

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Meeting of: January 9, 2026
MINUTES

The Wright County Board of Adjustment met on Friday, January 9, 2025 at 8:30 a.m. in the County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. With members present being Paul Aarestad, 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.

First meeting of the year, Ogle, acting as Chairman, pro-tem, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and called for nominations for a Chair. Neuman nominated Aarestad as Chair with Mol making a second. Ogle called three times for further nominations, hearing none, a roll call was called, and unanimous ballot cast for Aarestad.

Aarestad assumed the Chair and called for nominations for a Vice-Chair. Vick nominated Neumann as Vice-Chair, with a second by Mol and hearing no further nominations a roll call vote was called with a unanimous ballot cast for Neumann.

Aarestad called for action to adopt the Meeting Calendar for 2026. On a motion by Mol, seconded by Neumann, all voted to adopt the meeting dates at 8:30 a.m. on suggested calendar.

ACTION ON MINUTES FOR THE DECEMBER 5, 2025 MEETING

Vick noted a correction to Item #7, indicating that the motion should reflect Neumann as making the motion and Vick as seconding.

On a motion by Mol, seconded by Vick the minutes for the December 5th meeting were unanimously approved with the noted correction.

1. **CAP CUSTOM HOMES** – Continued from 12/5/2025

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 reminded the Commission of the request being continued from the December 5th meeting so the applicant could reassess their plans based on the Board's discussion. Updated plans were received which adjusted the setback from the centerline of the road as traveled from originally proposed amount of 26.9 ft. to 33.1 ft., with no change in proposed boathouse location. The variance is required to construct either a new home or water-oriented accessory structure within 65 ft. from the centerline of the road as traveled. Ogle noted that the Township approved the original proposal and stated they do not maintain the road and the parcel size limits the building location. No other written comments from the public were received.
- B. Miller noted that the revised plan pulls the garage back and now proposes it at 63.8 feet. He reiterated that the building was moved from 26.9 feet to 33.1 feet, which is consistent with the boathouse, and that there are no other variances requested other than to the centerline of the traveled roadway. He explained that the option of moving the home closer to the lake was considered, as that is where the majority of the ideal buildable area exists, but that option was ultimately rejected. The applicant feels the proposed plan works well with the site elevations and driveway location. Miller presented three exhibits to the Board and reviewed them using the document camera. Exhibit A showed the buildable area with meeting setbacks, Exhibit B showed the portion of the proposed home outside of setback requirements, and Exhibit C showed the proposed home with setback at 65 feet from the lake. Miller noted that moving the home to 65 feet from the OHW would result in very little improvement to the road setback while creating the need for an additional lake setback variance, yielding no real benefit. It was also noted that impervious coverage was reduced from 24.9% to 23.5%.
- C. There were no comments from the public.
- D. Mol stated that he continues to struggle to find a practical difficulty as to why the road setback cannot be met. He noted that the proposed home is quite large and represents a significant increase over the existing structure, with the total size of the home across all levels being approximately 8,000 square feet. He reiterated that he finds it challenging to identify a true hardship based on what has been presented. While he understands the site has limited space to meet setbacks and that a road setback variance may be necessary, he expressed concern that a 33-foot setback to the road centerline is very close and presents a safety issue. He acknowledged that the home is located on a peninsula but noted that it is the first home encountered by traffic traveling the road. Mol referenced the prior meeting discussion indicating that nearby homes are set back 40–45 feet from the centerline, which he had hoped the applicant would return with as a revised proposal.
- E. Vick stated that he shares several of Mol's concerns. He asked whether a baluster or other protective device would be installed to protect the home. Evavold responded that they had explored the option

of an engineered guardrail and that it is a possibility, provided Township approval is obtained. Vick indicated that such a measure would address his safety concerns.

