

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting of: March 28, 2025

MINUTES

The Wright County Board of Adjustment met on Friday, March 28, 2025, at 8:30 a.m. County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Board members present: Paul Aarestad, Dan Mol, Dan Vick & Bob Neumann. Vacant seat for 5th member at this time. Representing the Planning & Zoning Office was Aaron Ogle, Planner. Rachel Pence, Assistant County Attorney, legal counsel.

ACTION ON MINUTES FOR THE MARCH 7, 2025 MEETING

On a motion by Mol, seconded by Neumann, all voted to approve the minutes for the March 7th meeting as printed.

1. ALIAKSANDR HARHUN – New

LOCATION: 7934 JASON AVE NE – PRT OF N1/2OF NE1/4COM AT NE COR OF SEC 29TH N88D30'W ALG N LN OF N1/2OF NE1/4, Section 29, Township 121, Range 24, Wright County, Minnesota. (Monticello Twp.) Tax #: 213-000-291202 Property owners: ALIAKSANDR HARHUN

REQUEST: After-the-fact variance as regulated in Section 155.026 and 155.048(F)(2) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow unpermitted additions and allow a new addition to the existing home located within the road setback.

Present: Aliaksandr Harhun

- A. Ogle displayed the site details as he reviewed the request. The property is 6.02 acres and zoned General Agriculture (AG). The request is to allow a 10 ft. x 12 ft. unpermitted front porch, 14 ft. x 18 ft. unpermitted four-season area, 14 ft. x 25 ft. unpermitted deck, and a 28 ft. x 44.5 ft. proposed addition to the existing home. The home would be 105 ft. from the centerline of the County Road. A variance is required because the existing home is located within the 130 ft. setback from the centerline of a County Road. The Township approves of the request. The County Highway Department does not have any issues with the request and would not want any new structures placed closer to the roadway than the nearest portion of the existing home which is approximately 100 ft. from the centerline. While not officially submitted public comments, two phone calls from neighbors were received asking what exactly was being done and that the applicant has done a really good job with the property, and it is in much better shape than it used to be. No other comments received.
- B. Harhun stated that he was not aware he needed a permit when he constructed the first two additions. The requirement only came to his attention when he contacted Planning & Zoning to ask the building inspectors questions about the larger addition. He is willing to comply with all necessary requirements.
- C. No comment from the public.
- D. Mol expressed concern that work was done without a permit. He also questioned the status of the septic system, noting that while the addition plan lists certain rooms as non-bedrooms, they could easily be used as bedrooms. Harhun stated that he had spoken with the sewer department, which explained the necessary requirements, and he plans to address them. Ogle confirmed that this conversation took place and noted that if any of the non-bedroom rooms are converted into bedrooms, the septic system would need to be upgraded. Mol further questioned the number of bedrooms in the addition. Although they are not labeled as bedrooms, he pointed out that it would be difficult to argue they won't be used as such. He is concerned that the septic system may not be upgraded to handle the

actual number of bedrooms. Ogle explained that in many cases like this, compliance partly relies on the honor system as people sometimes do unpermitted work on the property. Mol stated that he has reservations about the non-permitted work, as well as concerns about the addition and whether the septic system can support a five- to six-bedroom home. However, he is less concerned about the 105-foot setback, as the structure is no closer to the highway than the existing home.

