

CORINNA TOWNSHIP
MINUTES
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT / PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
February 12, 2013

7:00 PM

1. Call to Order Call to Order: Charlotte Quiggle called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.
2. Roll Call: Board of Adjustment/Planning Commission Members Present: Charlotte Quiggle (Chair); Larry Smith; Patricia Taylor; Larry Thompson.

Absent: Lee Parks; Barry Schultz.

Others in attendance: Marty Ferguson; Lauri Ferguson; Bernie Miller; Christalene Larsen; Stan Tekiela; Rick Suddendorf; Jim Dearing; Richard Naaktgeboren; Denise Froehlich; John Dearing; Jim Miller; Karen Lohn; Bob Lohn; Jim Diorio; Julie Vande Steeg; Ken Vande Steeg; Steve Bruggeman; Carol Schomaker; Patrick M. Schomaker; Mark Lampi; Joel C. Olson.

3. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda: None.

A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Taylor, to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Hearings

- a. Conditional Use Permit for the expansion of an existing commercial building to be used for display and storage related to a wholesale business. Variance to add a 27' x 72' addition with additional 3' soffit to the existing building. Addition to range from approximately 2-9 feet from a rear property line abutting a residential district (50 ft required).
 - i. Applicant(s): Marty Ferguson
 - ii. Property Address: 9030 - 64th Street NW
 - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 33-121-27
 - iv. Parcel Number(s): 206114002040 and 206106001010

Marty Ferguson addressed the Planning Commission.

Ferguson: We did put in a new septic system late in December, 2012. That is recorded at the county. I have an updated survey to show that and a letter from the county if you do not have a record of that.

Oleson: We have that information.

Ferguson: We are in hopes of being able to add to the north of the existing building. We realize it is very close to the existing property line. If you know the property - there is nothing the neighbor can do with that property. We have a letter from the property owners - they have no issue with us being so close to their property line. It is a hill leading to a tree line leading to a

wetland. We are hoping to expand that building with a lean to. The land between the existing building and the property line is frozen – the snow falls off the existing roofline and sits there and freezes. Literally, we can hardly drive a forklift around the building. In the spring, last year, we pulled our forklift out around ten times. We are in the hopes that if we can enclose that, and then utilize it for cold storage – there would be no concrete in there – we can pull items off on the south side that faces Highway 55, clean up that area, and be able to use this land any time of year. We have a written statement from the only adjacent property owner. Moving forward we hope to do other additions to the building. This is the most important one. I don't know how we can expand without it.

Quiggle asked for comments from the audience. There were none.

Oleson explained the request. In this zoning district a CUP is required. The variance is because it is too close to the lot line and goes toward the wetland there- The roof is fairly close to the hill. We just want to make sure it does not create an erosion problem. The Soil and Water letter addresses that. There was conversation last time – what will be stored outside, what will be screened?

Ferguson: What will be outside will be no different from what is currently outside. Screening? What does that term mean? Vegetation screening or a steel-sided fence?

Oleson: Vegetative screening is adequate. What you have on the east and north is pretty good – just vegetative screening. Last time it was more about what is visible from Highway 55.

Ferguson: If we get to enclose that part – then it is enclosed. We just have a chain link fence that is just to the south side of the building – the gate area, but we haven't had any complaints that I am aware of that we are storing things outside that are bothering people.

Oleson: Is that still a concern of the board? Last time it was related to the request to add on to the building to the north.

Ferguson: Last time I was not the registered property owner. Now we are trying to pay for this as we go.

Oleson: From a zoning perspective – adding onto the north in the future is probably going to be fine – according to the coverage of the lot.

Ferguson: It is a strange piece of land. It is not a square piece. The property works really well for us. It is tough to fit stuff in there. We are trying to work with what we have to work with. We are looking to expand to the east or west in the future. Not too much to the south as we are already limited. The parcel in yellow border is also part of this but we are not doing anything there. It is a designated wetland.

Ferguson: The new septic – the original tank was right here (shown on map). It was built in the 90s. A lot of those drainfields failed. Now it has a pump system. The pump moves the sewage to the undisturbed soil area here – it is elevated - has two tiered septic system that had to be approved by the county – and was signed off on. We are a small business and only have 5 employees that work out of this building. We have an insulated 2 inch pipe that puts everything over into here.

Smith: Does that affect your future expansion?

Ferguson: No.

Smith: The addition – is there any way to scale it down some?

Ferguson: I appreciate that question. The situation you run into – I have some drawings –

Quiggle: In the Staff Report it said that in 1993 there was a CUP issued for a plumbing business – and in 1999 a CUP for real estate business. The CUP for a wholesale business was not in the Staff Report.

Ferguson: We have had that CUP for quite some time.

Quiggle: Did your CUP allow for outside storage? The others did not.

Ferguson: Yes.

Ferguson passed out a drawing.

Quiggle: You are not running a real estate business.

Ferguson: You drive into the lean to with a forklift. You try to store materials on this side of the existing building on racking - and try to turn to get things to go on the interior wall here. It is tough to do that. We are trying to ask for what is realistic. I realize how close we are getting to the property line. The neighbors cannot build there.

Smith: The further you bring out the building the less height you can get.

Ferguson: We are trying to tie into the existing roof line. Yes - you are right - the outside wall will only be about 8 feet high. We can still drive the fork lift into the proposed overhead door. We can store vehicles or trailers in there to get them out of public view.

Taylor: Along that back lot line - when you are only 2 feet - I would like you to keep the vegetation and trees. I was concerned about being 2 feet from the line.

Ferguson: We put grass mat down to stop erosion on the hillside. I've been there 10 years. We have tried to be a good neighbor. I don't think you have had any complaints on us.

Taylor: The CUP said no outside storage? Is there a reason that CUP was eliminated from this?

Oleson: My understanding was that there were two other CUPs that specified no outdoor storage, but when Marty was here in 2010...I guess when you say there was another CUP...

Ferguson: You are right - maybe I misstated that - I don't think I have ever applied for a CUP except for when I applied to add on to the building.

Oleson: You had been there since 2002?

Ferguson: We moved there in 2003.

Oleson: So they have been there since 2003? Corinna did not take over zoning until 2008-09.

Quiggle: Technically, shouldn't there be a CUP for this type of business?

