

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Meeting of: December 5, 2025
MINUTES

The Wright County Board of Adjustment met on Friday, December 5, 2025 at 8:30 a.m. in the County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Paul Aarestad. With members present being Dan Mol, Bob Neumann, Dan Vick & Bruce Maue. Representing the Planning & Zoning Office was Aaron Ogle, Planner. Brian Wold, Assistant County Attorney, legal counsel, was also present.

ACTION ON MINUTES FOR THE NOVEMBER 7, 2025 MEETING

On a motion by Vick, seconded by Mol, the minutes for the November 7th meeting were approved as printed.

Abstained: Maue as this was his first official meeting.

1. **JOAN K KOTILA** – Cont. 11/7

LOCATION: COUNTY ROAD 3 NW & COUNTY ROAD 35 W – the majority of the entire SW 1/4 along with part of the SW1/4 OF SE1/4, Section 34, Township 120, Range 28, Wright County, MN (French Lake Twp.) Tax # 209-000-343200 & 209-000-343401. Property Owners: JOAN K KOTILA

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.048(G) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow for an entitlement division that does not meet the minimum road frontage requirements.

Ogle called for applicants or representatives 3 times. No one present yet.
Vick motioned to move item to end of meeting. Maue seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **MICHAEL FITZGERALD** – Cont. 11/7

LOCATION: 6997 PILGER AVE NW - SHADY NOOK REPLAT & ADDN LOT B, Section 28, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, MN (Southside Twp.) Tax # 217-068-000020 Property Owners: CHERYL A KREOFKY

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F) & 155.057(E) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to convert the existing homes crawl space into a full basement which is located within the shoreland and side yard setbacks.

Present: Mike Fitzgerald

A. Ogle displayed building plans and reviewed the request. The property is located at 6997 Pilger Ave NW in Southside Township. The property is 0.43 acres, zoned Urban/Rural Transition, and located on West Lake Sylvia which is classified as General Development. The request to convert the existing homes crawl space into a full basement which is located within the shoreland, and side yard setbacks was continued from the

November 7, 2025, meeting as the Board wanted more information such as the elevation of the “crawl space” and total impervious surface coverage. The applicant was able to provide information showing that the lowest floor elevation meets the minimum required and that the existing impervious surface coverage exceeds the 25% maximum. He reminded the board the proposed request would not be further increasing impervious surface and the existing home was permitted as an exact replacement. A variance is required to convert the existing homes crawl space into a full basement. The home itself is located within the shoreland and side yard setbacks. The Township approves of the request because it makes sense, there is no change to the footprint of existing home and allows for better use of space. A written response from the public was submitted that recommends the variance be approved.

- B. Fitzgerald stated that the 35% impervious coverage was grandfathered in for the property, but he is requesting additional space. He will get the impervious area back to 25% by removing gravel and concrete and replacing it with grass and other landscape materials. Additionally, the Board had requested information about the elevation on the lowest level, which exceeds the 1055 ft. minimum as they are at 1058 ft.
- C. There were no public comments.
- D. Mol stated that in his view, as he said in November meeting, this is like an after-the-fact variance since the home was rebuilt as an exact replacement. Mol expressed concern that approving such a request could set a precedent for others living around the area allowing them to build with removable ceilings and later seek variances. Or that the future property owners of this lot would come back asking for future variances as well. Although he understands the situation, he does not want to establish a precedent. Fitzgerald responded that he understands the concern and reminded the Board that at the previous meeting Ogle stated this was not a precedent setting variance request. Fitzgerald had previously discussed with Rhineberger and his predecessor Riley, that they do the 6 ft. with beams and come back after a few years to ask for a variance. Mol pointed out that over the years rule and regulations have been added, that probably didn't exist in the 50's, when the original cabin was probably built, and in the end it is the Board's responsibility is to protect the lake. Mol mentioned he must think about the future too and if the property gets sold and then eventually becomes a year-round residence. He acknowledged it is too close to the water, and he is concerned about the protection of the lake. Fitzgerald said the variance doesn't change the footprint of the house or change the septic location. When they bought the property, they removed quite a bit of the impervious coverage already there. They are trying to maintain the lake as much as they can.
- E. Vick reiterated his previous concern about the elevation and the impervious coverage. He said if the applicant removes the bunkhouse cabin and goes above & beyond the impervious requirement that he'd be more willing to approve the variance request. Fitzgerald stated that he was certainly willing to go under the 25% impervious coverage and entertain removal of the bunkhouse. He explained the measures he would take to achieve lessening the impervious coverage by pointing out things on his lot survey that was displayed for the Board to see. Vick mentioned that even though this wouldn't set precedents it would be viewed as such to others maybe if Fitzgerald takes the steps to improve the impervious coverage.
- F. Neumann mentioned after he understood more of the situation and that the footprint was not changing that he would be fine with the request, if the applicant improved the impervious coverage. He feels that if this were a new build the impervious would be required to be met. He doesn't feel this request is an