- E. Vick shared similar concerns and asked about the process for after-the-fact permits. Ogle explained the process and confirmed that permits are required. Vick asked if the permit cost would be doubled, and Ogle stated that it is at the discretion of the Building Official but the Board of Adjustment fee was doubled. Vick emphasized that the septic system should be addressed. Ogle suggested a possible condition stating that rooms cannot be converted into bedrooms unless the septic system is updated. He also mentioned that, even if the rooms are not explicitly designated as bedrooms, they could still be counted as such based on certain requirements, meaning requiring the septic system be upgraded is reasonable.
- F. Neumann asked legal counsel whether there is a penalty for failing to obtain a permit when required. Pence responded that she was unsure and would look into it. Neumann stated that this is the appropriate time to address the septic system and include that as a condition, if the request is approved. Neumann asked Harhun to clarify the location of the proposed addition. Using the displayed plans, Harhun explained that the addition will expand both the garage and add living space for his young and growing family. The new living area will be above the garage. The existing garage is 24' x 24', and the new addition will increase its size to 28' x 44'. Neumann also asked about the type of septic system in place. Harhun stated that it is a fairly new mound system, installed approximately five years ago. He was told by the septic inspector that if only one bedroom is added, he would need to add a timer to the system. If two bedrooms are added, the drain field would need to be enlarged. He is aware of these requirements and plans to comply. Using the Beacon aerial photo Neumann confirmed that there is adequate space to expand the existing system. He also asked when the unpermitted additions were built, and Harhun stated that they were added between 2018 and 2023.
- G. Aarstad stated that he does not believe the applicant acted in bad faith and can understand how the work was completed without a permit. He noted that if the applicant had come before the board with a request for the deck and porch, he would have approved them. As such, he has no issue with the after-the-fact request. Since the Township and Highway Department have no objections to the proposed addition, he also has no concerns about that aspect of the request. He acknowledged that there is a penalty for after-the-fact work in the form of fees, but he wants to ensure that all unpermitted additions are properly permitted and inspected.
- H. Ogle addressed concerns regarding bedroom classification. Using the proposed building plans, he reviewed how certain walls or doors could possibly be removed to prevent the rooms from being used as bedrooms until they are properly permitted. The Board could also require a septic permit at the time of the addition. Aarstad agreed that now is the right time to address the septic system and complete any necessary upgrades. Mol concurred, stating that the proposed rooms could easily be converted into bedrooms, and given the applicant's growing family, the septic system should be updated now. Vick also agreed that the septic system should be addressed at this stage.
- I. Vick asked about the age of the septic system. Harhun explained that the system was installed shortly before he purchased the home in 2018. Ogle confirmed that a permit was issued in October 2017 for a replacement four-bedroom mound system.

- J. Mol moved to approve a 10 ft. x 12 ft. unpermitted front porch, 14 ft. x 18 ft. unpermitted four-season area, 14 ft. x 25 ft. unpermitted deck, and a 28 ft. x 44.5 ft. proposed addition to the existing home that is 105 ft. from the centerline of a County Road CONDITIONED after-the-fact work is subject to building department approval and all required permits for after-the-fact work are applied for within 60 days and the septic needs to be updated showing it can handle two additional bedrooms. Site plan noted Exhibit A and building plans noted Exhibit B. Seconded by Vick.

DISCUSSION: Ogle suggested that the condition regarding the septic system be made more flexible to allow for potential plan modifications. The final requirements should be determined by the building and septic inspectors to ensure an adequately sized septic system. He noted that if the applicant decides to use the addition as a storage area rather than bedrooms, they should not be required to upgrade the septic system unnecessarily. Mol expressed concern that if no upgrades are required now, future owners could add bedrooms later without ensuring the system is compliant. He pointed out that while septic systems are typically inspected during property sales, failing to upgrade the system as needed could create future issues. He suggested treating the addition as a two-bedroom rather than a one-bedroom expansion.

Neumann asked whether it would be clearer to require the septic system to meet the standards of a five- to six-bedroom home, rather than specifying a two-bedroom addition.

Bernie Miller of MSTs stepped forward and explained that the septic code allows a Type III system to incorporate time dosing. A person could have a ten bedroom house with a two-bedroom mound system if time dosing is used and that meets septic code. The septic system doesn't know how many bedrooms the house has, it only cares about the amount of water. Miller went on to explain that the County has higher requirements than the State and because of that in Wright County you tend to see mound systems over built and therefore last longer and fewer problems. A house with ten bedrooms could still legally operate with a two-bedroom mound system if time dosing is used.