- F. Maue acknowledged that the property is difficult to build on but believes there is an opportunity to reduce the size of the proposed home. He felt that the 33-foot setback is an improvement over the originally proposed 26 feet and that the proposal is moving in the right direction.
- G. Neumann stated that he is disappointed with the 33-foot setback. He referenced the minutes from the prior meeting, which indicated a desire to see something closer to a 50-foot variance, consistent with existing conditions in the area. He stated that he does not see a practical difficulty justifying the house being located so close to the road. Neumann expressed the opinion that the applicant is not out of options and noted that there are larger lots for sale across the lake. He stated that if the goal is to build a large home, this may not be the appropriate lot. He reiterated that he had hoped to see a proposal closer to a 50-foot setback rather than 33 feet.
- H. Aarestad stated that he was initially comfortable with the plan and remains comfortable with what is currently proposed. He felt that a guardrail would be a positive safety feature. Addressing the applicant, he noted that there appears to be sufficient concern among Board members that he is uncertain a motion to approve would pass. He asked whether the applicant would prefer the Board to take a vote or to return with revised plans that address the concerns related to setback distance and square footage.
- I. Miller requested an opportunity to further address the issue of uniqueness. He stated that the location and shift of the roadway are the source of the practical difficulty. Ogle displayed Google Earth Street View images to illustrate the roadway conditions and surrounding structures. Miller explained that the project could have been initiated with the home within the lake setback, requiring several variances, but the applicant instead pursued a plan intended to minimize both the number and impact of variances. He reiterated that the narrowness of the lot significantly limits buildable area.
- J. Aarestad again asked the applicant whether they would like the Board to proceed with a vote or allow additional time to revise the proposal in response to the members' concerns.
- K. Vick asked about the distance to the existing home. Miller stated that the proposed home would be approximately 30 feet closer to the road than the existing structure. Vick stated that he does see a hardship but would prefer a setback closer to 45 feet, which would still be 15 feet closer to the road than existing conditions.
- L. Neumann stated that the property owner was aware of the lot's constraints at the time of purchase and is now requesting a home that is nearly twice the size of the existing structure. He expressed the view that this represents a preference rather than a hardship and that the options are to construct a smaller home or select a different lot that better accommodates the desired size.
- M. Miller stated that the property owner was present and requested time to discuss their next steps.
- N. Mol moved to continue the item to the end of the meeting. Vick seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **AARON HORSCH** – Continued from 12/5/2025

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 and Stacy Horsch

- A. Ogle noted the request was continued from the December meeting so that the applicant could reassess their proposal based on the Boards discussion. He had not received any revised plans since that meeting, so the request stands as what was originally presented. The variance is needed for the proposed storage building to be located 15 ft. from the rear property line as 30 ft. is required. The Township recommend approval of their original request. They said there was no other good location for the shed on the property, and it would abut tillable land that's in the same family.
- B. S. Horsch stated that the plan was not revised, but that they are better prepared to explain the reasoning for the proposed building location. She stated that placing the building at a 30-foot setback would result in wasted space at the rear of the property. She noted that Member Vick had suggested locating the building northwest of the home; however, because the home is situated on a knoll, that option would require a significant amount of fill. She stated that they have lived at the property for 30 years and are familiar with the site's topography and the preferred location for the building. She explained that moving the building 15 feet closer to the home would place it uncomfortably close to the residence, and rotating the building, as previously suggested, would bring it closer to the drain tile serving the home. S. Horsch stated that the hardship is that they have been saving for this shed for 30 years and believe the proposed location is the most suitable for the building.
- C. There were no public comments.
- D. Vick requested that Ogle display the elevations map. He stated that he is not opposed to the shed itself but is struggling to identify a hardship, which is a required finding for the Board. He noted that financial considerations and the cost of fill are not considered hardships. Vick stated that he would prefer to see a lot line adjustment that would provide the additional acreage needed to meet the required 30-foot setback.
- E. Maue confirmed with the applicant that they own the surrounding property, with S. Horsch stating that the adjacent land is owned by her husband and his sister. Maue then asked whether the applicant fully understood the height of the proposed building and the visual impact it would have from their home. S. Horsch stated that they are aware.
- F. Neumann stated that the Board must consider future conditions and ownership, potentially two or three owners down the road. He noted that setback regulations are intended to protect neighboring properties. He stated that the lot may eventually be owned independently of the surrounding farmland and reiterated his position that the 30-foot setback should be maintained. He stated that he has not heard a reason beyond preference for the proposed location and does not find a hardship.

