying to find my calculations.

Gabriel: So I just wondered if that was an issue. I like to see the 25, but do the best you can, and I think we could entertain it.

Niklaus: I would like to see hard numbers I like you're not building closer to the lake. The fact that you're willing to try to get as close as possible to some of these limits is a positive. You have a beautiful property, and we're very positive you're going to keep it up. It's a matter of what's going to be tolerable for you and for us. I'd like to look at this again next month with hard numbers on everything. I think tonight we're just a little early on this.

Guck: My thoughts is that we had a situation where a garage that was close to the lot line burned down and it affected the neighbor's property so it is something we need to look at. How far are you from your neighbor's house? 10 feet?

Evenson: Probably 30 - 35.

Niklaus made a motion to table the request until the June meeting. Schultz seconded the motion.

Oleson: Explained where he is getting the numbers for building coverage and indicated we need to clarify.

Motion to table carried unanimously.

Requests related to the replacement of a dwelling and lakeside patio, the construction of a new septic system, and the construction of a new detached garage. Approvals required include Variances to construct a two-story dwelling with an 1120 sq ft footprint approximately 43.8 feet from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft. required), 9 and 10.2 feet from the side lot lines (min. 15 ft required) and 18.7 feet from a septic drainfield (min. 20 ft. required). The detached garage would be 5 feet from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required) and 24 feet to the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required). The septic system

would be located 8 feet from a side lot line and 7 feet from a road right of way (min. 10 ft required). The proposed detached garage would have its lowest floor at an elevation of 996.3 NAVD88 (min. 998.3 elevation required).

Applicant and Property Owner: Gary and Julie Johnson
Property address: 11043 Lawrence Ave NW, Annandale
Parcel number(s): 206019000181

Present: Gary & Julie Johnson, Bernie Miller, Scott Ergen

Johnson: We have the cabin, and when we bought it, the garage was in pretty rough shape. We had to do something with that. We have also some improvements on the cabin, so we started looking into the garage, talked to Ben, got a survey, realized that the cabin has some limitations with the crawl space and just a lot of additions over the last 80 - 90 years, so kind of evolved into reaching out to Bernie to look at a septic design to get drain field in instead of tanks, and also looking at reconstructing the cabin rather than remodeling, so we're looking at a detached garage across the street and cabin on the lake side.

Oleson: The variances would be the lake setback, going further back than it is now at 43.8 feet away from the lake, 9 and 10 feet from the side lot lines instead of 15, 18.7 feet from the septic drain field instead of 20, for the house. Garage would be 5ft from side yard instead of 10, 24 ½ to the center line instead of 65, and then the septic system would also not meet the side yard setback of 10 feet to the road right away or to the side lot line, so 8 and 7 feet. Detached garage has to meet some elevation requirements, and there's been some changes to the garage size, and typically you need to have 15 feet of fill around that building up to a certain elevation as well in all directions, and it doesn't get that either, so there's just no way to meet that. So those are the variances. Like I said, like noted on here, the original plan for the garage was bigger, and because of the requirements for the floodplain, it either has to be elevated, so the lowest floor is at the required elevation, or if it's under a certain size it can be left lower, but it has to let water in and out and be flood-proofed in some other ways at that lower part of the building, so they're proposing to do that, where they leave it lower, so they've reduced the size to a little less than 600 square feet, which is more than our 576, but it's less than the 600 that the DNR now allows for that internal flood-proofing to happen, but we can't change our ordinance to allow for that 600 until the county does, so it would still be a variance to the garage that's over 576 square feet in size that's not elevated to meet the floodplain elevation. Basically, the garage is allowed to be low as long as it's 576 square feet or less, but it's going to be like 580 or 590, whatever it came up to, so it's a bit larger than what would be allowed to do that. It's supposed to have fill around it for 15 feet in all directions that it doesn't have.

Guck: So we can't approve something like that, or we can?

Oleson: This was pretty recent that the DNR said we've changed our model ordinance, we will now allow 600 square feet to be that lower elevation and internally floodplain. It used to be 500, and then they changed the number to 576. So if they hadn't made that change to 600, I would say we're stuck at 576 because it's floodplain regulations, but now that they've kind of opened up the door to that 600, I would say we're in a better position to grant them variance to go up to that 600 if we want to, because the DNR is not going to object to it, but it's still a variance. It would still need the flood vents, and the lower part of it has to be concrete or something that's flood resistant, and they have to have all their electric and everything elevated to the right elevation. So that's with the garage, and then the house is all the different, the side yard and the lakes up back and going up to two stories instead of the one that it is now. We don't really have any block views from the behind, obviously, because it's a mid-wetland and a bunch of garages.

Miller: I know better than to come in here without having it dialed in on our impervious building coverage. So, we made a point to get there. Currently, 27.9% total impervious, right at 15% building coverage is what's there existing. This is on the lake lot. So the cabin we have 1120 square feet gets us to the 15%. And we're proposing to get the impervious down to 22.9% and that does include an allowance for a walkway and patio. If you notice on the plan right now, there's a pretty good-sized patio on both the lake and the roadside that will be eliminated and replaced with a smaller patio. We're moving back, increasing the setbacks on this.