Neumann again asked Pence about penalties for failing to obtain a permit. Pence responded that in her brief search, she found no provisions for additional fines beyond the double permit fee. Ogle emphasized that while the double fee applies to Board of Adjustment applications, the Board is not obligated to approve after-the-fact work. In some cases, applicants have been required to remove non-permitted work.

Neumann noted that the applicant has room to expand the septic system, and the cost should be minimal. Mol reiterated his intent to ensure the system can handle two additional bedrooms. Aarstad acknowledged that time dosing could address the issue. Ogle confirmed that at time of building plan review staff would review the septic system to ensure compliance. Mol clarified that inspectors would see this proposed plan and evaluate as an addition of a single bedroom, a lounge, and an office where he wants to ensuring it is assessed as a two-bedroom expansion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **BARRY ZANDER** – New

LOCATION: 2268 Hoyt NW – THE SOUTH 555.05 FEET OF THE WEST 784.77 FEET OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER, Section 23, Township 120, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Albion Twp.) Tax #: 201-000-234201 Property owners: BARRY J ZANDER & SUSAN ZANDER FAMREVLIVTR

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 of Chapter 155 and Section 152.025(A) of Chapter 152, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to exceed the maximum allowed number of animal units (AU).

Present: Barry Zander

- A. Ogle displayed the site photo and reviewed the request details. The request is located at 2268 Hoyt Ave NW in Albion Township, 10.0 acres and zoned General Agriculture (AG). The property was part of a division in 2024 that split it out on 10 acres leaving the remainder with zero building entitlements. This request is to allow 23 animal units (AU) on a 10.0 acre property and a variance is required because 5.0 animal units is the maximum for a 10 acre property. The applicant met with the Township prior to applying for the request. The Township approved of 12 cattle instead of 5. After speaking with Wright County Planning & Zoning, it was recommended the applicant speak with the Township again and request 23 animal units. That number was derived from a conversation between the applicant and the Feedlot Administrator. The Township updated their motion at a following meeting to allow 23 animal units if the applicant was OK with that approval being void if the property were sold to someone other than family and further mitigated by an active manure management plan. No written responses from the public have been received.
- B. Zander stated that the manure is hauled to owned property ½ mile down the road and that none of the manure stays on the 10-acre property. This was a dairy farm for years, so there are plenty of buildings.
- C. Public Comment.
 - John Ucker – Supervisor of Albion Township – The farm has been in the family for many years. The family recently divided the property, and he does not understand why it is not grandfathered in, as it was established prior to zoning rules. Ucker questioned why animal unit (AU) limits are so strict on these 10-acre parcels when many other land uses are allowed without restrictions.
 - Tracy Janikula – County Feedlot Program Administrator – The 10-acre animal restrictions are related to uncertainty about manure disposal. In this case, the challenge arises because the lot was recently split, and the applicant's family was informed that animal units would be restricted. While the family still owns additional acreage, it is not contiguous, which complicates the situation. In most cases, manure management would not be an issue, but with 23 animal units, over-application is a concern. The Township's animal number confusion stems from incorrect calculations of cows, calves, yearlings, and bulls. The applicant does have acreage available for manure application, just not contiguous to the 10-acre parcel.