- G. Mol stated that his position remains unchanged from the previous meeting. He asked Ogle to confirm the required setbacks, questioning whether the side yard setback is 15 feet and the rear yard setback is 30 feet. Mol stated that based on the lot configuration shown on the proposed map, it was unclear to him why both setbacks would not be 15 feet. He indicated that the potential hardship or practical difficulty appears to be related to the location of the septic system and the lower elevation of the rear portion of the lot, which may present wetland concerns. He also referenced the drain tile mentioned earlier. Mol stated that he would oppose a lot line adjustment that adds acreage, as it would conflict with farmland preservation goals, a topic frequently discussed by the Board. He stated that the owner would be the primary party impacted by the visual presence of the building and that if they are comfortable with it, he is as well. He stated that he is comfortable with a 15-foot rear yard variance, as the setback is adjacent to a farm field owned by the applicant.
- H. Aarestad stated that he is comfortable with the request as presented and feels the proposal is consistent with the rural character of the area.
- I. Vick added that if the lot line were adjusted, the land could remain in agricultural use. S. Horsch asked whether a lot line adjustment would require returning to the Board. Ogle noted that any expansion of the property, because of the tillable land, may require a variance. Ogle stated that a variance would not be required to reduce the property to 2.49 acres, which would allow the 15-foot rear yard setback. S. Horsch stated that reducing the north side of the property could be an option, as it is lower ground. Ogle clarified that reducing the lot size to 2.49 acres would also change the detached accessory structure coverage limit. The proposed 2,400-square-foot building is the maximum allowed on lots between 1.0 and 2.49 acres; therefore, any additional sheds or accessory buildings would need to be removed.
- J. Mol moved to approve the request to construct a 40 ft. x 60 ft. (2,400 sq. ft.) storage building 15 ft. from the rear property line. Conditioned: Site plan Exhibit A and building plan Exhibit B. Motion seconded by Aarestad.

MOTION FAILED

VOTE: AYE: Mol & Aarestad NAY: Maue, Vick & Neumann

- K. Vick asked whether a motion would be required to adjust the property size to 2.49 acres. Ogle stated that likely could be handled administratively, provided no variances are created. He suggested continuing the item to allow time for the applicant to meet with Planning and Zoning staff to determine whether their objectives could be achieved administratively. If so, the variance request could be withdrawn.
- L. Vick moved to continue the item to the February 6th meeting to allow time for the applicant to review reducing the lot size. Motion seconded by Maue.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **DEANNA LAPLANT** – New

LOCATION: xxxx 25th St. SW – PRT SW1/4OF NE1/4&TH PRT OF NW1/4OF SE1/4, Section 16, Township 119, Range 26, Wright County, MN (Marysville Twp.) Tax # 211-000-161300. Property Owners: CHARLOTTE M LAPLANT

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 exceeds the maximum size and prime soils allowance.

