

CORINNA TOWNSHIP  
MINUTES  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT / PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
June 10, 2015  
7:00 PM

Charlotte Quiggle called meeting to order at 7:00 PM on June 10, 2015

Roll Call: Board of Adjustment/Planning Commission Members Present: Larry Thompson, Trish Taylor, Barry Schultz, Charlotte Quiggle (chair), Ben Oleson (Zoning Administrator)

Absent: Jeff Lundquist, Larry Smith, Lee Parks

Others in Attendance: Lynne & Jim Kuhn, Dan & Ruth Mahr, Pat Freiberg, William Papas, Gretchen Kittok, Mike Zieska, Floyd Baker, Karen & Rex Ostabauer, Martin Shallbetter, Leo Kill, Bruce Stuhr, Scott Perry, Terri Hawkins.

Additions or Deletions to the Agenda? Taylor made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously

Public Hearings

- a. (Tabled from May 2015 meeting) Variance to replace an 8' x 28' open deck with a 12' x 28' covered pergola approx. 38.2 feet from Cedar Lake (min. 75 ft required) and approx. 12.5 feet from a side lot line (min. 15 ft required). Building coverage will increase from 16.8% to 20.7%. Impervious coverage will decrease from 27.7% to 25.9% (max. 25% allowed).
  - i. Applicant: James Kuhn
  - ii. Property address: 8010 Irvine Ave NW, Annandale
  - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 22-121-27
  - iv. Parcel number(s): 206075000020

**Present:** James Kuhn & Lynne Kuhn

**Kuhn:** When we left here the discussion was that we could not increase the building coverage, so what we did is talked to the general contractor and we would be doing is a pergola with just a screen roof over the top. It was kind of a challenge since there's not a lot that have been done in Minnesota.

**Oleson:** We are still dealing with an extension from an 8ft to a 12ft deck so the variance would be the lake set back & the side yard setback. Last time they were going to be increasing their building coverage however, with the new changes we would not be increasing the building coverage. I am assuming we are doing the changes for the reduction in impervious.

**Kuhn:** Yes

**Audience:** None

**Taylor:** I have nothing

**Schultz:** When you were here last time were talked about knocking it down on the one corner to get a little further from the lake did you look at that?

**Kuhn:** We did stay outside of the shore impact line with the 38ft.

**Quiggle:** It is still considerably inside of the 75ft required.

**Kuhn:** What are you looking for I guess?

**Schultz:** It was just that we talked about shrinking it and was wondering if you looked at that, I am ok with it was just wondering.

**Quiggle:** They are still over impervious.

**Kuhn:** We are going to be taking that down.

**Thompson:** I was not here last month, however, I did go out and look at it. Where we are going to gain on pervious coverage? Is taking out the walkway going to be part of that?

**Kuhn:** Taking out the walkway and doing pervious pavers and changing the retaining walls to boulders bring it down to 25.9%. We feel we will be improving the overall quality of the lot.

**Thompson:** I'm ok with it.

**Quiggle:** I have a few questions. On the decking what is the spacing between the boards?

**Kuhn:** We will make sure the water can get through, standard decking.

**Quiggle:** Can you explain how your changing the walk way?

**Kuhn:** Go back to the illustration, we will be removing concrete and change to pervious pavers and remove a portion entirely.

**Quiggle:** Are you doing anything else regarding the pervious pavers? The reason I am asking is really for pervious pavers does not make it pervious it has to be a pervious paver system. Do you have those spec's to Ben?

**Kuhn:** Ben has talked to our landscaper and he will get them as per the specifications that are needed.

**Quiggle:** Ben I want to make sure they are doing the pervious paver system not just pervious pavers.

**Thompson:** We are comfortable giving credit?

**Quiggle:** That is part of our ordinance that you get 50% for a pervious paver system. I have no other problems with it.

Schultz made a motion to approve the variance to replace on 8'x25.8 open deck with a 12'x28' pergola approx. 38.2 feet from Cedar Lake and approx. 12.5 feet from a side lot lin. Building coverage will remain at 16.8%. Impervious coverage will decrease from 27.7% to 25.9% with the following conditions:

- The conversion of the concrete sidewalk to a pervious paver walkway would need to be done such that it meet proper specifications and actually infiltrates water into the soil. Plans will need to be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Township Zoning Administrator (in consultation with Wright County SWCD staff) to show the proper base and underlying soil types to ensure infiltration. Installation would need to be as per approved design.
- 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.
- 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. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate

areas, rain barrels, 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.

Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

- b. Lot line adjustment to attach an approximate 14,500 sq ft portion of a 24 acre lot to an existing 17,358 sq ft lot. Request to allow the resulting enlarged lot to be considered a separate lot for the purpose of sale or development.
  - i. Applicant: Michael and Victoria Zieska and Floyd Baker/Jessica Moen-Baker
  - ii. Property address: 11804 Gulden Ave NW and 6559 117<sup>th</sup> St NW, Maple Lake
  - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 1-121-27
  - iv. Parcel number(s): 206000012102 and 206000012100

**Present:** Mike Zieska & Floyd Baker

**Zieska:** Question as to what it indicates for purpose of sale or development?

**Quiggle:** Because right now it is tied to the existing lot and now it will be a separate lot.

**Zieska:** Its is next to my lot I have been using for 20 years and it make since that I own it. There is an easement there and most of it is wetlands so nothing can be done on it.

**Baker:** The only change is the owner not the use.

**Oleson:** The easement is part of the public road so there is a separation between the two sections. They are proposing to take the one section and attaching it to Zieska's parcel. It is about 17,000+ sq ft, most is wet lands and just a little high grounds. He was approved to put up a guest house on the lot and one of the conditions was that the lot's would tied together with only one permanent home. In addition he is asking for that condition to be removed. There is a number of conditions in the ordinance we would look for to be a separate lot. One is that it can have a sewer, and he does have one on there, that he has road frontage which he does and that it have 20,000 sq ft which it would if the lot line adjustment is approved. The ordinance does not indicate that it has to be 20,000 of buildable land.

**Audience:** Martin Shallbetter: We own the property next to the property in question and I believe you did have something that was sent via email from the Shallbetter family. The concern is that there is land that was kind of already filled in there and that it does not continue. Most of the property is wetlands and there wetlands that were filled in way back and we would like to preserve the wet lands and make it so it is not buildable. So the question is how that works out in the transfer of that property not only in Mike's case, but challenge is when the property is sold what will happen. We're asking basically how can we preserve that land.

**Quiggle:** There are laws that do not allow filling in the wet lands.

**Shallbetter:** There has already been area's filled in, we are asking for some caution.

**Rex Ostabauer:** Talking wetlands, I really don't think there's going to be any possibility to build there. As far as I'm concerned wetlands should stay wetlands and they need to be preserved. If someone fills it in they would be in big trouble.

**Naaktgeboren:** Was there any delineation of what is or is not wetlands?

**Oleson:** No this is an estimate from Soil and Water they do not do the delineation themselves. If one needed to be done they would require the land owner to do one.

**Zieska:** We have not done one since we are not building on it so one is not required.

**Schultz:** Is this going to be part of your current parcel?

**Zieska:** Yes and then we will do a survey and detach the two parcels.

**Quiggle:** Basically they will end up with Zieska A which is his current home & Zieska B which is currently the guest house. The wetlands (new property) and the guest house would be become one.

**Zieska:** The home and the guest house were separate. We had a survey done to combine them now we would have it redone to separate them and add the wetlands to the guest house property.

**Schultz:** So the lot that you have with the guest home is that building going to be a buildable lot?

**Oleson:** This means the guest house is no longer a guest house and you could put a year round home on the property. It had nothing to with septic, it was because the lot was under 20,000 sq ft and could not have a year round home on it. Now with adding the additional land he would have over 20,000 sq ft. so you could remove the condition that was placed on the property. Therefore if you grant the lot line adjustment you could remove the condition.

**Schultz:** I think that the way it was left before it was not going to be a buildable lot.

**Quiggle:** That was because of the sq footage of the lot.

**Oleson:** The issue before he was asking for a guest house on a non-conforming lot.

**Zieska:** This would give us the option if we retire and want to travel to have a home on the the guest house lot and summer here.