- D. Vick questioned whether there is more concern with only cows on the property versus a mixture of animals. Janikula responded that there is no concern, as sometimes better management is achieved when a person specializes in a single species. Vick then asked if 23 animal units were a concern. Janikula, given the family's history, was not concerned.
- E. Neumann stated that, as a township supervisor, his perspective is different because he tries to accommodate residents. However, as a Board member evaluating 10-acre properties across the county, he recognizes that while this parcel is in a rural area, some 10-acre parcels are surrounded by houses and development. That is when the 0.5 AU limit becomes particularly relevant. The Board must also consider hardship and whether anything makes this 10-acre parcel unique. The recent property split complicates the situation, as the division could have resulted in a larger acreage to avoid these restrictions. The applicants knew what they were getting when they retained only 10 acres. While he understands their situation and acknowledges that they have other land available for manure application, this issue could have been avoided if more acreage had been retained during the split.
- F. Mol shared some of Neumann's concerns. He pointed out that the main farm site was reduced to 10 acres with a 5 AU restriction a year ago, meaning the applicants were aware of their animal and acreage limitations. A 10-acre site in Rockford Township differs significantly from a 10-acre site elsewhere in the county. Rockford Township has extensive residential development, while other areas are surrounded by large tracts of farmland with little to no development. This parcel was recently divided, and at that time, AU restrictions should have been considered by either reducing the number of animals or by retaining more land. He emphasized that while he does not want to stifle agricultural production, adding animals to this property differs from adding animals to a property in a more developed part of the county, like Rockford Township.
- G. Aarestad shared similar concerns. However, considering the family's history, the Feedlot Administrator's comments, the ability to spread manure on their own land, and the fact that the property is in a rural area and already operating under feedlot management, he is confident that the situation will be managed appropriately. He added that if the property were sold, the variance would cease. Zander agreed to that condition.
- H. Mol moved to allow 23.0 animal units (AU) on the 10.0 acre property because the property is located in a rural area and is CONDITIONED not to exceed 23.0 animal units, manure application agreement submitted by March 1 of each year to Wright County Feedlot Officer, and the approval expires once the property is transferred. Seconded by Neumann.

DISCUSSION: Ogle asked if Mol wanted to include the variance expires upon transfer, with the exception of transfers to immediate family. Mol stated he does not want to include that in his motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **LUNDEEN FARMS** – New

LOCATION: 10366 10TH ST NW – S3/4 OF W1/2 OF SE1/4 and S1/2 OF NE1/4 OF SE1/4, Section 29, Township 120, Range 27 Wright County, Minnesota. (Albion Twp.) Tax #: 201-000-294300, 201-000-294100 Property owners: LUNDEEN FARMS

REQUEST: Lot line adjustment as regulated in Section 155.026 of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to alter the property lines between PID 201-000-294300 and 201-000-294100.

Present: Gail Lundeen-Brandt

- A. Ogle displayed proposed plan and reviewed the request. The properties involved are PID 201-000-294300 which is 61.5 acres and PID 201-000-294100 which is 20.5 acres. The request is to add the South half of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter to PID 201-000-294100 from PID 201-000-294300. The proposed lot line adjustment does not meet the standards for an administrative approval, so the Board of Adjustment has the ability to approve these types of lot line adjustments. The Township approves of the request as there would be no change in ag land being farmed. No written responses from the public have been received.
- B. No comment for applicant or public.
- C. Neumann questioned intent, building or selling. Lundeen-Brandt stated it is not for building purposes. This is a partnership and one of the members, her brother, would like to purchase the farmhouse and it is more affordable at 40 acres vs. the 60 acres as it sits. Neumann stated he does not have a concern with the request as both properties will have adequate road frontage and no land locked property.
- D. Mol stated the division still leaves two 40 acre parcels with no land locked land, he is okay with the request.
- E. Vick agrees with the comments of others and has no concerns.
- F. Aarstad stated he is good with the proposed plan.
- G. Vick moved to approve the request to add the south half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter to PID 201-000-294100 from PID 201-000-294300 CONDITIONED that it is subject to survey and subject to Administrative Order. Concept plan noted Exhibit A. Seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **CLINT NELSON** – New

LOCATION: 3894 59TH ST NW – MAPLE GROVE BEACH 1ST ADDN LOT-010 & LOT-011, Section 04, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Maple Lake - Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #: 210-016-000110, 210-016-000100. Property owners: TYLER S PURTILO & KRYSTAL M PURTILO

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 and 155.048(F)(3) to construct a new single-family dwelling that would be within the side yard property line setback.