Present: Deanna LaPlant

- A. Ogle displayed the proposed site plan and reviewed the request details. The 61.25 acre property is located off 25th St. SW in Marysville Township. The property is currently zoned General Agriculture (AG) and located on an unnamed lake which is classified as Natural Environment (NE). The request is to allow a 25.8-acre entitlement division, which is approximately 13.0 acres above the lake, which includes approximately 2.6 acres of prime soil. A variance is required for an entitlement division that exceeds 10.0 acres in total size and/or exceeds 2.5 acres of prime soil. The Township approves of the request and no written responses from the public had been received.
- B. LaPlant noted that the proposal is to divide the property along the roadway. She explained that the northern portion of the property is entirely tillable, while the southern parcel would remain a permitted building site. She stated that a large portion of the southern property consists of marshland, which provides an ideal setting for wildlife habitat. LaPlant acknowledged that she has included more than 2.5 acres of tillable land and noted that the remaining tillable acreage is compact and limited in size. She stated that it makes the most sense to retain the entire southern quarter section as a single parcel, as further dividing the tillable area would create issues. She also noted that she spoke with representatives of the church regarding the adjacent cemetery, and they expressed no concerns with the proposal. LaPlant further stated that Township staff did not raise concerns with the request.
- C. Public Comment
- Wayne Bauerschmitt, representing Zion Church and the Swedesburg Cemetery, stated that he has worked with the LaPlant family on clearing and maintaining property lines, including trees. He indicated that there are no concerns with the proposed subdivision, provided that appropriate setbacks, drainage, and utility easements are applied.
- D. Maue stated that he does not see an issue with the request and agreed that reducing the parcel to under 2.5 acres of tillable would likely create more complications than benefits. He stated that he is comfortable with the proposal as presented.
- E. Neumann stated that the roadway serves as a natural barrier and boundary. He asked whether a 25.8-acre parcel could present concerns related to livestock and stated that he would like to see a limitation placed on animal units (AU). He noted that the Board has typically used a standard of 0.5 AU per acre but suggested that in this situation non-grazable areas be excluded and that the calculation focus on acreage above the lake.
- F. Mol stated that he agrees with the comments made by other Board members.

- G. Vick stated that he agrees with the discussion but would like any motion to include an animal unit limitation of 6.5 AUs, based on usable high ground acreage. Ogle noted that the Ordinary High Water (OHW) line is approximate and that the estimated acreage above OHW is approximately 13 acres.
- H. Tracy Janikula, Feedlot Program Administrator, addressed the Board. Vick noted that the proposal shows approximately 13 acres above the OHW line and asked whether a limitation of 6.5 AUs would be reasonable. Ogle clarified that the surveyed acreage is approximately 25 acres total, with roughly 13 acres located above the OHW of a Natural Environment lake. Janikula requested that the floodplain map be displayed and clarified the lake boundary as shown in Beacon. She agreed that an animal unit restriction is appropriate, noting that livestock would be required to remain at least 300 feet from the lake edge. Given the configuration of the property and the roadway, she stated that the allowable areas for livestock would be limited, thereby naturally restricting animal numbers. She agreed that a maximum limit of 6.5 AUs would be reasonable. Ogle asked the Board how it wished to word the animal unit condition and provided several options. Vick stated that he would be comfortable with a limit of 6.5 AUs.
- I. Aarestad stated that he is comfortable with the proposal as presented and supports the inclusion of a 6.5 animal unit limitation.
- J. Vick moved to approve the request to allow a 25.8-acre (approximately 13 acres above the lake) entitlement division which includes approximately 2.6 acres of prime soil CONDITIONED on survey, Deed Restriction, and not to exceed 6.5 animal units (AU). Concept plan noted Exhibit A. Motion seconded by Maue.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **CHARLES WREN** – New

LOCATION: 4377 US HIGHWAY 12 SW – PART OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 118, RANGE 26, WRIGHT COUNTY, MINNESOTA (Woodland Twp.) Tax # 220-000-051205. Property Owners: CHARLES WREN

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.049(C)(5) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a storage building that exceeds the single accessory structure maximum size.