**Thompson:** I don't see a problem with it. Just to confirm that I am understanding this, right now the house that you live on is on one side and the guest house is on the other. There is a stipulation on record that if one is sold they are both sold. If we approve this that stipulation would be taken out of there. The wetlands piece will be added to the guest house and could be sold or developed separately. I am fine with it. There are enough laws out there to cover wetlands.

**Quiggle:** I understand the concerns about the wetlands, but wetland rules in this state are very strict. I am comfortable with it.

**Taylor:** I am still have a question. There is a guest house on there now, if put these two together for sale or future development you would have to get rid of guest house or add on kitchen.

**Oleson:** Without changing the size of the home you could add a kitchen and it could become a home. If they wanted to remove that house and build new it would be possible if it meets the set backs.

**Zieska:** It barely meets the setbacks now.

**Quiggle:** So if it just barely meets the setbacks, since majority is wetlands, is it possible to make a condition that they could not count the wetlands as total sq foot for impervious coverage?

**Oleson:** You could specify that but it would be different than what you require for any other lot.

**Thompson:** Why would you do that it either meets it or it doesn't meet the requirements.

**Quiggle:** Because it much larger so for impervious you could make it larger.

**Zieska:** It could not expand with the current septic and where the home is and it would not meet any setbacks.

**Terri Hawkins:** I live across the lake is there a reason he could increase the lot line and then take it out of the wetlands? Can he change his lot just by the amount he needs and leave the rest?

**Quiggle:** A that is not what he wants to do? B not sure why that would be an issue?

**Thompson:** Why is that a concern as to who owns it?

**Baker:** I am not sure why that makes a difference - I just purchased that a year ago. It just makes since with where the property lines are.

**Thompson** I do not see that it is our job to say who owns the land.

**Quiggle:** Since it does not change what the wet lands are used for it should not make a difference who owns them.

Thompson made a motion to approve the lot line adjustment to attach an approximate 14,500 sq ft portion of a 24 acre lot to an existing 17,358 sq ft lot and to allow the resulting enlarged lot to be considered a separate lot for the purpose of sale or development with the following conditions:

- The applicants shall provide legal descriptions for each of the parcels and sign a deed restriction prepared by the Township that would tie each of the parcels together. The lots shall only be sold and developed as one unit unless a split is later allowed under applicable zoning regulations and procedures.
- Only one dwelling shall be allowed on the combined parcels.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

- c. Conditional use permit for the placement of over 50 cu yds (approx. 100) of fill in a shoreland/floodplain area to elevate a storage building to the required flood protection elevation.
  - i. Applicant: Larry Overstreet (Owner: James Worcester Trust)
  - ii. Property address: 9650 Kramer Ave NW, Annandale
  - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 18-121-27
  - iv. Parcel number(s): 206000184204

**Present:** Leo Kilz, Liman Lumber for the property owner

**Kilz:** They would like to build a 36x40 shed. Ben let us know that it had to be at a certain elevation since it is a designated wetland. We hired someone to come out and do the elevation, it is a little higher than we would like since it is higher than the cabin but that is what the rules are. We moved it away from the water further.

**Thompson:** how many loads of fill?

**Kilz:** About 14-15 loads, it's a real steep hill and it will be a challenge for the trucks.

**Oleson:** The requirement for the CUP is because they are over 50 cu yards they thought they were going to need about 100 cu yards however, it will be about 170 cu. yards due to the flood plain elevations on Clearwater Lake. You were all out there and saw the stakes. It is a lot of fill and it is going to change it out there. The shed will be meeting all setbacks.

**Audience:** None

**Oleson:** There is an issue in the staff recommendation on number one there is no neighboring property to the west and you may not want to include number two since this is a large property and may not need permanent stormwater management.

**Thompson:** No concerns

**Taylor:** I am good

**Schultz:** How do you know how deep to go, and are there pads?

**Kilz:** We have a way to know how far we need to go down it will be about 5ft. We thought about a floating slab but decided on the pole building.