Oleson: Last time Marty was here - a condition was that it be screened. Based on my knowledge - there is not a current CUP for this business, except that we did grant one in 2010. We can argue that the use was permitted in 2010. The addition request part of the CUP was not done - so that has expired. In 2010 - we granted the CUP for the business use. It is covered now; it wasn't before 2010, as far as I can tell, according to the records.

Taylor: I would like to see the outside storage screened with trees or shrubs.

Ferguson: I have no problem with that. I am talking to a landscaper about trees that do not shed leaves.

Thompson had no questions.

Quiggle: Staff Report - because of storm water run off continuing from existing roof and the new roof at the property line going down the hill - there is thought to guttering it and drain tiling it to the bottom of the hill - that would get rid of any gouging out of any wall of water. Except that you don't own the hill. Would the neighbor/owner be amenable to that?

Ferguson: I honestly believe that - it states in their letter that they hope we can build this. Did I ask him that specific question? No I did not. I believe that he would. We don't want to see that hillside erode any more than anyone else.

Quiggle: If you can get permission to do that - it would be good. Otherwise I want to see some other means of storm water management to do that.

Ferguson: We would be amenable to erosion control of any type.

Quiggle: Work that out with the property owner and Ben Oleson - as long as Ben feels it will address the potential issues.

Oleson: If that drain tile won't work - where would you want it to go?

Ferguson: We sell pipe and know how to dig - we can gutter the entire span and pipe it under this side of the building and put it in the other puddle that is there. The only things we have are power lines and telephone.

Taylor: With whoever is putting on the addition - the builder is really going to have to take precautions.

Ferguson: We would rather start this right now. The builder is ready. We are ready. We would rather do this in the winter when there are no big rainfalls. Then the chance of erosion screening and such failing is less.

Smith: Can you drop the overhang down to a 2' instead of a 3'?

Ferguson: If you would rather see it only 2' - I guess the main reason was - the existing building was 3' overhand. It is OK to make new part 2'.

A motion was made by Taylor, to approve CUP and Variance requests, following all conditions set forth, and findings of fact, seconded by Smith. Quiggle specified that storm water management plan will direct water to the other wetland, and that outdoor storage will be screened as much as possible.

Oleson: The vegetation on Highway 6 was fine. The view from 55 and 6 is what we are talking about.

Quiggle: For me - from 55 - especially with Lampi Auction - it all blends in.

Ferguson: It is a business. I can't cover all of it. Then I will be over my 15% limit.

Quiggle: You were talking about landscaping or trees.

Ferguson: On lower land here - our only gate is here. We are hoping in the next couple years to put a gate down by County Road 6 and start putting in a fence and evergreens along that whole area. Maybe someone can tell me in the future - what do we have to do to get a fence put in? All the way on the County Road 6 side up there - there are some current trees - I would rather put up some green trees that you can't see through in the winter.

Taylor: I'd like to see some vegetation and trees.

Oleson: The screen is for residential. It says that unless it is being displayed for sale - it should be screened.

Quiggle: Want to add of course about the erosions and sedimentation controls are required.

Smith: 2 foot soffit.

Ferguson: Does that mean I can have one more foot of building?

Smith: No.

Taylor accepted all changes and adjustments (2 foot soffit; storm water management plan will direct water to the other (east) wetland; that outdoor storage will be screened as much as possible). Smith seconded all changes and adjustments.

Motion carried unanimously.

- b. Variance to construct a 24' x 34' garage with an approximate 14'10" sidewall (max. 14 ft required) approximately 75 feet from Mink Lake (100 ft required).
 - i. Applicant(s): Stan Tekiela
 - ii. Property Address: 6918 - 80th Street NW, Maple Lake
 - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 24-121-27
 - iv. Parcel Number(s): 206000243301

Quiggle explained the request.

Stan Tekiela addressed the Planning Commission.

Tekiela: I noticed that on the agenda the 14' 10" side wall is not part of it anymore. That is correct. Bought property and a small house 8 or so years ago and constructed what is there now with the intention to move there. We want to start a garage in order to move there as a permanent residence. I am willing to put the garage anywhere. Last year we had our boat vandalized. It sits where the garage would sit. Someone took wiring and batteries. We would like to build a garage to hold 2 cars and a boat.

Taylor: In this part - in here it says a 24' by 34' garage - in the back it says 24' by 36'.

Oleson: There were a couple different plans. Stan and I started talking about this last summer. Oleson said that the current is 24' by 34'. That is the correct size.

Tekiela: Ben if you want to go back to - I would have to take umbrage with the site plan - as they were saying - the lake is here - the house sits here - as the driveway comes in the garage would come here. We are marking it to here. Especially when we compare it to the house - it is further back from the lake than the house.

Quiggle: It is based on the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) elevation?

Oleson: The OHWM is 1023.1. So the lakes fluctuate - based on the DNR - that is the OHWM - but when I have been there it is wetland - but not lake.

Tekiela: There are cat tails growing there. We talked about putting it here - but then I got a letter from the watershed district - when we had turned it that direction - they had no major objections to the proposed activity. They were fine when we had the garage turned. You drive in the driveway and go straight into the garage. Ben and I were trying to get this with the least amount of variances possible.

Quiggle: Doesn't that get you awfully close to the 1024 elevation - which they said was the beginning of the wetland?

Oleson: Last summer Stan and I went to look at it. Soil and Water came to look at it. Part of their first letter said you have put some flags in the ground. This is an odd shaped lot - the OHWM comes in an unusual way ---septic we need to stay away from; property line. The general question - is the size of the garage appropriate? Location? Stan is open to moving this. I don't know if we are ready to make a decision - or want to table it for more information.

Tekiela: Why don't we turn it back the way it originally was?

Oleson: My concern is that if we turn it like that - we don't know where the exact boundary is. It has not been delineated yet.

Quiggle: I think we need to get the wetland delineated before we take any action.

Oleson: The second letter said there was no problem as long as there is no driveway. You would probably leave it the same way.

Tekiela: Why not flip it back to the original way? They already looked at that. They were OK with that.

Taylor: Right now it looks like the corner of the garage is 20 feet from the wetland?

Oleson: There is no setback to a wetland.

Taylor: If he did turn it, how many feet would it be from the wetland?

Quiggle: It ought to be delineated.

Oleson: Soil and Water said that needed to be done. Procedurally, you can table it or approve it conditional on it is going to stay out of wetland. Get delineation.

Tekiela: Keep in mind it is an area that I mow.

Taylor: I know - but this is still an area about which they are very particular.