Present: Charles Wren

- A. Ogle displayed the proposed site plan and reviewed the request details. The property is 1.51 acres (approximately 65,660 sq. ft.) and zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R-1). The request is to construct a 36 ft. x 60 ft. (2,160 sq. ft.) storage building which exceeds the 1,400 sq. ft. single accessory structure maximum size. A variance is required to construct a storage building that exceeds 1,400 sq. ft. on an R-1 zoned property with a lot area over 20,000 square feet but less than 80,000 square feet. The Township approves of the request, no written comments from the public have been received.
- B. Wren stated that the proposed building meets all required setback standards. He noted that other properties in Woodland Township, including the neighboring property to the west, have similar sized accessory structures. He referenced a natural tree line along the eastern boundary adjacent to the City of Waverly and a solar field located to the rear of the property. Wren stated that the proposed shed location is on high ground, so watershed impacts would not be an issue. He explained that the requested size is intended to allow his personal property to be stored indoors and protected from the elements. He feels that 1,400 sq. ft. is difficult to even use as storage for an RV.
- C. There were no public comments.
- D. Neumann asked for clarification regarding which existing buildings would be removed, as indicated on the site plan. Wren stated that he had previously added a lean-to to an existing structure and it would be removed as part of this project. Neumann commented that having multiple accessory buildings can create visual clutter and stated that, because the request meets all setback requirements, he is comfortable with approving a single larger building rather than multiple smaller structures. He noted that, given the location, the proposed building would be compatible with the area.
- E. Mol stated that he shares Neumann's perspective. He noted that the proposal remains under the maximum allowed overall accessory structure coverage and that multiple smaller buildings would not be practical in this situation. He emphasized that all setbacks are met and that Township staff has approved the proposal, which he considers important.
- F. Vick stated that he agrees with the comments made by the other members. He asked about the total proposed accessory building square footage. Ogle stated that the total detached accessory structure area would be approximately 2,350 square feet, which is below the 2,400-square-foot maximum. Wren confirmed that several existing structures, including the lean-to, would be removed. Vick stated that he has no issues with the request.
- G. Maue stated that he has no concerns with the proposal.

- H. Aarestad stated that he has viewed the property from Highway 12 and noted that the proposed building location would be largely out of sight. He stated that the size of the building would not be out of character for the surrounding area.
- I. Mol moved to approve the request to construct a 36 ft. x 60 ft. (2,160 sq. ft.) storage building which exceeds the 1,400 sq. ft. single accessory structure maximum size, noting the Township approved. Site plan noted Exhibit A and building plans Exhibit B. Motion seconded by Vick.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **SAMUEL REDINGER** – New

LOCATION: 2678 STATE HIGHWAY 25 SE – Part of the South 1/2 of the NW 1/4 of the SE 1/4; the S 1/2 of the NE 1/4 of the SW 1/4; and the S 1/2 of the NW 1/4 of the SW 1/4 as well as Outlot A, Rassat Addition, SECTION 17, TOWNSHIP 119, RANGE 25, WRIGHT COUNTY, MINNESOTA (Rockford Twp.) Tax #215-100-173202 & #215-139-000010. Property Owners: SAMUEL & SALLY REDINGER

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 where the remainder of the parcel has substandard road frontage.

Present: Sam Redinger

- A. Ogle displayed the site plan and reviewed the request. The property is located at 2678 State Highway 25 SE in Rockford Township, is 61.5 acres and zoned General Agriculture (AG). The request is to allow a 3.3 acre entitlement division where the remainder of the parcel would be 56.9 acres and have 150 ft. of road frontage. A variance is required for AG zoned parcels exceeding 5.0 acres that do not meet the administrative standards for an access strip or have less than 300 ft. of public road frontage. The Township approves of the request regarding the road frontage, no written responses from the public were received. Ogle noted the property is off of the State Highway and in speaking with MnDOT they are not opposed to multiple lots but would request a shared access.
- B. Redinger noted that the reason for the variance request is the configuration of the existing parcel boundaries and the limited available road frontage, which creates a practical difficulty in meeting the road frontage requirements needed to utilize the second entitlement. Without approval of the variance, the second entitlement would effectively be unusable. He stated that the long, narrow shape of the property and the limited road frontage predate his ownership and were not self-created. Redinger further noted that the request is consistent with the Wright County Land Use Plan (LUP) designation for the area, which supports continued residential use. He stated that approval of the request would not adversely impact surrounding properties, neighboring landowners, or public health and safety. He added that similar variances have been approved in the surrounding area, as evidenced by other large parcels with limited road frontage.
- C. Ogle explained that the property has two entitlements and that the minimum road frontage requirement is 150 feet for parcels between 1.0 and 2.49 acres. He noted that as parcel size increases, so does the required road frontage, with parcels over 5 acres requiring 300 feet of frontage. He stated that the existing 61.5-acre parcel would require a minimum of 450 feet of road frontage to complete a division, while the property currently has approximately 438 feet of frontage. He reiterated that, without a variance, it would be very difficult to utilize the second entitlement.
- D. Public Comments
 - Andrew Walzer, who resides on 30th Street SE just south of the rear southeast corner of the property, asked whether the proposal was intended to create multiple homes on the property. Ogle explained that this Board does not have the authority to approve a rezone/subdivision. He stated the parcel has two entitlements, one of which is currently used by the existing home. Ogle further explained the rezoning and subdivision processes and clarified that the current request is not for rezoning or subdivision, but solely to allow use of the second