unreasonable request and that the applicant can reach the impervious coverage. they would make the owners of the lot meet that requirement anyways if it was a new build so he doesn't see it as an unreasonable request and feels that the applicant can reach that impervious coverage anyway they want.

- L. Maue voiced his thoughts about the closeness to the lake already existing and agreed with Neumann about getting the impervious coverage down to the 25%.
- M. Aarestad feels that the applicant is following prior Planning & Zoning department advice and is not acting in malus He felt that Fitzgerald addressed what the Board had asked him to in the previous meeting and has demonstrated the elevation meets requirements and how to reduce the impervious coverage. Aarestad is fine with granting the variance.
- N. Neumann motioned to grant the request to convert the existing home crawl space into a full basement which is located within the shoreland and side yard setbacks. CONDITIONED that all required septic standards are met, must obtain any required building permits, and impervious surface is reduced to 25% or less. Building plans noted Exhibit A. Motion seconded by Maue.

DISCUSSION: Vick said he would like to see additional impervious coverage removed and that the motion should also include removing the bunkhouse. Vick questioned if there is intention to require the bunkhouse be removed. His concern is that without removing the bunkhouse if only gravel and other yard coverage is removed those are things easily brought back to the property, but removal of the bunkhouse would address that concern. Neumann stated his intent is allowing the applicant to do what he chooses to get down to that 25% impervious. Fitzgerald stated he would remove the bunkhouse.

VOTE: Aarestad, Neumann, Maue & Vick

NAY: Mol

MOTION CARRIED

3. **CAP CUSTOM HOMES** – New

LOCATION: 6356 PILGER AVE NW – COATES P BULL ADDN LOT-020, Section 33, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, MN (Southside Twp.) Tax # 217-022-000200. Property Owners: LANSE C & LIVIA D LANG

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.049(F) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a new home and water-oriented accessory structure that would be located within the road setback.

Present: Bernie Miller of MSTs & Al Evavold with CAP Custom Homes

- A. Ogle displayed building plans and reviewed the request. The property is located at 6356 Pilger Ave NW in Southside Township. The property is 0.80 acres, zoned Urban/Rural Transition, and located on East Lake Sylvia which is classified as General Development. A variance was granted in 1997 to allow decking on the home and attached to the guest house. A variance was granted in 1999 to allow a 36 ft. x 40 ft. attached garage with house expansion above that which would be 51 ft. from the centerline of township road. The Board also granted a 24 ft. x 28 ft. addition to the existing garage to be in line with the existing building which is approximately 5 ft. from the property line. It was conditioned that the garage could not be used for a business or living space. This request is to construct a new home 26.9 ft. from the centerline of Pilger Ave NW and water-oriented accessory structure 33 ft. from the centerline of Pilger Ave NW. A variance is required to construct a new home or water-oriented accessory structure within the 65 ft. road setback. The Township recommends approval as it improves the impervious coverage, they are upgrading the septic, the Township does not maintain the road, and parcel size limits the building location. No written responses from the public have been received.
- B. Miller informed the Board about the unique shape of the property being long and skinny. He discussed with the applicants about trying to consolidate some of the existing structures into the new design to free up some of the impervious coverage. He went through several designs to have the house fit in the setbacks and right-of-way (ROW) as the Township road angles into the lot. He explained the biggest challenge is a 33 ft. ROW and a Township road that doesn't go down the center of the ROW. Miller stated the proposed plan would take the building coverage down to 14.4%, under the 15% required. While the current impervious coverage is at 27.6%, they would be able to get the impervious coverage down to 24.9%. He noted that Southside Township approved the proposed plans. Miller then handed the Board a printout packet which showed the only space left on the lot to build with-in all the setbacks, the proposed house shape with the variance requested setback from the ROW, a diagram showing the proposed house with ROW and corner of house not meeting setback requirements and lastly a diagram showing the proposed house shape and coverage overlaying the building space available within the normal setbacks.
- C. Evavold stated the current driveway would stay in the same location and when he discussed the plans with the Township they were okay with what is proposed. He noted that the well would be staying in the same place, as would the current septic system for now.
- D. There were no public comments.
- E. Vick stated he did not have a lot of issues with the proposal except for the corner of the house being so close to the roadway and an accident waiting to happen. Evavold informed the Board of an existing dirt embankment covered with pine trees that would block the corner of the house from the road. Vick asked for clarification on the distance of the home from the driving surface with Miller stating roughly 16 ft. Miller referenced Beacon and explained that because the road is a dead end there would be very little traffic, outside of limited residents, on the road. Miller stated that he has done other jobs requiring variances in the