Present: Clint Nelson, Tyler Purtilo and Krystal Purtilo

- A. Ogle displayed the site plan and reviewed the request. The request is located at 3894 59th St. NW in Maple Lake Township, is 0.31 acres (with 2 parcels required to be owned in common), zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R-1), and located across the road from Maple Lake which is classified as General Development (GD). A variance was granted in 2024 for a new home no closer than 5.7 ft. from the east side yard. This request is an update to the 2024 approval to construct a new single-family dwelling 5.7 ft. from the east side property line but is larger than previously approved and within the side yard setback. No response yet received from Maple Lake Township. No written responses from the public have been received.
- B. Nelson stated that they are back before the Board with a revised plan, which includes an added basement and the conversion of an area previously approved as open space into living space. They also plan to acquire a five-acre parcel north of these properties. The new variance does not impact the neighbor to the east and maintains the same overall effect as the previously approved plan. There is also a small addition proposed for the upper level, along with the basement, if approved.
- C. No comment from the public.
- D. Mol asked for clarification that everything is the same as the current variance other than expanding into the basement. Ogle used the site plan and building plans to review differences. There is a small area noted on the 2024 plans as a mechanical area that will now have a story above where in the initial plans it was a single level. The basement is proposed in 2025 where it was not included in the 2024 plans. Regarding setbacks, the primary reason for this variance request, Ogle confirmed that the structure is not moving any closer than previously approved. Mol noted that the proposed building coverage is 14.1%, which is within the allowed 15%, and the total impervious lot coverage remains under the 25% limit at 23.9%. Given that there is already an approved variance for the setbacks, he does not see how the addition of a basement and minor changes would alter what has already been approved and vetted.
- E. Vick expressed a different opinion from Mol, questioning whether the home could be moved closer to the existing shed. Ogle clarified that there are some requirements in building code depending on the distance between the home and the shed but is not dictated by zoning ordinances. Nelson pointed out that moving the home closer to the shed could create an issue with the well, as there is an existing well between the house and shed. Vick stated that since excavation will already take place for the basement, shifting the home slightly should not be a major issue. He had initially supported the previous request because the footprint was to remain unchanged. In his view, relocating the house could eliminate the need for a variance altogether. Ogle mentioned that adjusting the

placement of the home could potentially bring it outside of setbacks from the property line. He also noted he believes the required well setback is three feet from the overhang of the building and that wells can sometimes be relocated. However, he was uncertain whether moving the home or well would comply with septic setbacks. Vick also raised concerns about the property nearing the impervious coverage limit, particularly regarding the need for a walkway between the home and shed. He maintained that moving the home would allow it to meet the required 15-foot setback and eliminate the need for a variance. Nelson questioned whether relocating the home would impact construction feasibility and usability. Vick also felt that the revised home design is taller than the previous plan. Nelson clarified that the elevation above grade is planned to be similar, with only a slight increase. Vick remained skeptical, disagreeing that replacing the original 4-inch slab with a full basement would raise the height of the house.