Oleson: When this addition was approved by the county years ago - they wanted to approve access to the well.

Taylor: How close is the neighbor if you put the garage closer to the line?

Tekiela: There is no home. There is a shed. The owner lives three quarters a mile down the road.

Quiggle: I am concerned because Soil and Water said that any proposed disturbance within these areas (within the 1024') should require professional wetland delineation prior to approval.

Oleson: They do not do their own wetland delineation.

Quiggle: I am uncomfortable with approving a variance on conditions rather than waiting for those conditions to be met and then....

Tekiela: When she was there on site - she clearly said that if we flip it the other way it would be our best bet - we would not encroach on the wetlands if we went back to the way I originally had it. They said they had no problems with it at all.

Oleson: Here is the first letter that was sent. The reason they sent a second letter was because I called them and said the first site plan was not really reflecting the location where you wanted it.

Quiggle: I am more interested in seeing what the plan is and whether it encroaches on the 1024'. In order to put up the building, my assumption is that there will be a disturbance of the soil within the boundary of the 1024'.

Oleson: I will pull up the e-mails from WCSW.

Smith: I think the way you currently have it proposed - it encroaches less. This one has less impact.

Quiggle: But you have to change the road.

Quiggle: WCSW contradicts itself in the second letter.

Taylor: Concrete pad?

Tekiela: 10 foot apron.

Taylor: You are going to go over the 1024'.

Taylor: Can you bring the garage closer to the house?

Tekiela: It would put you closer to the lake. For scale - it would sit approximately here.

Quiggle: That is why we want accurate drawings.

Tekiela: Here is the septic. This is a rock and flag pole. The garage would sit here - here is the wet area. It is all mowed.

Quiggle: Wetland can me mowed.

Tekiela: I understand that. Just so you know it is all mowed.

Smith: I am not comfortable without a drawing to scale, how close it gets to get to the wetland - how it lays out both ways - I would like to see the way it was proposed tonight.

Quiggle: With the road put in - how much dirt is necessary and where?

Smith: I agree.

Tekiela: Where would the doors be?

Smith: The doors would be facing west. If you put an entrance to the garage where the road is now, then you don't have to go around the other way...Then I guess we have accomplished quite a bit. It is 24 feet wide at that point and it is 36 foot deep - which you are probably not going to want. It is not really fitting the puzzle there. You would be better with a 24' wide x 28' deep garage. Does a 2 stall garage work?

Tekiela: I would like to get the boat in because we have had vandalism.

Smith: I would feel comfortable tonight if it we scaled down.

Quiggle: The boat can always be stored offsite.

Tekiela: 2 doors, double deep - coming straight in.

Smith: I don't think you can achieve that with only 24' deep. A car is 18-20 feet deep.

Quiggle: It is not up to us to design this.

Smith: Right now you need time to think about this and you need to get exact numbers. I don't want to give you something you don't want after you leave here tonight. I know you are not going to build next week. We all need to take time and do it right. I still like that - but what size can you work with?

Smith: I am OK with where it is with that width - he does not have an exact number on the depth.

Tekiela: 24' you are good with?

Smith: You are staying more out of the impact that way.

Quiggle: If we were to say that he could build a garage 10 feet from the property line, no more than 24 foot wide - no more than 34 feet from the property line and no longer than 34 feet we would be OK with 34, as he has it, - with the doors on the 24 foot side.

Taylor: Would you allow a small door, off on the side of the arrow point, to allow a boat access?

Smith and Quiggle: No problem.

Smith: I don't want to see a concrete pad there.

Smith: How much would we have to build up to do that?

Taylor: Otherwise I don't have a problem.

Quiggle: I would like to keep this moving.

Taylor: I still would like to see the delineation.

Quiggle: If he does it this way - he is outside of the wetland. The road would not go into the wetland. So Soil and Water does not require delineation. We would make it part of the motion that there be no grading or land disturbance within the perimeter outline of the 1024'.

Smith and Taylor: I can agree with that.

Oleson: Are you looking at building it right away? There would be time to get delineation if required?

Smith: I am not big about a door on the side due to moved in soils.

A motion was made by Smith to approve 24' by 34' - no bigger than 34' garage - 10 feet off property line and use Staff, and Soil and Water recommendations, findings of fact - do not think we need wetland delineation - just need a site plan drawn to scale for Ben to approve, use proper sediment and erosion control when you do the project. Seconded by Taylor.

Quiggle: I would like to add that there will be no soil disturbance within the 1024' elevation and if it looks like it is going to be soil disturbance there - you consult with Ben - you are limited to 20 square foot disturbance within that.

Motion carried unanimously.

- c. Variance to replace the existing dwelling with a new 2,016 square ft dwelling/attached garage with partial second story approximately 55 ft from Cedar Lake (75 ft required) and approximately 19 ft from the road right-of-way (20 ft required) and 53 ft from the centerline of the road (65 ft required).
 - i. Applicant(s): Robert and Karen Lohn
 - ii. Property Address: 8857 Ingram Ave. NW, Annandale
 - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 22-121-27
 - iv. Parcel Number(s): 206021000120

Robert and Karen Lohn and Bernie Miller addressed the Planning Commission.

Bernie Miller: The lot is a double lot. They had brought this to us – two and a half lots – came to us early this summer. Their daughter is an architect. We had initial meeting and initial plans. We proceeded to get survey – knowing we had steep slopes – determined what was the bluff, from the surveyor, on the site plan. You can see the bluff actually wraps around – the rest of this is not a bluff – it is a steep slope. Currently they have a cabin there – you can see the deck. You can see existing cabin – currently have a pretty large deck on the lake side. What we worked on with their daughter is a plan that would get them a house that would fit grade-wise and setbacks the best they could. Have the least amount of impact on everything. We meet the bluff setback. Because of the depth of the lot – it is really difficult to design around the grades to have a garage and still have the septic and still meet all the setbacks – it is not possible to do all this the way the grades are. The grade slopes down to the east quite a bit. This is about the only place we can put the septic system. It is a standard type 1 system. In the past we have had different ideas and plans. This is the only plan we have at this time. We don't have any other plans. We have worked on this for a very long time. I started to see how much cut and fill. The driveway is, the slopes comes down and comes up for the driveway, the grade is about a foot higher than it is now. The back foot of the wall can stick out of the ground. We can capture almost all the drainage from this side of the house – and have it come back into the ditch that is currently there. We have designed the house not to have a deck – but to have a patio. The cut and fill is about 30 cubic yards total. It fits almost perfectly with the grades. I have other drawings if you have other concerns.