same area and the lots were all narrow like this one requesting the variance. He went on to explain that the road is not maintained by the Township and reiterated there is very little traffic on the road. Vick voiced his concern of safety with the corner of the proposed dwelling so close to the road.

- F. Neumann stated that he would not support the proposal as-is. He referenced the current size of the house at 2,582 sq. ft. and the proposed new home is 5,010 sq. ft., double the size of the existing home. Neumann believed that the new owners could build smaller which would eliminate the need for a variance request. There is a big difference in elevation between the lake to the North end of the property, but even with that he feels a 5,000 sq. ft. building will dwarf homes in the area. He mentioned the proposed home is only 16 ft. off the driving surface and that the road was probably not going to change. He feels that the Board would not usually allow a completely new structure to be built 6 ft. inside the road's ROW. He went on to reiterate that he is not in support with what is currently proposed.
- G. Mol had concerns about the new home being more like roughly 10,000 sq. ft. once the square footage of the first, second floor, and garage is added together. He stated that the current lot already has a 52 ft. road setback variance and now they are asking to be 26 ft. He could understand a 50 ft. variance, as that is what currently exists but in the end what is the practical difficulty for such a big home and increased variance to the road.
- H. Evavold explained the existing 3-story home has a 1,300 sq. ft. foundation and the proposed house has a 2,700 sq. ft. foundation with the majority of the new footprint being the garage. Miller added that the proposed house would gain almost 1,000 sq. ft. in the breezeway, that would attach the garage to the home. Miller reiterated that the road ROW and setback requirements added a level of difficulty that played a role in the home design and went on to acknowledge that the new house would be bigger but that it would still be under the 15% building coverage limit. He mentioned that this size home would seem normal in comparison to all the other houses on the southside of the peninsula of the same lake but they don't have the road issue. Miller pointed out other homes in the area don't have the road as a side yard setback and that when the area was originally developed about an additional 33 ft. of property would have helped the situation. He feels that practical difficulty is the road and is not something that the applicant created.
- I. Mol noted the diagram provided by Miller has about 309 sq. ft. at 32 ft. from the ROW and asked how much that impacts the redesign of the home to make the home fit. Mol stated he is seeing his neighbors at about 45 ft. from the road and what is being asked is roughly half that at 26 ft. Miller responded, saying there may be some home design changes that could occur. Initially they talked about maybe pushing closer to the lake, but it was decided to go with the road variance and treat the ROW more like a side yard. The proposed house plan submitted only involves one variance needed. Mol stated as of now he does have a challenge with what is proposed.
- J. Maue understands the unique challenge of the lot shape but feels the applicant knew the limitations with the lot when it was purchased and feel that the setbacks could still be met if the proposed house design was downsized. He mentioned that if it were downsized in square footage the applicant could get closer to the road setback requirements and equalize the size with other homes in the neighborhood.
- K. Aarestad informed the applicants that at this time the Board could move forward with a vote, the request could be withdrawn, or the item could be continued to the next meeting and allow time for a redesign with the aforementioned ideas.
- L. Miller asked if the Board members would approve if the design was adjusted down to 32 ft. from the current ROW. Vick stated that it would be 16 ft. less than what was originally being asked for. Neumann pointed out there is ability to access onto 64th street and because of a new build there is an opportunity to use 64th street as an access. Aarestad stated the two main concerns he is hearing is the proposed house size needed its

be addressed and the other is the ROW setback. He is hearing there could be other alternatives to look at as well.