- F. Neumann agreed with Vick, emphasizing that the original approval was based on keeping the same footprint. Since the footings will now be removed, there is an opportunity to redesign the home to meet setback requirements. He pointed out that many homes on same size lots comply with setback regulations and suggested that the Board should consider requiring this home to do the same. He also questioned how adding a basement would not increase the home's height. Nelson explained that the additional basement space does not change the planned elevation. Vick countered that since the original home had only a slab foundation, adding a basement would naturally elevate the structure. Neumann asked about the distance between the proposed home and the eastern neighbor's house. Ogle estimated it to be approximately 30 feet. Neumann also inquired about potential impacts on the existing septic system, with Nelson confirming there would be none.
- G. Aarestad feels this as an opportunity to move the home further from the property line, providing additional space for the neighboring property. He suggested shifting the home at least a few more feet to allow for easier maintenance without encroaching on the neighbor's property. He encouraged reconsidering the placement now, while adjustments can still be made.
- H. Nelson asked if there was any flexibility within the 10-15 foot setback range. Vick questioned whether a 10-foot variance would be feasible.
- I. Mol acknowledged that while the original variance approved a 5.7-foot setback, there was always a possibility that new footings might be required. Since approval was granted for 5.7 feet, he believed the applicants still had the right to build at that distance. However, he also understood the concerns about new construction. Vick reiterated that excavation will now take place around the entire building, whereas the original plan required less digging and disturbance. He maintained that this is the right time to redesign the home to fit within setback requirements. Nelson agreed but was uncertain whether a 15-foot setback would be practical. He also expressed concerns about moving too close to the shed. Aarestad clarified that he was not insisting on 15 feet but suggested a compromise between 5.7 and 15 feet. Mol summarized that the applicants had the option to redesign the home and return to the next meeting or adjust the plans to eliminate the need for a variance altogether. Nelson asked if the Board would approve a 10-foot setback today. Vick preferred to see a revised plan and suggested including a walkway between the shed and house in the site plan. Aarestad indicated that he would support a 10-foot setback. K. Purtilo explained that the basement addition was suggested by an excavator who assessed the property, leading to the revised plan. Vick reiterated that the basement was a key concern for him. K. Purtilo stated that they would be willing to comply with a 10-foot setback. Vick agreed but emphasized that the walkway should be included to ensure the property does not exceed the 25% impervious coverage limit. Mol suggested adding a condition to ensure compliance with this limit.

Nelson confirmed that an as-built survey would be conducted as part of obtaining the Certificate of Occupancy. K. Purtilo added that a walkway already exists but had not been included in the site plan.

- J. Neumann moved to approve the request to construct a new single-family dwelling 10 ft. from the east side yard property line CONDITIONED the property does not exceed 25% and an as-built survey is required. Site plan noted Exhibit A and building plans noted Exhibit B. Seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **RYAN BLAKE** – New

LOCATION: 4678 Fillmore Ave NW – RAMSEY LAKE HEIGHTS LOT-063 LTS 62 &63, Section 07, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Ramsey Lake - Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #: 210-024-000630 Property owners: RYAN BLAKE & KAISA BLAKE

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 and 155.090(B)(12) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow a new home to be serviced by a holding tank.

Present: Ryan Blake and Berine Miller with MSTs

- A. Ogle displayed the proposed site plan and viewed the request. The request is located at 4678 Fillmore Ave NW in Maple Lake Township, 0.63 acres, zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R-1), and located on Ramsey Lake. A variance was granted in 2018 to allow a new home on a Type IV septic system that would be 68.7 ft. from the lake. That variance has since expired and this request is to allow a new single-family dwelling that would be serviced by a holding tank. A variance is required because the ordinance states that holding tanks shall not be used as a sanitary system for a new residential dwelling. The Township did not provide a direct response to Planning & Zoning; however, a text message from Bernie Miller (via Vern Haag, Township Supervisor) indicated that the Township approved the request. No written responses from the public have been received.
- B. Miller clarified that the Township had an assistant clerk at the meeting, so the minutes have not yet been posted, but the request was approved. Around 1998, the Township explored solutions for sewer problems on this side of the lake, which were also of concern to the state. Options such as connecting to City Sewer or creating a community system were considered. Since then, several new Type IV systems and holding tanks have been installed. This lot consists of two combined lots with a steep slope that, while not classified as a bluff, creates challenges for a mound system. Miller examined two potential locations for a Type IV system. Near the road contains fill soil and would pose a high risk due to the slope and soil conditions. Within the driveway area there is also contains disturbed soil, making installation very difficult. The owner's intention is to use the structure as a true cabin, not a permanent residence. A holding tank is considered an appropriate solution as long as the building remains a cabin. If the property were to be used as a full-time residence, there is space near the lake for a full system. However, constructing a mound system near the lake would be challenging due to the presence of large trees, accessibility issues, and poor soil conditions. A reduced-size mound system has been designed, which is permitted with pretreatment and a Type IV system. However, Type IV systems are not always ideal for seasonal use when the property is unoccupied for extended periods. At present he feels a holding tank is the best option but a Type IV system remains a potential future solution if needed.