Karen Lohn: This is an old family cabin. At first we wanted to retain that feel. We did not realize it was a bluff. So we flipped it over – and that was really respectful of the bluff – and giving up this huge deck. We have been trying to respect that.

Miller: They are from Grand Marias. They would like to move down here.

Quiggle asked for questions from the audience.

Crystal Larson: I am just a few doors down from them. We tore down and built five years ago. Why isn't it designed 75 feet from the lake? I worry about encroachment on the lake. We moved our place back and we had to have a top of the line septic putting – so if the requirement is 75 feet to the lake – then I think it should be 75 feet from the lake – which can't speak for itself.

Rick Suddendorf: I am on the other side. How far is the septic from the lot line?

Miller: 10.1'. Setback is 10' - no variance needed.

Crystal Larson: We sit up high too; we had to move our back and had to lose more trees than we wanted to lose.

Oleson: This is showing 55 feet from the lake right now. The existing cabin is even closer. Road setback – about 53' to the garage right now. The ordinance implies that you should be 20' from Right of Way. When Bernie initially contacted me – is there some way you can put the garage somewhere different then you have issue of the septic system? When we started to put everything together - that was the issue we talked about. This is the only plan I saw. In our Staff Report we said – is this the best way to fit all the pieces together? The garage is 24 x 22 - it is not enormous. Would it fit somewhere else?

Crystal Larson: Does detaching the garage have any advantage or disadvantage?

Oleson: The road curves a little bit so...the sewer takes some precedence.

Miller: Basically you can see we did a boring – and they have an existing tank and drainfield in this area. When you try to place wells and miss everyone else's septic and be able to get a septic system – there is no way to detach the garage. If you swing the arc from the bluff – there

is no way to slide it down without asking for a variance with the sewer. We started here and kept pushing and condensing. As far as grade-wise - we have look-out windows with very little grade that has to move. Actually - I understand their point about the trees. In this case - it is designed around mature oak trees. It preserves most of them. This is a heavily vegetated bank. I can show you a drawing of what it looks like when you put all the setbacks in here - I can show you what is left. It is long and skinny like a trailer house.

Taylor: What is the width and depth of the house?

Oleson: 46' wide by 36.5' at the widest.

Miller: They have most on one level. They have a partial second story.

Quiggle: Would you say this is shifting back from ordinary high water mark?

Miller: 51' original. Now it is 55'.

Taylor: If you are abandoning the existing well - where do you anticipate?

Miller showed a bigger drawing that was easier to read and explained layout..

Oleson: 50 foot radiuses?

Miller: Here are the 50 foot radiuses.

Smith: I think they put a lot of work into this. I like it.

Taylor: Thinking. Most of single dwelling homes in the area - I know there are a couple 2 stories - because of the space - you opted to go higher?

Karen: Yes. It is a story and a half.

Miller: It is a small portion.

Quiggle: Do I understand that you have native grasses on the bank? You have long rooted grasses to protect the bluff and steep slope? It really helps mitigate the setback issue. The drainage goes by and large to that ditch adjacent to the road and can be directed there. You have talked about the possibility of a rain garden.

Karen Lohn: I would consult Soil and Water to do that correctly.

Quiggle: And they do have programs for that.

Miller: The only spot left for storm water management - we need to make it go this way. The 1020 and 1021 elevation - it is very flat right there- the only thing you can do - is like a small narrow rain garden - possibility around this side. They only thing we really don't have is this right here. Everything else we can capture.

Quiggle: And drain to the back. But with long rooted native grasses on the bluff - that will help the water from the patio infiltrate and keep the erosion down on the bluff.

Miller: It will be less erosion than what is there currently.

Quiggle: I have no problem with 19 feet from the road because really you are more than that to the traveled road surface

Miller: It is 40 feet off the edge of the road.

Taylor: I am looking on lake side - you have the two extended out - like a porch bedroom.

Robert Lohn: That is to mimic the existing porch.

Taylor: If they brought it back to match it would give them a few more feet of...

Quiggle: I don't see there being that much gain in doing that.

Miller: It is pretty compact, really.

Crystal Larson: OK. I just asked.

Quiggle: The house is not overly large.

Taylor: I like the natural grasses.

A motion was made by Smith to accept variance for 2,016 square foot house and garage, at the 19 foot setback of the road Right of Way and 55 feet from the lake, and that they do the erosion

and sediment control at the time of building, and permanent storm water management plan; including the findings of fact. Taylor seconded.

Quiggle: Just make sure you work with Oleson on the permanent storm water management plan so that no water goes onto the adjacent property.

Motion carried unanimously.

- d. **Variance to create two nonconforming lots not meeting the minimum size or depth for the purpose of accommodating new sewer systems. Lots to be created would be approximately 26,398 and 19,220 square ft in size (43,560 square ft required) and ranging from 42 to 175 ft in depth (150 ft required).**
 - i. Applicant(s): Steve Bruggeman/Jim Miller (Lyndon and Nancy Johnson property)
 - ii. Property Address: North side of 89th Street NW approximately between 11815 and 11859 89th Street NW.
 - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 19-121-27
 - iv. Parcel Number(s): 206000192200

Steve Bruggeman, Jim Miller and Bernie Miller addressed the Planning Commission.

Quiggle explained the request.

Miller: I have some bigger drawings. They are the same ones.

Bruggeman: The history of the property. Jim and I both live on the north side of Pleasant Lake. Lyndon and Nancy Johnson own approximately 29 acres across the road from us. I have been trying to buy some property from them for 20 years. They did not want to sell. They have approximately 6 acres of woods - low land, kind of non-productive land. I tried to buy 6 acres. I tried to buy some land straight behind - up on the field. I tried to buy the whole thing. They said they just did not want to sell. About 5 years ago - it was proposed moving the road - 89th Street and moving it north a little bit. Johnsons said they would consider that. The road did not get moved - that was 5 years ago. Last year there was a piece of property that came for sale - it was next to the Johnson's 29 acres. It was owned by Marilyn Alberg - 40 acres - we proposed that if we could buy that 40 acres - and trade and give them 40 acres even up for their 29 acres. They did not want to sell. Johnson later decided they would sell with some restrictions. They were not willing to sell any tillable property. They will sell this piece but will not sell anything west of the Miller's line. There is lowland and woods they want to retain. This is what they are willing to sell. This is where we proposed these two lots to put the septic systems in the back. I may someday propose to put a garage there. I am not asking for that at this meeting. The property had not been surveyed yet. I just want to be upfront and honest with you - someday I might come back for a garage.