- M. Miller asked if there should be any discussion about the boathouse location since it doesn't meet the setback. He noted the building can be moved 10 ft. from the ordinary high-water mark (OHW) if needed. Ogle clarified the requirements for having a water-oriented accessory structure which included noting they still need to meet the road setback. Aarestad stated he was fine with the proposed boathouse location. Neumann said he was fine with the proposed boathouse as well, since it is not the main residence and living quarters. He reiterated the house is his main concern. Mol asked Aarestad if the boathouse should meet with the house setback requirements too, at 33 ft. and stay consistent.
- N. Aarestad said he had examined the Google street view of the location and look at the road. He feels the fence and existing berm type area has been in place for some time and there have not been issues or concerns.
- O. Mol asked how much of the existing trees on the lot would be cleared for the construction of the new house? He understands trees can be replaced but his concern is lake view and having a lot completely cleared of trees. He asked how much of the lot will be cleared? Miller said he wasn't 100% sure but when they looked at the existing survey not all the trees were listed in all areas of the property. He added that they planned on clearing a few trees between the proposed house and road but nothing major since the proposal is to build in proposed to almost the same spot of the lot as the existing home. Miller said the lot was already set up for the proposed design so extensive grading is not needed
- O. Vick added that if Pilger Ave was straight he would have no problem approving the variance, but he felt it was too narrow for the proposed design. Aarestad asked if the applicants had enough information to make their decision of whether to withdraw or continue. Miller verified that they would continue the item to the next meeting and work on addressing the comments made.
- P. Mol motioned to continue the item to the January 9th meeting to allow the applicant time to review plans. Motion seconded by Neumann.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4 . **JAMES GELLERMAN** –New

LOCATION: 8824 51ST St NW – Lots 19 & 20, Block 1, Swartout Beach Addition, according to plat of record, and part of road, Section 03, Township 120, Range 27, Wright County, MN (Albion Twp.) Tax 201-023-001190. Property Owners: JAMES M GELLERMAN

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F), & 155.057(E)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct an addition to an existing accessory building that is located within the road and side yard setback.

Present: James Gellerman

- A. Ogle displayed building plans and reviewed the request. The request is located at 8824 51st St. NW in Albion Township. The property is 0.95 acres, zoned Urban/Rural Transition, and located on Swartout Lake which is classified as Natural Environment. In 2016 a variance was granted to allow a 3 ft. x 22 ft. addition to the detached garage that would be 4 ft. from the public right-of-way, 20.5 ft. from the centerline of the road, and 5.5 ft. from the side property line. This request is to construct a 320 sq. ft. addition to an existing 280 sq. ft. accessory building. The closest part of the building would be 5.2 ft. from the east side property line and 28 ft. from the centerline of 51st. St. NW. A variance is required to construct an addition to an existing accessory building that is located within the 20 ft. side yard setback or 65 ft. road setback. The Township recommends approval because the current structure already exists and it is consistent with the other properties in the neighborhood. Noted it will be going on the opposite side of the road. No written responses from the public were received.
- B. Gellerman mentioned that due to the skinny lot he would need a variance to be that close to the neighbor's property, who he spoke to, and they were alright with. He also explained the reason for his request is that he needs a covered storage spot for his plow truck due to the unmaintained road and neighbors requesting his clearing assistance.
- C. There were no public comments.
- D. Neumann saw this request at the Albion Township meeting and noted that the hardship for this variance is due to the lower elevation towards the lake causing the existing buildings and septic being closer to the road (51stSt.). He noted all along the road there are buildings close to the road. He added that the Township has wanted to take over the road, but the residents cannot all agree and if that were done some of the buildings would certainly be in the road and right-of-way (ROW) if that happened. Neumann noted that the Township did approve Gellerman's request for the variance and he would support it too.
- E. Mol voiced concern with the construction process of the addition impacting the existing septic mound. The applicant would be building away from the road and is only asking for 12 more inches, leaving space to maintain the building and mow around without being on the neighbor's property. He mentioned that even though the building will be close to the neighbor's the property will still meet the criteria of 25% impervious coverage, so Mol felt for just requesting 12 extra inches, he was okay to approve the request.
- F. Vick agreed with Mol but wanted to know if the septic system would need to be tested. Ogle stated he spoke the Environmental Health staff and the comment made was to make sure the applicants are not damaging the septic system. Vick asked about the corner of the building's proximity to the septic system as it looked like the corner was right on top of the system. Ogle reiterated that according to a septic person in our office, it should not be a problem if they are careful during construction. Vick stated he was not opposed to the variance but gave a suggestion for possibly putting a pole barn on the other side of the garage and alleviating the need for a variance. Vick clarified he was not opposed to what is proposed.