**Quiggle:** Are there any other questions?

Taylor made a motion to approve the placement of over 50 cu yds (approx.. 170) of fill in a shoreland/floodplain area to elevate a storage building to the required flood protection elevation on the following condition:

- 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 and any downslope areas, seeding of all disturbed areas and installation of erosion control blankets as identified in the submitted erosion control plan, or otherwise recommended by Wright County SWCE and/or approved by the Zoning Administrator.

Thompson seconded the motion. Motion approve unanimously

- d. Conditional use permit for the placement of over 50 cu yds of fill in a shoreland/floodplain area to elevate a storage building to the required flood protection elevation. Variance for fill extending less than 15 ft out from the proposed building at the required flood protection elevation.
  - i. Applicant: Scott and Elizabeth Perry
  - ii. Property address: 11579 Kramer Ave NW
  - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 06-121-27
  - iv. Parcel number(s): 206000061402

**Present:** Bruce Stuhr & Scott Perry

**Perry:** The existing cabin is there and we would like to put up a garage, I purchased the cabin in November. We found out later that we had to bring fill in.

**Stuhr:** We meet the side yard setbacks. We are 13 feet to the property line on both sides so a little short of area and just under 50 yards to get the pad and with adding fill around it we are over 50 yards.

**Oleson:** (Ben showed the map indicating what is and what was not a flood plain area) So since the one area is below the flood plain elevation and you have to raise the floor to be above the flood plain elevation and then around the building you are supposed to have 15 ft around all sides 1ft below the floor. He has about a 50ft wide lot with a 24 foot wide garage so he cannot meet the 15 ft requirement. We did get some elevations and the flood elevation is 996.7 and they are at 995 for the entire pad. I did talk to the DNR and they have supported a variance to not have fill around all 4 sides. They like to see one side to the required elevation but the other sides you can do retaining walls or other means to keep water out. One request is the CUP for fill & the other one is the Variance that they are not required to fill all 4 sides 15 ft out. (Pictures were shown to the board) Options would be; we want you as close as you can on all 4 side or you could require 2 or 3 sides, or the DNR said they would be ok with 1 side.

**Thompson:** I see there was a new garage on the other side was that required for them?

**Oleson:** That was not caught at that time. We have to go back to them, they are close and we are working with the township attorney on that one.

**Audience:** None

**Quiggle:** I have a question; the location of the garage seems to be in the lowest part of the yard, why?

**Perry:** - it is heavily wooded and it we would have to take down many trees and move the driveway.

**Taylor:** The garage meets setbacks from the side lot?

**Stuhr:** Correct.

**Schultz:** What type of foundation?

**Stuhr:** Floating slab.

**Quiggle:** With all this raising your changing the path of the water, could you potentially causing water issues? Is that why you are suggesting culverts?

**Oleson:** If you're going to require 15 ft all the way around I would be concerned and you may want to think about culverts, if do require all the way around they may not be needed.

**Thompson:** Is the property to the North wider than Perry's.

**Oleson:** Yes

**Quiggle:** Let's start with how do you feel about

**Taylor:** If you don't do all 4 will water fill into the garage door area

**Oleson:** the floor of the garage does need to meet the flood elevation and it will be higher than the fill. If you don't require on all 4 sides you will have areas for flood waters which you will not have with the fill. The main reason to have the fill is to have access to the building for emergency vehicles.

**Quiggle:** What bothers me is the 15ft out at that level, could we not taper it out?

**Taylor:** Even if we taper to the N and the S side and only have one side that goes out 15ft.

**Oleson:** The other reason is to protect the foundation of the building

**Quiggle:** Then you could g

**Oleson:** You can require that or you could give them the option.

**Taylor:** I like the tapering so the water is going to flow. Are you building where the driveway is?

**Perry:** On part of the driveway.

**Taylor:** How will a fire truck get to the home?

**Stuhr:** There is 13ft on the side of the garage.

**Schultz:** Nothing

**Thompson:** Would it make any since to make the garage 20ft instead of 24ft and make it longer?

**Stuhr:** If you make it longer you will not be able to turn around, there are trees and the elevation would be an issue along with the drain field.

**Quiggle:** To sum it up am I correct to saying that it tapers down on the lake side to the grade on 3 sides and then 15 ft out on road side.