Miller: I think this is a lot like Stuart Ulfers [previous variance] - this is the concept of what we would like to do. If it goes beyond this - we will get surveyed. We don't know exactly how far back from the edge of the field they are going to be comfortable selling. We don't know the exact size of the lots. This is a concept plan. Roughly these size lots - back lots that they could have septic systems on. As you go up - get further to the west - it gets steeper. The contours get closer together - it gets steeper. There is a terrace - a bit of the bench where it flattens out. Quite honestly - that is a considerable ways - more than 75 or 80 feet from the wetland that is down below. That is pretty wooded - well established hillside there. As you get further east - that would be Steve's - the other would be a pressure bed over there. There is not a lot of other

potential for other septic systems here. This is about the extent of what you can do with this property.

Quiggle asked the audience if they had comments.

Jim Diorio: I come in peace. These are my neighbors. These are my friends. I don't know the history. The history - about 12 years ago- non conforming lots on that side of the lake. Septic is a problem. I think I even had Bernie Miller at my place. We always tried to come up with a concept that benefitted the most. I thought we were in agreement to do a community septic. 5 or 6 years ago - came close to putting Annandale sewer on that side of the lake. Failed with 2 guys out of 66 that did not want it. Jim has a problem, I have a problem, my neighbor has a problem This does not solve the problem. I thought we would all have a fair share of the apple. I think that moving the road would solve all the problems. I think this is - I hate to say I am not for it - because I am - I don't think this is the solution to the long term goal of cleaning up the lake. Did you all get a copy of my e-mail?

Quiggle: Yes.

Denise Froehlich: I live down the road. My mother owns the property right here. She is in Florida and just had surgery a week ago Monday. Her letter says that the reason that we have rules is so that people don't get hurt. The previous people - sometimes the only way you can do something - is to get a variance - as long as it is neutral to the other neighbors - however - these two properties will forever have a problem and be forever landlocked. My mother was under the impression - Lyndon is a second cousin of mine - we were under the assumption that if Lyndon decided to sell - we would all be approached and it would be beneficial to everyone.

Joel Oleson: Joann Olson sent me to say that she strongly, strongly, strongly objects. I am her attorney. I am also her son. When the previous people were up here - you had mentioned yourself that this was locking them into a very small box. This is going to lock 2 properties in a small box that they cannot get out of. This variance, as it is set up now, is not benefitting the most people. My mom is going to have to stare at a garage. They are not going to be able to put water and sewer through as easily. It is not going to help the county, it is not going to help the property owners that are adjacent to it. They strongly, strongly object to this.

Pat Schomaker: To make it clear - you are purchasing this property to put septic systems on, only? And only for your use?

Bruggeman: For both our properties, yes.

Pat Schomaker: And maybe a garage at some point?

Bruggeman: Yes.

Pat Schomaker: Is there enough land there to put a community sewer?

Bernie Miller: I would say no. There is not room to put...as you can see how much Miller's takes up for a primary system, I mean it takes up the width - because of the slope - because of the nature of it. Is there room further into the field? There is all kinds of room there. I am almost certain that there is good soil there. This piece of land is not a solution for the community.

Pat Schomaker: My issue is that with variances - the last people that were up here were on property that they purchased a while ago - and apparently things fit on there - and now they come with something new - and they have to get variances. Well the alternative is don't build that there. There are setbacks for a reason. I assume 75' for the lake for a reason. Why do they have the laws out there? To protect the lake, road and community! I agree - they should do something with that road. Nobody can put a septic on that land. They all have that same problem.

Bernie Miller: From Millers that way - is extremely low - and heavy soil. The rest of the way up it is sand - it is very easy to do septic. Further down - did they not move the road and put back lots for septic systems? If this did not have the hill, and if it did not have that wetland there - it would have worked. The problem is that land is not useful for everybody to have a little piece of it - because it doesn't do Millers any good to just have the width of their lot back. If there is a community system, we worked on a number of them, it is very difficult because everyone in the time of their life are in a different stage. You have cabins - you have homes. It is very hard to get them all coordinated at the same time. If you did a community system - you would run a low pressure force main - you can run it 2,000 feet if you want - to a spot where the land is for sale - and collect it very easily and have the tanks on the property. I don't think it puts anyone in a box as far as what they have. They have the land they have.

Froehlich: I don't think that is true. You are basically taking all that land - circling the land, basically, around my mother's property and Diorio's property.

Quiggle: But it is no change from what it is right now.

Froehlich: The land behind my mother, across the road from my mother, should be owned by her - not by someone else. We don't allow second tier housing, right?

Quiggle: This is not second tier housing. There would be no housing on this.

Froehlich: If you own a cabin, if you own a property - across the road - should not be someone else's garage - it should be your garage.

Quiggle: It should be whoever buys the property.

Froehlich: Joann did not approach Lyndon because there was an agreement that anything done there would be a solution to benefit all 4 property owners. And she did not want to get into a bidding war with Lyndon.

Naaktgeboren: This proposed area - there is only enough room for potentially 2 sewers now?

Bernie Miller: I don't know how to get more on there. You would have to go further to the north.

Diorio and Froehlich: It would be forever and ever.

Bernie Miller: What is we granted ten foot easement along this property line - that if you did get land up there - that you could get a pipe to go further up and in back.

Diorio: We have an acre piece that was going to be a community septic. We can work out a deal the new property line would go? Basically what you guys are doing is approving two non-conforming lots. If it is actually for septic use - extending septic lots. There is an association down the road that works very well. I am just afraid that if we land lock...I could have gone to Lyndon, by myself, years ago. Thank god for the hearing notice. I think this one acre lot could accommodate 4 septic tanks. This is Bernie's opinion. I would like to get another opinion. If anything - we don't need to cross the road - the developer put land there for future improvements - buy more from Lyndon and push that road back and have a nice front yard and additional land to do primary and secondary site.

Quiggle: John or Dick - could you explain situation with the road?

Naaktgeboren: Road is there - I don't know what the situation is.

Diorio: Actually, the road is not where it is supposed to be.