- H. Maue and Aarestad stated they were okay with the variance request.
- P. Mol motioned to approve the request to construct a 320 sq. ft. addition to an existing 280 sq. ft. accessory building. The closest part of the building would be 5 ft. 2 in. from the east side property line and 28 ft. from the centerline of 51st St. NW. Site plan noted Exhibit A and building plans Exhibit B. Motion seconded by Vick.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **MARY SPIKE** – New

LOCATION: 9447 20TH ST NW – part of NW1/4 OF NE1/4 with part of the E1/2OF W1/2OF SW1/4 OF NE1/4&NW1/4OF SE1/4 along with part of W1/2 OF SW1/4 OF SE1/4, Section 28, Township 120, Range 27, Wright County, MN (Albion Twp.) Tax # 201-000-281200, -284101, 284300. Property Owners: ROSE MARY PRIBYL, DAVID D SPIKE REVTR & MARY M SPIKE REVTR

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 adjust the property boundary between PID 201-000-281200 and PID 201-000-084101.

Present: Matt Spike (Dave & Mary's son) and Joe Pribyl (son of Rosy, the other lot's property owner)

- A. Ogle displayed building plans and reviewed the request. The request is for a lot line adjustment in Albion Township. The properties involved are PID 201-000-281200 which is 29.94 acres, 201-000-284101 which is 50.19 acres, and 201-000-284300 which is 15.09 acres. All parcels are zoned General Agriculture and are listed as Agricultural in the Land Use Plan. The request is to add approximately 10.0 acres from PID 201-000-281200 to PID 201-000-284101. The Township recommends approval because it will allow the land to be kept in AG and no building entitlements are being moved. No written responses from the public have been received.
- B. There were no comments from the applicant or public.
- C. Mol pointed out that the owners have 218 ft. of road frontage and asked Spike if they would be adding road frontage on 20th St. NW for the property once the strip of land is acquired. Ogle noted that strip would need to be owned with the other parcels on the plan. There's been different interpretations over the years by zoning administrators on whether the road frontage needs to be contiguous, or whether, you just needed 300 ft. total. PID 201-000-284300 was approved administratively, and the landlocked parcel (PID# 201-000-284101) needs to be owned with it. Mol voiced his concern with the road frontage issue and how the land will be affected in the future. The 200 ft. strip down the road being left seems weird to him and there may be other future variances asked for and causing future problems in Planning & Zoning.
- D. Vick asked for clarification of who owned which parcel shown in the aerial image. Ogle clarified who the owners of each parcel were and the lot line adjustment that they were requesting. Vick also asked if there were any building entitlements on the parcels. Ogle stated there would be no transfer of building eligibility. There was a deed restriction in 2000 that divided off a piece, which they gave to a family member. Matt Spike verified it was him. So, it left the rest restricted on that plot. Ogle referred to some research he did stating PID 201-000-281200 was a lot of record which has one building eligibility that remains with the existing home. Ogle concluded that there should be no transfer of entitlements and there should not be any extra on Spike's specific piece of land.
- E. Neumann asked if the applicants had discussed between the two of them perhaps splitting off a 10 acre area with the buildings of Mr. Pribyl's and take over and having the Spikes purchase the rest of PID 201-000-281200. The applicants responded saying, "not yet." Neumann pointed out that if they combined lots into the middle parcel it would probably alleviate some of Mr. Mol's concerns about future road frontage issues. Neumann thought heading off any problems before they start would be key in this situation and that the Pribyl's & Spikes should discuss purchasing a larger portion of 281200.
- F. Maue agreed and thought it would be a good idea to do the division for correct road access and frontage for there to be no issues in the future.