**Taylor:** I was thinking 15 ft on the lake and road side and then taper on the other two sides.

**Oleson:** The requirement is 15ft out flat and then taper from there. When you say tapering it could be two different things; you can come out a few feet and then taper or you could say 15ft and then taper.

**Quiggle:** They do not have 15ft on all sides. I would think bring out 2 ft on 3 sides and then taper and on the road side (east) you would come out 15 ft and then taper.

**Oleson:** You want something tapered on the Lake side so you can get lawn mowers in etc.

**Perry:** Yes

**Quiggle:** If they taper after the 15ft that will be more fill.

**Oleson:** And with more fill are we going to have issues with the water?

**Quiggle:** That is why I was going with 3 sides tapered and only the road side with the 15ft before tapering.

Taylor made a motion to approve the Conditional Use permit for the placement of over 50 cu yds of fill in a shoreland/floodplain area to elevate a storage building to the required flood protection elevation and to approve the Variance for fill extending less than 15 ft out from the proposed building at the required flood protection elevation on the north, west and south sides with the following conditions:

- 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 the area of disturbance and any downslope areas, seeding of all disturbed areas and installation of erosion control blankets as identified in the submitted erosion control plan, or as otherwise recommended by Wright County SWCD and/or approved by the Zoning Administrator.

- The applicant shall implement a permanent stormwater management plan designed to ensure that water that currently would flow from the adjoining properties to the north through this lot to the south is not blocked and to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of runoff from the site. The plan shall include a swale or other method approved by the Zoning Administrator to allow water flow on the west side of the proposed building. Permanent erosion control measures may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, 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.

Schultz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

- e. Variance to enclose a 14' x 32' portion of an existing lakeside deck approx. 65 feet from Mink Lake (100 ft required) and approx. 10 ft from the top steep slope. Variance to construct a 20' x 30' two-story addition to the existing dwelling approx. 57 ft from the centerline of a township road (min. 65 ft required).
  - i. Applicant: Dan Mahr
  - ii. Property address: 8071 Greer Ave NW, Maple Lake
  - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 24-121-27
  - iv. Parcel number(s): 206020001010

Present: Dan & Ruth Mahr

**Mr. Mahr:** We bought this house not too long ago and it is only about 800sq ft. With my wife, myself and my daughter it is kind of small and would like to enclose the deck to add some sq. footage to the front and also an addition to the back of the house.

**Oleson:** It was an open deck and they started to enclose it with a roof and they have 2 sides on it. There is also a new deck next that was not on before so getting closer the lake which gives us the lake set back. Before the survey we thought it was a bluff, however, it is not so we do not have that issue any longer. The lake set back is 100 ft on Mink Lake they would be 67 ft to the old deck and another 10 ft closer with the new deck. Road side it is 57 ft to the centerline of the road. Side yard is fine, impervious is fine. Sewer system is from 1982 and they will be replacing it.

**Quiggle:** what type

**Mr. Mahr:** pressure bed system that was designed.

**Audience:** None

**Quiggle:** I understand the building was started before permit applied for.

**Thompson:** Obvious question is how did we get started on this without starting the process?

**Mr. Mahr:** That was our mistake. The roof was on there about a year, and we just added the front deck on there and start closing it in.

**Thompson:** I have an issue going closer to the lake. You have the existing deck is on there and covering that is one thing and the other is coming closer to the lake with another deck.

**Mr. Mahr:** Could we change that to a patio?

**Thompson:** Where are with impervious?

**Oleson:** They are fine with impervious and there are no requirements on a patio.

**Thompson:** The other question is would the open deck go back to an open deck.

**Taylor:** I have an issue with the deck coming out to the hill because that hill looks like it is about to erode.

**Mr. Mahr:** They had some 4x12s that were starting to deteriorate. We are going to look at some retaining walls or some smaller walls.

**Taylor:** If the new deck was lowered to a patio it would be better and not attached to the cabin. The other issue is the enclosed the porch/deck area.

**Audience:** If you look at the direction of the home the water is now going to the side rather than going directly down to the lake like it was previously. Therefore, the roof is actually helping with the erosion of the hill.