Froehlich: My understanding is that the road has come in closer and closer to the homes.

Quiggle: Has the road right-of-way changed at all, Dick?

Naaktgeboren: No.

Quiggle: So the property lines have not changed at all. So people have grass or whatever - in the road right of way.

Pat Schomaker: What happened is that people built garages in the right of way. The road physically moved – but the plat did not move. Where they put things moved.

Bernie Miller: It was originally at 33 foot wide road. There was 16 and a half feet added. It is now 49.5 feet wide, total.

Diorio: There was a feasibility study with a survey of that road – when the sewer was coming in- there should be something somewhere in the files – pushing the road over – would solve a lot of problems.

Dearing: We were not going to give you more property. Lyndon would not sell it. We can't move it anywhere.

Arguments ensued in the audience.

Quiggle asked for order in the room.

Quiggle: The way I see it – we are dealing with a situation as presented – we cannot order a seller to sell to people other than who he wants to sell to.

Oleson: Right.

Quiggle: That is outside of our control. We can just deal with what is here. If you neighbors are amenable to discussing with you – it sounds like they would allow a property easement between the two if there were a future sight behind.

Pat Schomaker: Variances are not necessarily something that should be given just because they are asked for. You have to consider the effect of the surrounding property owners. They have told you they strongly feel that it is detrimental to their property if you grant this variance.

Diorio: We all have hardships.

Oleson: Specific criteria – laid out in the State Statutes – the effect on the neighborhood – there are two questions – is it going to alter the essential character of the neighborhood; is it going to adversely affect the environmental quality of the area? We can't get involved in who sells what to whom. That is not our role as government. You have to work with what is in front of you and go through the criteria and see what applies. The variance is being requested due to the lots that are not big enough to accommodate homes. It is not being proposed for homes. Just for sewer systems and a possible shed or garage. That, in my mind, is what the criteria are addressing: Is it justified to have smaller lots to address the sewer issue? Is there a big enough problem with lots on the lake to justify needing more lots for the sewers, either now or in the future?

Bruggeman: My sewer was certified in 2000.

Oleson: Look to future – where will they put sewer when their existing sewers do not work anymore?

Jim Miller: Our sewer has not been updated since 1970 - something. We would put in a whole new system.

Oleson: I talked to neighbors on the phone. Again - we cannot force a sale – it is kind of like – you would have to figure out that amongst yourselves as owners. We are forced to deal with whatever is in front of us.

Diorio: It fails to meet the criteria.

Oleson: That would be the debate the Board of Adjustment has to decide.

Diorio: I suggest you table it, it is not very simple. There are legal issues. There are 2 property owners that are trying to grab the land across the street.

Smith: What options does Jim Miller have other than off-site?

Miller: We designed a type 4 system, multi-flow system. Over excavation, raised bed, even think we need variances from the road.

Taylor: If you buy -you are going to end up platting the new lots?

Bruggeman: If it is what is required – yes.

Pat Schomaker: If you grant this – is there any way in this point in time that someone could build a home?

Quiggle: Absolutely not. We will make that in the motion. Size of lot. They are being created for non conforming - for sewer purposes only. Not for building purposes.

Smith: I hear the message.

Taylor: I understand – you are landlocked in essence right now. You have neighbors on either side and a road. It is not different than where I live.

Froehlich: It is a little bit different when you have your neighbor's garage across the street from you.

Diorio: I relocated my well to accommodate Jim's future well site - spent \$3800 to be a good neighbor, wanted a new addition, I relocated my well to meet the 15 foot...

Quiggle: From what I am hearing from Bernie Miller – there is no possibility of getting 4 separate sewer systems on the property.

De Oreo: I don't believe that.

Quiggle: You have steep slopes, wetland,

Diorio: Pushing the road is not an option?

Jim Miller: That would not help in my case.

Naaktgeboren: It would not make it a steeper road. Plus, is the person on the corner going to sell his land? I don't know.

Quiggle: Should we go through the points? Would the granting of the variance be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Corinna Land Use and/or Subdivision Ordinance?

Smith: I think it would be in harmony with the Township Land Use.

Quiggle: So do I – because it provides additional space for septic systems.

Taylor: Yes.

Quiggle: Will the granting of the variance be consistent with the Corinna Township Comprehensive Plan?

Taylor: Yes.

Quiggle: Yes.

Quiggle: Is the use of the property reasonable? Yes – in my mind it is the only use of the property...non buildable sites with septic systems on them. That is a reasonable use of the property.

Quiggle: Is plight of the owner due to circumstances unique to the property and not created by the land owner?

Quiggle: Yes – we are dealing with the land between the road and the tillable property. It is what it is.

Quiggle: Will the granting of the variance alter the essential character of the locality? In my mind – it won't. The septic systems will not be visible.

Diorio: Him parking his trucks will affect the neighborhood.

Froehlich: You are making her lot less desirable and harming it.

Quiggle: Generally people cannot have a lot of junk on their property. There are junk ordinances against that.

A motion was made by Smith to table the request until the next meeting.

Smith: I have no control. Can we let the audience talk to Mr. Bruggeman and Jim Miller – if they can work something out by next month – lets come back next month and re-address it.

Bruggeman: I am concerned – we have one chance to buy this. We have been trying to buy it for a long time. This is what we are proposing. I think it fits all the criteria we have here and I don't see the reason for tabling it.

Smith: I am going to give some people a chance. If nothing gets done between the next meeting – then I think we are leaning toward this variance to go through.

Taylor: Do you have a signed purchase agreement?

Bruggeman: Yes.

Smith: Is there a date on it?

Bruggeman showed the purchase agreement with the signatures on the bottom. One more page behind has the final signatures. We had 90 days to get through this. In November.

Smith: It is only 30 more days. I don't think Lyndon will have a problem with this.

Bruggeman: I feel that Jim Diorio has had a lot to express here tonight. He was aware of the meeting tonight. You have sent the notices. I haven't talked to Jim Diorio in 5 years. Couldn't he have called me before the meeting? Couldn't we have worked something out prior to tonight?

Diorio: Jim Miller - you told me this fall you were going to keep me updated.

Jim Miller: I have had conversations with Jim Diorio and other neighbors – I have had those same discussions. My wife and I have talked to Johnson on our own – on a couple of occasions. They declined. Steve has had the bulk of the work most recently. Kept us in mind with that. As far as the details of the negotiations – I wasn't involved in much of that.