- G. Aarestad added a different take on the request highlighting that PID 201-000-284101 would be gaining additional acreage preserving more farmland, which is part of the county's long-range plan. How it would affect the building entitlements is another matter. Aarestad stated that he would be ok with the proposed request and listed some options for how the applicants could proceed based on the information they heard from the Board members. Ogle clarified that the actual request was not for a variance but for a lot line adjustment regarding criteria for approval. Pribyl motioned for Rose Mary Pribyl to come up so the applicants could discuss options with her and asked if they could be able to move a property line over or did the Board members think the applicants would have to sell everything around the homestead with the woods. Spike asked to clarify if the members had mentioned 8.2 acres which would make it over 5 acres, but he couldn't remember if there was a rule on that.
- H. Mol asked Ogle to pull up Beacon on the screen to look and measure out if the applicants were to meet the 300 ft. road frontage where would that put them on the buildings. Ogle asked the applicants if they had any livestock in their buildings or the intention of having any in the future due to the difference in setbacks for those. The applicants all responded with "No". Ogle wanted to make known to the applicants that the Board was trying to accommodate the applicants request but also save them from any potential headaches down the road. He measured an approximate 12 acres in regard to Mol's question about the 300 ft. road frontage. Aarestad asked Mol to confirm if that would solve future planning and zoning issues, Mol verified it would. The applicants were ok with the lot line adjustment option.
- I. Mol motioned to approve the addition of approximately 12 acres from PID 201-000-281200 to PID 201-000-284101 and that it requires 300 ft. of road frontage on 20th St. NW, subject to survey, subject to administrative order tying the approximate 12 acres to PID 201-000-284101. Concept plan noted Exhibit A. Motion seconded by Neumann.

Discussion: Pribyl asked if Spike would gain a building entitlement with this adjustment. Aarestad verified it would not.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **DOUGLAS DUSKE** – New

LOCATION: 2681 80TH ST SW – PART OF W1/2OF NE1/4OF NW1/4 in Section 15, Township 118, Range 26, Wright County, MN (Woodland Twp.) Tax 220-000-152100. Property Owners: DOUGLAS K DUSKE

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Sections 155.026 and 155.048 of Chapter 155 & Section 152.027 of Chapter 152, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow a feedlot and livestock building within 100 ft. of a property line.

Present: Douglas Duske and Tracy Janikula P&Z Feedlot Administrator.

- A. Ogle displayed building plans and reviewed the request. It is located at 2681 80th St. SW in Woodland Township. The property is 14.5 acres and zoned General Agriculture. The existing Feedlot/Livestock building is 100 ft. from property lines, and this request is to allow the feedlot and livestock building to be 83 ft. from the east property line whereas 100 ft. setback is required. The Township approves of the request. The neighbor to the East who owns PID 220-000-152102 submitted written comment stating they had no objections.
- B. There were no comments from the applicant or public.
- C. Vick stated he was curious about the 500 ft. for feedlots. Janikula stated that the property already has over 10 animal units resulting in the 500 ft. setback from neighbors. There are no houses within 500 ft. but there is a neighboring lot. Ogle showed a visual of approximate distances from where the building in the request is to the three nearest neighboring residences. Duske stated that Terry, the neighbor to the East who wrote in with comments, knows exactly what's going on.
- E. Neumann stated that since the neighbor and Woodland Twp approved then he was ok with the variance too.
- F. Mol asked the applicant about prior variances granted. Duske stated it wasn't about livestock previously. Mol asked if there was no variance really needed then. Ogle clarified the setback regulations and referred to the aerial image shown with the proposed lines drawn to help explain the new fencing that would be installed. Mol confirmed with the applicant that there would be no building added. Duske and Janikula verified there would be no building, just fencing added outside of an existing building for livestock use. Mol was fine with the request.
- G. Maue and Aarestad stated they were fine with the request as well.
- H. Vick motioned to approve the feedlot and livestock building at 83 ft. from the East property line, noting site plan as Exhibit A. Motion seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. **AARON HORSCH** – New

LOCATION: 10340 COUNTY ROAD 5 SW– PRT OF SW1/4OF NW1/4, Section 30, Township 118, Range 27, Wright County, MN (Victor Twp.) Tax 219-000-302300. Property Owners: AARON B & STACY L HORSCH

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.048(F) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a storage building within the rear yard setback.