homesite entitlement. Walzer stated that he understood the explanation and appreciated the clarification, noting that maintaining privacy was his primary concern.

- E. Mol asked whether it would be possible, by adjusting lot sizes, to create one parcel with the required 300 feet of road frontage while still providing sufficient frontage for a second parcel. Ogle stated that this would not be possible under the current ordinance requirements. Mol confirmed that any division would require a variance, and Ogle agreed, noting that the alternative would be for a new road to be constructed and approved by the Township to provide required frontages. He explained that such an option would be costly. Mol stated that the primary question for the Board is whether 150 feet of frontage is sufficient or whether a wider or narrower frontage should be required. He noted that while he would prefer not to see only 150 feet of frontage, he feels the proposal does provide adequate access, space for driveways, and buffering from the roadway.
- F. Vick stated that he believes 150 feet of road frontage is workable. He asked whether there is an opportunity to square up the proposed 3-acre parcel, noting a jog in the boundary near the septic system. Redinger explained that the jog is necessary to maintain required setbacks from the mound system. He explained that with MnDOT preferring the shared access approach the proposed 150 feet of frontage nearly bisects the existing driveway, which influenced the proposed lot line configuration. Vick asked whether a condition could be included requiring the lot line to be straightened if the mound system is replaced, noting uncertainty as to whether such a condition could be imposed.
- G. Maue stated that the parcel's length and limited road frontage create a difficult situation and that there are limited options available. He stated that he believes the applicant has proposed the best feasible solution.
- H. Neumann noted recent development to the south and questioned whether this property could be a logical next step for future development. He asked whether allowing a second access and second home could complicate future planning efforts. While acknowledging that the applicant may not intend to further develop the property, he noted that continued growth in the County may eventually increase development pressure in the area. He stated that he would prefer to see the proposed 3.3-acre parcel squared up with straight lot lines and, if necessary, configured more like an access strip. He questioned whether the area may serve as a future transition zone. Ogle responded that the Land Use Plan designates the property as Rural Residential and noted that while rezoning requests could be submitted in the future, road frontage requirements would remain a significant limiting factor, as all new parcels must meet frontage standards.
- I. Vick asked whether there is a limit on how far back from the road a home may be constructed. Ogle explained that there is no specific maximum distance requirement and clarified that Vick's question was more applicable to access-strip scenarios, which are not relevant in this case.
- J. Aarestad requested that the Beacon aerial imagery be displayed and asked about the amount of wetland and buildable area on the property. He questioned how much of the land is truly buildable for a future development. Redinger responded by referencing the topographic map and explaining the rolling nature of the property, identifying both high ground and wetland areas. Aarestad stated that while he is not a land planner, based on the topography shown, he believes it would be difficult to develop the property into a large-lot subdivision in the future. He stated that he is comfortable with the proposal as presented.