Quiggle: It sounds to me like many people have been very interested in this land.

Froehlich: We all thought Steve was negotiating on behalf of all of us.

Diorio: This is an ethics issue right now.

Larry Thompson: I am the new guy here. If we were to grant the variances this evening – is there anything that says these gentlemen have to act on it in the next 30 days – or could they go ahead and have their discussions with the neighbors?.

Oleson: The approval is granted for three years.

Larry Thompson: But can that be undone?

Quiggle: That is why it makes sense to table it.

Quiggle: There is a motion on the table and I will second it.

Smith and Quiggle voted aye.

Taylor and Thompson voted nay.

The motion to table failed.

Taylor: I am having a hard time. I understand everyone's point of view. I am sorry and to be honest – and if you assumed that the people were negotiating on behalf of the whole area – I am looking at the fact that they approached us to give the variance so they could purchase the property for their septic systems. It is not changing or altering any of the land over there. The septic will be hidden underneath. I understand the plight of the neighbors in between – that they feel they are landlocked. Could an easement be given, if by chance they sell for land in the back – that if could be given

There was conversation in the audience.

Quiggle: Please be quiet out there.

Taylor: Yes – it has to be rezoned?

Oleson: No. I don't mean that it has to be rezoned for this purpose. It would have to be rezoned in order to put houses on it.

Oleson: In talking to the county – this comes up – no we do not rezone – we do not want to create the impression that it is for homes. They also make clear in our approval if structures will be allowed on the property or not.

Diorio: We are here for the sewer issue.

Quiggle: We can say no accessory structures on it just septic. That is up to us.

Oleson: You have to have findings for all this. You can table it for findings. If you can come up with the findings tonight it would be better to take care of it.

Pat Schomaker: On the criteria - it is adverse to the zoning plan. It is zoned Ag.

Quiggle: Ag with septic does not need to be rezoned.

Oleson: In the Ag district – minimum lots would need to be an acre. R1 would also be an acre. There is no zoning district that would allow a lot this size to be for a house purpose anyways.

Diorio: The application says for sewer purposes only. Structure came about when I saw the site plan.

Quiggle: Apparently there were later discussions with Oleson that there may be an interest in possibly putting a garage on the property later.

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Thompson, to accept the 2 non conforming lots – surveyed, and a certificate of survey filed and everything that needs to be done. On a note – I would like to see just the septic, maybe with the possibility down the road. Limited to septic systems.

Quiggle: Limit it to septic systems now?

Taylor: At this time.

Oleson: It is best to be clear right now.

Quiggle: The public hearing is closed.

Taylor: For septic purposes only. No buildings shall be put on it. Findings of fact and an easement of 5 feet on either side for the purposes of septic systems for the 2 properties in-between for septic and/or sewer lines.

Thompson seconded.

Motion carried unanimously.

- e. Variance to replace existing 20' x 26' garage with a 32' x 32' (1,024 square ft) garage (max. 800 square ft allowed) approximately 15 ft from the road right-of-way (20 ft required), 30 ft from the centerline of the road (65 ft required), 2 ft from a septic drain field (20 ft required). Proposed garage to exceed the maximum roof pitch (max. 6/12), 2nd floor ceiling height (max. 6 ft) and sidewall height (max. 12 feet) allowed.
 - i. Applicant(s): Kenneth and Julie Vande Steeg
 - ii. Property Address: 11047 Hollister Ave NW, Maple Lake
 - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 2-121-27
 - iv. Parcel Number(s): 206079001030

Julie and Kenneth Vande Steeg and Jim Dearing addressed the Planning Commission.

Quiggle read the variance request.

Dearing: I am concerned with the 15%. I came up 2 feet under with my calculations.

Kenneth Vande Steeg: We are on the end of a dead end road. The road had been abated to the north of us. The road stops at the Tarts. Right now we have a 20' by 26' foot garage – built in the 40's. It is rotting out. We wanted to replace it. We thought we had a normal size lot

according to the abstract. But I guess when they did the abstract in the 40s they went further out into the lake – so we lost 26’ or 27’ into the lake - the surveyors came out 3 times –trying to figure it out. The way it stands we have 18,055. What we wanted to do is move the garage 3 feet off the existing roadway. Where we have it now we had the garage placed 15 feet back from the roadway. We should tear the existing garage down. Wanted to do 32’ by 32’. Jim figured we had to do 32’ -by 26’. The roof pitch is 12/12 on the house. If we could do an 8/12 at least it would like more like a pre-planned garage with the home. Otherwise it would seem like there was not concern to try to match the two. As far as the drainfield – we can move it south – we can work with that, too. The garage is not visible from that lake. My neighbors to the north and south would be able to see it. The neighbor’s home is quite a bit bigger home. Their roof pitch is around 8 or 10/12. If the neighbors pitch – even the 8/12 would not be as sharp. At least ours – it would blend in better with the 8/12 pitch. The ceiling height can stay at the 6 feet. The aesthetics – it would look nicer. The essential character would be improved by having the roof lines match, as opposed to having a larger and one a smaller. We have lake on one side and the other side is 6 acres of ag field. The garage setback of 15’ – snowplows would have easier access to turn around. They would have room to back around. The snow plow guys do a really good job.

Quiggle: Asked the audience if they had questions. No questions.

Oleson: The variance regarding the building size is related to any lot under 20,000 square feet is limited to 800 square feet of detached accessory building. The variance regarding roof pitch is that with lots less than an acre, the roof pitch for a detached accessory building is 6/12 or less. Road setbacks and septic setbacks come into play here, too. It would be possible to build a garage where the old garage was – with the septic setback – apparently trying to preserve some site lines with the new placement of the garage. Other than that it is just the aesthetics of the roof pitch. These are tough because on the one hand you have this attached garage down the road with as much roof pitch as he wants, and because this one is detached you can’t. so it is tough to say no to that but...

Quiggle: The other one down the road has a second story – attached to the home.

Julie Vande Steeg: Our existing roof has that high roof pitch.

Quiggle: The existing ordinance does not give an exception for aesthetics.

Oleson: They are proposing 15 feet from right of way. The road setback is what it is – the lot size forces that. The main question is 8/12 vs. 6/12; 832 square feet vs. 800 square feet; and over on building calculations by my calculations. 1865 (my calculations) vs. 1832 (Dearing) house calculations.

Quiggle: It has to at 15% or less, in my book.