Present: Aaron Horsch

- A. Ogle displayed building plans and reviewed the request. It is located at 10340 County Road 5 SW in Victor Township. The property is 2.58 acres and zoned General Agriculture. Deed Restriction from 1994 allowed the referenced parcel to be divided out of 219-000-303200. The request is to construct a 40 ft. x 60 ft. (2,400 sq. ft.) storage building 15 ft. from the rear property line. A variance is required to construct a 40 ft. x 60 ft. (2,400 sq. ft.) storage building 15 ft. from the rear property line because AG zoned properties between 2.5-4.99 acres require a 30 ft. rear yard setback. The Township recommends approval of the request as there is no other good location for the shed on the property and it would be tillable land that is in the same family. No written responses from the public have been received.
- B. The comments from the public came from Troy Lange, a Victor Twp Supervisor in support of the applicant's request. He referenced the displayed lots and stated the Twp felt the Horsch's had enough room to build the shed and that the location was a reasonable spot when taking water flow and drainage on the lot into account,
- C. Neumann asked the applicant what prevented him from meeting the 30 ft. setback requirements. Neumann felt the building could be placed somewhere else on the property to meet those setbacks. Horsch explained the topography of the lot, typical drainage areas and the septic mound placement would prevent it from going in some spots. Ogle did mention the property is off a county road which has a setback twice as much as a township road. Neumann thought the setbacks could still be met in the back corner of the lot where the proposed structure would go or the applicant could move it to a different spot on the lot where it fit within the setbacks.
- E. Mol asked Horsch if there would be any gravel roads or pathways to the structure constructed for access and the applicant stated there would not. Mol also asked if Horsch tills the farm field behind their lot and he stated he does since it's a part of his family's land. Ogle noted that while the farm behind their property may be theirs, it technically has a different ownership name. Mol asked Ogle for more clarification of the setbacks for this lot. Ogle stated that the lot has 10 ft. side yards setbacks and a 30 ft. rear yard setback. Mol expressed that he would be ok approving the proposed site for the building.
- H. Vick offered the suggestion of putting it on the garage side of the house for noise reduction for the applicants. He felt where the shed is proposed to go may be troublesome for future owners.
- I. Maue asked what the structure would be used for on the property? Horsch stated that it would house his lawn mowers and be extra storage for other things. Maue asked if the proposed building could be angled or placed closer towards the house to meet setbacks. Horsch agreed that it could but that he likes it better at the proposed site.
- J. Aarestad stated that since the lot is in a rural area and taking into consideration the possible future of it, he is fine with the proposed placement as-is. Aarestad listed some options for the applicant before moving to a vote on the item.

- K. Vick asked again what the hardship was for meeting the setback requirements. Aarestad stated that was a valid question, but his opinion was that the requested setback variance was reasonable for the rural area of the parcel.
- L. Mol said it was not exactly what the applicant wanted but asked if moving the proposed location of the building would be an option for them. Horsch stated that if it was placed towards the front of the lot that it would block their front view.
- M. Aarestad asked Horsch if he would like to withdraw their application, go home and think about some of the suggestions and continue the item to the next meeting, or by having the Board go ahead and vote? The applicant did not readily respond.
- N. Mol addressed the Board asking that since the Twp representative was present should they consider it as a good sign to approve the variance. Vick asked Troy Lange, the Twp representative to come up to the front again. Lange pointed out how different areas of the lot would probably not work if Horsch were to move the proposed building's site.
- O. Maue stated he thinks turning the building 90 degrees would improve the view from the house and meet the setback. Ogle displayed the aerial view on Beacon for a visual reference. The applicant was not ready to make a decision.
- P. Neumann motioned to continue the item at the January 9th BOA meeting. Motion seconded by Vick.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Ogle clarified the options to the applicant including a withdrawal if they changed the proposed to no longer need a variance request.*