- K. Mol moved to approve a 3.3 acre entitlement division where the remainder of the parcel would be 56.9 acres and have 150 ft. of road frontage, noting the Township approved the request. CONDITIONED on survey, Deed Restriction, and reciprocal easements must be recorded for the shared access. Concept plan noted Exhibit A. Motion seconded by Aarestad.

DISCUSSION: Neumann questioned whether an animal unit restriction should be imposed due to the parcel size and the adjacent residential use. Mol confirmed that the property is currently zoned Agricultural (AG), is surrounded by AG-zoned properties, and is designated as Rural Residential in the Land Use Plan (LUP). He noted that, despite the AG zoning and Rural Residential LUP designation, applicable County feedlot regulations would still apply. Mol stated that because the property is zoned AG, landowners should be allowed to keep livestock, including horses, on a 50-acre parcel so long as all County ordinance requirements are met. He stated that he does not support adding an animal unit restriction and is not willing to amend his motion.

Neumann stated that he would prefer an animal unit restriction limiting the property to no more than 9.9 animal units. With no response from Mol, Aarestad called for a vote.

MOTION PASSED

VOTE: AYE: Mol, Maue & Aarestad NAY: Vick & Neumann

The item was held over from the beginning of the meeting for additional discussion.

1. **CAP CUSTOM HOMES** – Continued from 12/5/2025

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. Aarestad noted that the item was held over to allow the applicant time to consult with the property owner regarding next steps.
- B. Miller stated that there are limits to what the client is willing to modify and that they are seeking additional clarification from the Board. They would like a sense of whether a road setback in the range of 40 feet, or closer to that distance, would be acceptable to the Board. He noted that if the Board remains uncertain, a site visit may be helpful to allow members to view the property, roadway conditions, and surrounding properties that have received similar variances. Miller stated that concerns were raised regarding the proximity of the home to the road and that seeing the site in person would better illustrate the uniqueness of the lot.
- C. Mol asked Ogle to clarify the time limitations. Ogle stated that the 120-day review period expires on March 14, with Board of Adjustment meetings scheduled for February 6 and March 13. Mol stated that he would be willing to participate in a site visit but reiterated that he continues to prefer a greater setback from the road. Vick agreed that a site visit would be beneficial.
- D. Aarestad noted that the size of the proposed home had been discussed and asked whether the Board wished to further address concerns related to the overall size increase and how the structure would appear from the lake.
- E. Neumann stated that he believes the setback from the road should be 50 feet and that the Board should not settle for anything less. He stated that from an aesthetic standpoint, the proposal represents a significant increase in size, from approximately 2,500 square feet to over 4,000 square feet, and that the additional size reflects a preference rather than a necessity. Vick stated that a site visit may help determine whether a 45-foot setback would be acceptable.
- F. Evavold noted that the comparison between the existing 2,500 sq. ft. home and the proposed 6,000 sq. ft. home does not fully account for livable space, since the existing home has multiple levels. He suggested a livable-to-livable comparison might be more accurate. Neumann stated his concern is the increased footprint, which affects height and massing regardless of livable space. Evavold added that the proposal remains under the 15% building coverage limit. Mol stated that the main issue is the road setback, and reducing the home's size or footprint could allow it to be moved farther back. Aarestad agreed that a livable-to-livable comparison would be helpful.

- G. Miller stated that if a site visit is conducted, the applicant would like sufficient time afterward to hear the Board's discussion and revise plans accordingly. Following additional discussion between the Board and the applicant, consensus was reached to continue the item to the February 6 meeting.
- H. Vick moved to continue the meeting to February 6th, to allow time for a site inspection. Motion seconded by Maue.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE INSPECTION

The Board scheduled a site inspection for Wednesday, January 14, 2026 with the Commission to meet at 8:30 a.m. at the Government Center.

Meeting adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Aaron Ogle
Planning & Zoning Planner

AO: sld

CC: Board of Adjustment
Applicants/Owners
Twp. Clerks