C. Public Comment

- Chiemi Eley – A resident living across the lake and a member of the Ramsey Lake Association. She attended to gather information on the proposal. She emphasized that due to past septic system leaks, the association is working to be more aware of available options. However, she stated that their intent is not to restrict development.

- D. Blake noted that, based on the Township's opinion, a holding tank would be a better option for the lake in terms of preventing leaks.
- E. Neumann asked whether the City has plans to extend sewer services to the Ramsey Lake area. Given its proximity to the City and the number of homes around the lake, he suggested that using a holding tank temporarily might be the best option if in the future City sewer will be in the area. Miller explained that in the late 1990s or early 2000s, this part of the lake created a Subordinate Service District to explore special projects, including a community sewer system. However, due to mixed support and concerns over what annexation would entail, the project did not move forward. Advances in septic technology have since led to the installation of many Type IV systems, resolving most of the previous issues. Miller does not anticipate City sewer expansion or annexation occurring for at least 10-20 years, if not longer. Neumann also questioned whether the variance would apply to future owners. Ogle confirmed that the variance would follow the property, but any future request for an addition or extra bedrooms would possibly require septic system modifications or updates. Neumann inquired about holding tank maintenance, including how often it would be pumped and whether a contract is required. Miller explained that Wright County does not actively enforce holding tank agreements. Typically, agreements state the tank must be pumped as needed to prevent overflow and the owner must contact a service provider when the tank reaches 75% capacity. The tank's capacity is monitored using manual float systems (e.g., a bobber setup) or an electronic notification alarm in the home. Neumann also asked whether all household water (e.g., water softener discharge) would flow into the holding tank. Miller clarified that water softener discharge and furnace condensation are not supposed to go into the holding tank, but most household wastewater does.
- F. Mol feels that Neumann's questions covered the area's history. He acknowledged the steep embankments and septic challenges. He supports holding tanks over septic systems near the lake for water quality reasons.
- G. Vick supported the plan and inquired whether there would be room for a future garage. Blake responded that there is space near the turnaround area, but it is also the same location used for pumping the holding tank, making it less than ideal. Vick questioned the definition of a cabin versus a home. Ogle stated that if a structure meets single-family dwelling standards, it is considered a home, even if used recreationally. Ogle reminded the applicant that the existing cabin must be either removed or converted as part of new home build. Vick asked whether a holding pond could be used to catch overflow from the tank. Bernie was unsure how that would work given the elevations. He noted that holding tanks typically back up into the home before overflowing.
- H. Aarestad agreed that a holding tank is the best option to protect lake quality and supported the request.
- I. Mol moved to approve the request is to allow a new single-family dwelling that would be serviced by a holding tank with the site plan noted as Exhibit A, building plans noted Exhibit B, septic plan noted Exhibit C. Motion seconded by Neumann.

DISCUSSION: Neumann suggested adding a stormwater management plan, but Mol stated this was not discussed and no variances were requested for home placement or lot coverage so he isn't sure how a stormwater plan relate to what is being asked. Neumann suggested adding a pumping plan requirement. Mol agreed, and the motion was amended.

Mol moved to amend the motion to include a condition that a noted plumbing plan is on record.
Neumann seconded.

Ogle stated that the existing cabin will be addressed as part of the house permit process, but he recommended adding a condition requiring that plans for either converting or removing the existing cabin be submitted at the time of the building permit application to ensure there are not two homes on the property.

Mol moved to amend the motion to include a condition that plans for the existing cabin either being converted or removed be submitted at time of building permit application so there are not two homes on the property. Seconded by Neumann.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting adjourned at 10:07 am.

Respectfully submitted,



Aaron Ogle
Planning & Zoning Planner

AO: sld

CC: Board of Adjustment
Applicants/Owners
Twp. Clerks