Niklaus: There must be a reason you can't go further back?

Miller: Yeah. Well, with the septic system, the way the septic system is, we're already asking for a variance from the house to the septic system and from the road. So, we really can't push that back much.

Schultz: I see the neighbor has their pressure bed on the other side of the road. Wouldn't that be a good idea there?

Miller: This has a well back there, so, you kind of start as a domino effect with everybody. Were kind of stuck in this spot. We're kind of stuck in this spot. Soils are far better over here. It's higher over here. I think some of this back area along the road, some of that's probably been filled over the years. It's actually pretty nice dry soil. We're on a narrow lot here so we can't quite get to 15 foot of fill all the way around it. I sent Ben an email with this and the DNR, the county sent me this and the DNR is looking at removing the 15 foot requirement around houses in the floodplain.

Guck: So, um, I guess just a general question. We've got a variance for the setback of the septic. What's the closest we've been to a septic with a structure been? You just off top of your head. We've been closer than 18 feet.

Miller: Yes.

Oleson: I think we've gone at least 10, but I feel like 7 was one.

Guck: Just questioning if we can move back further.

Miller: I mean, it's possibly, but also they could do replacement and be closer to the lake. The neighbors are also right where they're at. Naaktgeboren: But look at how much he's already gained.

Audience: None

Naaktgeboren: I like it. It was laid out well, and looking at where the house was, how much patio was out in front, and what you're moving back. That's a big change. It's a big improvement, I think.

Schultz: Yes, I'm good with it. What is the size of the patio?

Johnson: 12 x17, we're planning to put a concrete patio.

Oleson: Pulled up the plan and showed the area of the new patio.

Dircks: I like what you're doing. You're moving it back, which is always helpful and you're, you're well under impervious coverage.

Gabriel: Same.

Niklaus: You know you're done now. When, when you need a little more room for storage or things like that. Appreciate you coming with hard numbers and exactly what you're looking for. What's complicating it with going back that other 7 feet?

Guck: It's probably the sight line you lose with the house because this guy's way forward, this guy's way forward. So as you move back, you lose.

Niklaus: I just thought 50 was closer to 75 than 43. That's all I have.

Guck: I see your point. The guy on the left, the existing house, he's probably not going to do anything. The guy at the top, he's, got the right to build where he is.

Johnson: To the north, they just remodeled the last winter.

Guck: So I guess I'm good with it.

Oleson: Before, there's a motion, just to clarify it, the 15 feet of fill is around the house. That's where the requirement is for that. Not the garage. It's not for accessory structures. I might've misstated that before.

Schultz made a motion based on the finding of fact to approve the Variances to construct a two-story dwelling with an 1120 sq ft footprint approximately 43.8 feet from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft. required), 9 and 10.2 feet from the side lot lines (min. 15 ft required) and 18.7 feet from a septic drainfield (min. 20 ft. required). The detached garage would be 5 feet from a side lot line (min. 10 ft required) and 24.5 feet to the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required). The proposed Type IV septic system would be located 8 feet from a side lot line and 7 feet from a road right of way (min. 10 ft required). The proposed detached garage would have its lowest floor at an elevation of 996.3 NAVD88 (min. 998.3 elevation required) with the following conditions:

1. A final site plan, reflecting all approved variances and conditions, must be submitted and approved by Township Staff prior to the issuance of any permits. This plan must clearly show all setbacks, elevations, and proposed structures.
2. The proposed detached garage, due to its size of 594 square feet and proposed lowest floor elevation of 996.3 NAVD88, must be internally floodproofed in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations. This includes, but may not be limited to, elevating all utilities above the Regulatory Flood Protection Elevation (RFPE) of 998.3 NAVD88, using flood-resistant materials up to the RFPE, and installing certified flood vents as required to allow for automatic entry and exit of floodwaters.
3. The detached garage shall not exceed 594 square feet in total footprint. Any future expansion beyond this size would require a new variance and must meet higher elevation requirements if not internally floodproofed.
4. 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.
5. 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.

Naaktgeboren Second the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests related to the construction of a covered porch, entryway and attached garage. Approvals required include Variances to construct a 12.5' x 16' breezeway, 8' x 12.5' covered entry and 24' x 26' attached garage to an existing dwelling that is located approximately 48 feet from Bass Lake (min. 75 ft. required) and approximately 6 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft. required). All construction is subject to minimum lowest floor floodplain elevations.

Applicant and Property Owner: Joel and Sandra Weber
Property address: 11625 Kimball Ave NW, Annandale
Parcel number(s): 206087000010

Present: Joel & Sandra Weber

Weber: We're looking at uh putting a 12 by 16 breezeway on the south side of the house and with a 24 by 26 attached garage changing our entrance. We're good on our impervious the addition is good on our lake setback but our existing house is not.