Kenneth Vande Steeg: Would it help to eliminate 244 square feet in a deck and take and eventually put pervious pavers in? Would that be able to get the 26 feet on that?

Dearing: That is part of the 25 %.

Kenneth Vande Steeg: That deck is 15 feet from the L shape.

Smith: If you shrunk to 26’ by 30’ - 6” you would be there.

Dearing: I missed the 800 square feet on undersized lot.

Smith: Roof pitch: I think we have to go with the 6/12.

Quiggle: I agree with the 6/12.

Kenneth Vande Steeg: If you put a breezeway or something like that – it would be an attached garage.

Smith: Then you would have to shrink the garage even more.

Taylor: I have one big concern. Is the septic is a mound?

Kenneth Vande Steeg: No – it is a pressure bed. It was done last year.

Taylor: My biggest concern is that it is only 2 feet.

Quiggle: I thought we had talked about shifting.

Kenneth Vande Steeg: There are 6 or 8 lines – right where the pontoon is parked in the picture– is about 6 feet right there. The last line of the septic is right about here. We are looking at 6 or 7 feet anyway, so the 10 feet is fine.

Kenneth Vande Steeg: I know they added extra dirt so that it did not look like a mound.

Taylor: I could not tell with all the snow. When it says mounded...

Oleson: It is a raised pressure bed – with dirt added to the sides.

Taylor: You would still have room around the garage toward the house?

Kenneth Vande Steeg: Yes. That is why...the existing garage is 3 feet here and three feet from the road. It would be 10 feet from the septic bed.

Quiggle: Would you have a parking area?

Kenneth Vande Steeg: Yes.

Quiggle: Would you have a guest parking area?

Kenneth Vande Steeg: Just in front of the garage.

Oleson: 32' by 15' assumed for driveway.

Quiggle: Making sure you are not swapping to put parking where the current garage is.

Kenneth Vande Steeg: That will all be grass and perennial gardens.

Oleson: For my total impervious coverage: I assumed driveway in front of garage...this would all be grass...

Taylor: It said in there that 20 feet from the drain field is technically required?

Oleson: The ordinance allows for administrative variance. That is not “me staff “ – it is mostly Wright County sewer staff. We did have a letter from environmental health about that.

Quiggle: Garage will be brought down to 800 square feet – 25' by 32'. Garage will have 6/12 roof pitch. No more than 6 feet of headroom. Will the 800 square feet garage get them down to 15% structure coverage?

Oleson: By my calculations they are 3 feet short still – but if we are going with the foundation – we can verify that.

Quiggle: Verify that. We are OK with road setback?

Smith: It is actually getting better.

Quiggle: Sewer – it is shifting away? It is 10 feet from the septic - Is that correct?

Kenneth Vande Steeg: I wish to withdraw all but the road setback variance.

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Smith to accept the road setback variance, citing findings of fact, and will also allow a variance allowing for down to a 10 foot setback between the garage and septic, pending review from Wright County, with all sedimentation and erosion controls. Motion carried unanimously.

- f. Zoning Ordinance amendment to Section X (Permits and Fees).
 - i. Applicant(s): Corinna Township
 - ii. Purpose: To match recent building code and zoning fee changes adopted by Wright County.

Dick Naaktgeboren and John Dearing addressed the Planning Commission.

Oleson: Wright County updated their building code fees. I have attached the changes that they made. Some went up 50 cents, some went up more. Because we contract with them, we need to change our fees to match their fees.

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Smith, to update our Ordinance Section X (Permits and Fees), to conform with Wright County. Smith seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Other Business:

Mark Lampi addressed the Planning Commission.

Lampi: I was going to add a 4' by 6' covered entryway over the front door, with the pitch matching the roof. I talked to building inspector. Oleson said you better run it by the Planning Commission.

Oleson: They got a variance for 2 feet wider- then Mark called and said he would like a covered entryway on it - no walls. The question to you - is that a bigger house or not?

Smith: Does it have footings?

Lampi: Yes. They drew footings in there. It says no deck or structure may be placed within 60' of Pleasant Lake's OHWM except for ground level decks which are at least 10 feet from any unit lot line. Is it my understanding that you can build a ground level deck closer than 60 feet to the water? Is ground level if it is less than 2 feet off the ground?

Oleson: It is ground level - even with the ground - or patio definition which allows for it to be 30 inches up. Good lesson about conditions. Be as clear as you can. If there were walls on it - it is probably an addition to the house. If there are no walls, it is just a covered step. I think it is not part of the dwelling - except as a part to get into it.

Taylor: Steps with a cover over it?

Quiggle: Inclined to say that it does not need an additional variance.

Smith: How far does it go out?

Lampi: 4 feet.

Smith: I do not see an issue.

Quiggle: You are not close to impervious. I think that we give permission to Oleson to do that administratively to do it under the umbrella of the previous variance.

Lampi: What does the term ground level deck mean?

Smith: On the ground. Concrete or pavers.

Taylor: We are a hundred foot setback. I can do the ground level - as long as it is flat and technically cannot be seen from the lake.

Lampi: No deck that would even be 12 inches off the ground.

Oleson: Because of these conditions of the county - they meant ground level.

Lampi: Is the definition of a deck different than the definition of a patio?

Smith: Yes.

Lampi: What is the difference?

Oleson: A patio is 30 inches or less in height. A deck is higher or attached to the house..

Quiggle: When they did this it was pre-ordinance?

Oleson:

Quiggle: A ground level thing? A ground level wood thing, or cement thing? right?

Oleson: The 2 places directly to the east have patios.

Quiggle: Ground level as opposed to deck.

Smith: I agree.

Oleson: I don't know if it will be very helpful. We have asked Wright County what they meant by this.

Oleson: No deck or structure can be within 60 feet from the lake. The 60 feet setback from lake is solid. If you want to go to the side, with a deck – you can. That is the way I interpret that.

Lampi: The wording in there and the definition is confusing.

Quiggle: We are all agreed on the covered entry? Work with Ben on that. Work with the building inspector to do whatever.

5. Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

a. January 8, 2013

Motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Smith to approve the Jan 8, 2013 Meeting Minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Elect Officers:

A motion was made by Taylor for Quiggle as Chair. Seconded by Larry Smith. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion made by Taylor for Smith as Vice-Chair. Second by Quiggle. Motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Taylor to table the remaining business until next month. Smith seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:08 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Barkley Brown