1. **JOAN K KOTILA** – Cont. 11/7 **Carried over from beginning of meeting**

LOCATION: COUNTY ROAD 3 NW & COUNTY ROAD 35 W – the majority of the entire SW 1/4 along with part of the SW1/4 OF SE1/4, Section 34, Township 120, Range 28, Wright County, MN (French Lake Twp.) Tax # 209-000-343200 & 209-000-343401. Property Owners: JOAN K KOTILA

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.048(G) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow for an entitlement division that does not meet the minimum road frontage requirements.

Present: Bernie Miller & Nathan Lake

- A. Ogle displayed the proposed plan and reviewed the request. There are two parcels directly involved in the request, PID 209-000-343200 which is an approximate 21.54 acre lot of record and PID 209-000-343401 which is approximately 163.54 acres. Both parcels are zoned General Agriculture. PID 209-000-343200 is a lot of record which has one (1) building eligibility and not considered part of the “farm” for entitlement calculation purposes as it was purchased in 2024 by Joan Kotila. PID 209-000-343401 is part of the “farm” which also includes PID 209-000-344200, PID 209-000-344400, and PID 209-000-353200. A 2024 Deed Restriction stated there are four (4) remaining entitlements on the “farm”, one (1) of the four (4) is being used by the existing home on PID 209-000-344400. The request to allow a 10.0-acre entitlement division that included approximately 2.5 acres of prime soils and used a 66-foot access strip to provide public road frontage was continued from the November 7, 2025 meeting so the applicant could reassess their proposal based on discussion amongst the Board. Some discussion regarding an updated plan was for a 66-foot access strip, not exceeding 10.0 acres, use existing property boundaries, keep property lines straight, and possibly exceeding 2.5 acres of prime soils. The updated request is to allow a 10.0-acre entitlement division that includes approximately 3.8 acres of prime soils and uses a 66-foot access strip to provide public road frontage. A variance is required for an entitlement division that exceeds 10.0 acres in total size, 2.5 acres of prime soil, or does not meet road frontage requirements. The Township had initially approved of their request to avoid low land disturbance by the driveway and allow easier use for farmland on the parcels. The Township approved their original plan as well as approving the updated plan to allow for straight lines which would utilize more prime soil. No written responses from the public were received.
- B. Miller from MSTs explained how he became involved in the project by way of the septic design and helping through the wetland area. He pointed out that soil surveys are not always accurate and are made to use for farming purposes so the Board should consider not basing zoning decisions on the results of those. He thought either proposal could work, but that it is a challenging property with the soils that are there and low land on the lot.
- C. No comments from the Public.
- D. Mol thanked the applicant for looking at the plan again, but he also wanted to note that they do own the whole property, so they could just split off up towards the front of the lot because it's on County Road 35 and then take 10 acres out completely of prime soil. Mol said he could approve their updated request based on the lot shape being squared up like the Board asked them to do at the previous meeting.
- E. Vick agreed with Mol and thanked the applicant for patience and liked the fact that they made the effort to adjust to meet the Board's concerns. He was ok with the updated proposal.
- F. Neumann was also good with the updated proposal and request as the Board had previously suggested to the applicant.

- G. Maue was not at the previous meeting so he could not speak on it.
- H. Mol motioned to approve allowance of a 10 acre entitlement division that includes approximately 3.8 acres of prime soils and uses a 66-foot access strip to ride public road frontage, subject to survey and subject to deed restriction. Concept plan noted exhibit A. Motion seconded by Vick.

Discussion – Miller asked Ogle for clarification. He was concerned about access along the South where a point cuts through the trees. Asked if a bit different on the survey if it would still be ok. Ogle responded, stating that most surveys have slightly different measurements than the plan submitted. It is fine so long as it follows the Board's intent.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Vick motioned to adjourn meeting. Motion seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting adjourned at 10:37 am.

Respectfully submitted,



Aaron Ogle
Planning & Zoning Planner

AO: cb

CC: Board of Adjustment
Applicants/Owners
Twp. Clerks