**Schultz:** I would be in favor of the patio. I am not sure about the addition, I am not necessarily against it.

**Quiggle:** I have an issue regarding the front deck being enclosed. I do not have a problem with the addition to the back. It is well within the 100 ft set back on a steep slope. If it was being built now we would not accept that. Adding more structure, more room within the setback is not the way to go. I would say that it would have to go back the way it was before the work was started. I am ok with the patio. This is on a lake that is already an impaired lake.

**Mrs. Mahr:** How far are we from the lake?

**Oleson:** The old house was about 81ft, old deck is 14 ft so 67 ft with the 10ft it is at 57 ft, there is an angle there so approximately.

**Mr. Mahr:** Can we get rid of the new deck and enclose the existing?

**Quiggle:** I have a hard time personally. Basically rewarding since we would not have allowed it in the first place. It would be impervious surface and it is close to the lake and inside the set back of 100ft.

**Thompson:** could they do a pergola?

**Oleson:** This would not give them enclosed structure which they are asking for.

**Taylor:** Could they go with a pergola with an open roof

**Quiggle:** Then it would not be an extension of the house which is what they were looking for. They may be better off doing an extension of the roof.

**Thompson:** What we have to say is no it cannot be a coverage structure and they will have to deal with what they want to do with it.

**Quiggle:** That is where I am.

**Taylor:** I agree, I understand that you have money and time into it already, we have to follow the rules that we have.

**Schultz:** We would not have allowed it if they would have come to us before they started.

**Quiggle:** Before we move on we have not discussed the addition to the back of the house.

**Taylor:** I have no issues with the back with the set back to the road.

**Schultz:** I am good with the addition to the back.

**Thompson:** The only issue we have it the road set back and I am fine with that.

Thompson made a motion to deny the expansion of the enclosed porch with the 10ft deck expansion and approve the 20 x 30 two-story addition to the existing dwelling approx. 57 ft from the centerline of a township road with the following conditions:

- 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.
- 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. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, 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.

Quiggle seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

- f. Variance to construct a 12' x 16' addition to an existing garage/shed approx. 7 ft from a side property line (min. 10 ft required).
  - i. Applicant: Jon Papas (Owner: William Papas)
  - ii. Property address: 11295 Kimball Ave NW, Annandale
  - iii. Sec/Twp/Range: 5-121-27
  - iv. Parcel number(s): 206087000190

**Present:** Lee Friberg & Jon Papas

**Papas:** what we are looking to do is taking a small storage shed and making it bigger. The shed was built in 1980's. Taking the storage building and coming out straight towards the road.

**Friberg:** We do not seem to have a problem with the adjoining neighbors.

**Oleson:** This is an area that the surveys are a nightmare. Pretty straight forward, we do not have a survey so we are not 100% sure where lines are. They are asking to add to an existing shed approx. 7ft from a side property line.

**Taylor:** Is their water to the bunk house and is there an outhouse?

**Papas:** Yes and the outhouse has not been used in years. Used for storage and bunk house, it is a one room with a bathroom that has a petition type door.

**Quiggle:** Grandfathered in.

**Friberg:** We are going to throw a little change into this, one we got looking at the size of the boat we would like to change to a 12'x20' rather than a 12'x16'.

**Quiggle:** The length is not an issue as long as it is not closer to the property line and we are not close to being over on impervious or structure coverage.

Schultz made a motion to approve the variance to construct a 12' x 20' addition to an existing garage/shed approx. 7 ft from a side property line with the following conditions:

- 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.

Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approve unanimously.

Thompson made a motion to approve the May 12, 2015 meeting minutes. Schultz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

#### Zoning Administrator's Report

- Permits

- Correspondence

- Enforcement Actions

- Findings of Fact - Previous PC/BOA Decisions

Over on Hwy 24 - He is looking to build on the back part of the lot, however, he has a feed lot that he has to deal with. The question is can he create a box back there and apply for a variance to build. I mentioned that I was not sure. Smith indicated that there may be some issues of having a well. Oleson indicated that he may have been given a variance to build closer to the road. Quiggle indicated that she would like to see a plan of some sort.

#### Other Business

- Review of previously granted variance requests (if time allows)

Schultz made a motion to adjourn. Quiggle seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously at 9:39 pm.

Prepared by: Jean Just