Oleson: The existing house doesn't meet the lake setback or the side yard setback, we don't have a survey of the lots and nothing's for sure, but the existing house is about 48 feet from the lake and the proposed addition would be right around that 75 maybe plus or minus a little bit, then I have the existing house at about 6 feet from the side yard line but the proposed addition would be well over that and then just noting that all construction again is subject to that minimum lowest floor floodplain elevation requirement, not really a concern we just have to verify that it doesn't exceed that or it's below that elevation requirement. Impervious and building coverage are fine. There's a 1999 septic system but the addition is not having any bedrooms and that 1999 system which **is not four bedrooms I think you only have three that are in the house now.**

Audience: None

Niklaus: That is a nice big beautiful lot, it's nice to see one like that, I don't have anything.

Naaktgeboren: I'm good with it because I went out there measurement wise there's not a problem to be 75 feet you know they can line it up perfect for 75 feet. Good elevation.

Schultz: I'm okay with it. Just that we had in earlier meetings we had talked about how we wanted to have a survey done with any and all.

Naaktgeboren: That is the staff recommendation.

Dircks: I'm good with it.

Gabriel: Nothing to add.

Guck: Yes as long as you got plenty of room.

Niklaus made a motion based on the findings of fact to approve variances to construct a 12.5' x 16' breezeway, 8' x 12.5' covered entry and 24' x 26' attached garage to an existing dwelling that is located approximately 48 feet from Bass Lake (min. 75 ft. required) and approximately 6 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft. required). All construction is subject to minimum lowest floor floodplain elevations 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 new garage, breezeway, and covered porch must be located at least 75 feet from the ordinary high water level of Bass Lake.

Dircks seconded the motion.

Oleson: I just want to make sure we're clear on this are you saying that the garage, breezeway and covered porch have to be so far from the lake? Do you care how much exactly that distance or is

Naaktgeboren: I think it would have to be at least 75 feet.

Niklaus: Yes, at least 75.

Oleson: Then are you requiring a survey?

Niklaus: I'd like to see it and I guess you should comment on that well.

Weber: So how long did before did we have to do surveys, because I just built that shed two years ago and I was never asked when we did our building permit for that?

Dircks: When was the last survey done?

Weber: I don't know there's got to be one in record from when did they sell that third lot? 2006 or 2007 would have been when they sold because when her mom owned a lot to the south that she surveyed off.

Niklaus: If you still have a copy of that that meets number four here.

Oleson: I haven't seen any surveys, I think the reason that survey wouldn't have been required for the shed is that it clearly met all the requirements.

Dircks: He's got plenty of room, and he's not going to be any closer than the garage.

Niklaus: I will amend that motion to exclude that recommendation for a survey.

Dircks: I'll second that.

Motion passed unanimously.

Guck made a motion to approve the April 14, 2026 meeting minutes. Naaktgeboren seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Zoning Administrator's Report

- Permits
- Correspondence
- Enforcement Actions

Other Business

Oleson: We have a permit application for a home in the Sugar Lake Rachel development. There building a home that slopes down to the northwest. They are doing a walkout and using so they are going to build up some retaining walls and take the fill that is there're from the excavation of the house foundation and put it around the house. What our ordinance says is that when you move over 50 cubic yards of shoreland you need a Conditional Use Permit. We specifically exempt what you're taking out for the foundation from that calculation but it does also specify that we only exempt that when you're removing that fill that you took out from the lot, so taking it somewhere else, if you're going to spread it around then you're potentially changing the topography of the site and potentially the drainage of the site. I asked the county how do you look at that something like that and they kind of said "Well it depends on what the natural topography is and what the surroundings are" and so I didn't really get a clear answer out of them about whether they would count that 50 cubic yards as required the Conditional Use permit or not. This development had a stormwater plan for the whole development so water that comes off the front of this house is going to go into this ditch and run down here and then run under the road into this and that's like a designed area to take water. There's also a number of small infiltration areas around the development that were designed and one of those is right here, so in some sense the water drainage is taken care. What I've been talking to the builder about is if you could put a berm or something here or a little swale that would take this water coming down and direct it rather than going across the lot. I thought it was worth talking about with you guys about how we want to handle things like this because not every one of these lots is going to have an overall subdivision stormwater plan like this one does, but I think our three options are either require the conditional use permit and you guys can decide whether you want to see any berms or swales or anything or if you don't care about it I cannot require that but require a Land Alteration permit where I theoretically could require things like that or we just kind of say it's normal fill around this walkout basement and we're not going to require anything.

Niklaus: I'd like to see the berm, I don't think you're looking at a 6 foot berm here that's going to be aesthetically, you're just going to redirect to that catch basin.

Naaktgeboren: You got a 10 foot fall from that that back strip to where if they can figure out just a slight grade of a foot or two going you don't have to have a major berm.

Oleson: I guess you know in these scenarios like these I'm looking for a little direction and maybe we don't get it tonight but something to think about is like in a situation like this should I be counting what they're taking out for the foundation and spreading around somewhere else in the lot towards that 50 cubic yards that requires a conditional use.

After further discussion with the board felt that they could do either the Conditional Use permit or the Land alteration permit with a berm, swale or some kind of catch basin.

Motion was made by Schultz seconded by Dircks to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously at 8:35 pm.

Minutes prepared by Heidi Eckerman