

**From:** McLain  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 27, 2018 4:09 PM  
**To:** Ben Oleson  
**Cc:** McLain, Gene  
**Subject:** Lee Variance Request

Mr. Oleson,

I received your letter requesting comments on the proposed variance to allow L. Lee to replace his home damaged by fire with a manufactured home twice the size. This brings back conversations that you and I had just last year when I wanted to build within the same footprint of the demolished home but wanted to put it on a basement just to get the floor above the surrounding terrain for surface water control. Based on those conversations, I would like to point out the following similarities of the Lee request to my requests.

1. Since we are both within the boundary of 1000' to Mink Lake, the same rules should apply.
2. Corinna Township ordinance for impervious due to structures is a maximum of 15% and the request is for 23% IF the existing metal shed is removed as stated. This is over the impervious area for structures designed to reduce surface water runoff near lakeshore.
3. The proposed house footprint is twice the size of the one being replaced. I was told that I was required to build within the existing footprint without a variance and that I would not qualify for variance approval without a septic upgrade from holding tanks. Is the last drawing on the submittal designating a septic tank and leachfield area? If so, will that be inspected and certified before construction to ensure that ground water and runoff to the lake is protected from sewage contamination? If the drawing depicts a drainfield/leach area, that would put that area of liquid sewage running just under the surface of the existing roadway ditch which in turn drains to the lake. As an appointed member to the Lake Improvement District, I would like some sort of varification that the sewer system has been sized for a 3 bedroom home and duly inspected for filtration and containment of sewage within the property boundaries. If there is a holding tank system only and the variance is approved, I will believe that I was treated unfairly when planning my project.
4. I see the driveway has theorhetically been reduced in size in the back with the entrance width being increased as the existing driveway is being shared with the neighbor. However, the total impervious coverage including the buildings reaches 43.9 % which is 18.9% above the maximum allowance by ordinance. If these "maximum" coverages can be stretched by 8-20%, they serve no purpose and it opens the entire ordinance to discretion and undermines the policy and planning of the Township.
5. I believe that an appropriate response to this request would be to allow a stick built or manufactured home of 768 square feet with a new septic system on the back part of the property so the drainfield is behind the garage to meet the 50' from the well (assuming the circle near the lp tank is the well) or holding tanks in effort to protect our lake from septic discharge. I further believe that allowance of this project as submitted undermines the protection of the natural resources provided by planning and zoning ordinances. (no matter how much I complained about having to adhere to them, I understand their need)

If my assumptions are incorrect, I apologize and await clarification.

Thank You for this opportunity for comment,

Gene & Deb McLain

8111 Griffith Ave. NW

Maple Lake, MN 55358