

STAFF REPORT

Application:	Requests related to the reconstruction and expansion of a dwelling. Approvals required include Variances to reconstruct a 24' x 36.5' 1.5 story dwelling with crawlspace damaged by fire and expand it with a 10' x 24' addition to the road side and a full second level. Expanded dwelling to be slab-on-grade construction approx. 35 ft from Clearwater Lake (min. 75 ft required), 11 and 14.7 ft from the side lot lines (min. 15 ft required) with impervious coverage being reduced from 33.2 to 33% (max. 25% allowed). Project will involve filling previous crawlspace to meet floodplain elevation requirements.
Applicant and Property Owner:	Scott and Elizabeth Perry
Agenda Item:	4(d)

Background Information:

- **Proposal:** The applicants are proposing to replace an existing dwelling that recently had a fire destroy much of the home.
- **Location:**
 - Property address: 11579 Kramer Ave NW , Annandale
 - Sec/Twp/Range: 6-121-27
 - Parcel number(s): 206000061402 and 206000052302
- **Zoning:** R1 - Urban/Rural Transition/S2 - Residential-Recreational Shorelands, Clearwater Lake (General Development lake)
- **Lot size:** Approx. 17,859 sq ft (0.41 acres) according to Beacon GIS estimate.
 - Existing Impervious Coverage:
 - Buildings: About 1715 sq ft (9.7%)
 - Total: About 6298 sq ft (35.7%)
 - Proposed Impervious Coverage:
 - Buildings: About 1955 sq ft (11.1%)
 - Total: About 6246 sq ft (35.4%)
- **Septic System Status:** The property is served by a septic system that will be replaced with an updated system (tanks and drainfield).
- **Natural Features:**
 - Floodplain: The existing and proposed structures are within an identified floodplain. Regulations require that the lowest floor of structures be at an elevation of at least 997.7 (NGVD29). The current structure has a crawlspace that does not meet that requirement. The proposal is to fill in that crawlspace and build a slab-on-grade over top that will meet the lowest floor elevation requirement.

- Bluff/Steep Slopes: The lot does not contain a bluff. The lot does not contain steep slopes that would impact the proposed improvement(s) to the property.
- Wetlands: There are not wetlands that are likely to be impacted by the proposed improvement(s) to the property.
- Current Shoreline Conditions: The shoreline of the property consists primarily of mowed grass with some mature trees.

● **Permit History:**

- 1970 - New dwelling and septic system
- 1977 - New septic system
- 2004 - Septic system certified as compliant
- 2009 - Replacement of existing deck using same footings
- 2014 - Septic system certified as compliant
- 2015 - 24' x 30' storage building
- 2016 - shoreline alteration

Board of Adjustment Action: The Board of Adjustment may approve the variance request, deny the request(s), or table the request(s) if the Board should need additional information from the applicant. If the Board should approve or deny the request, the Board should state the findings which support either of these actions.

Staff Comments:

1. The house will be placed in the same location as the existing home with the expansion to the rear and upward over top of the entire structure.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the findings of fact and discussion listed below, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Variance only if it alternative designs/layouts for the lot that minimize the need for variances are found to not be feasible.

If the application or some version of the application is approved, Staff would recommend consideration for the following conditions of approval (or tabling of the application to allow for review of revised plans consistent with the following):

1. Erosion and sedimentation control measures must be installed and maintained until the construction areas have been stabilized. These shall include at a minimum silt fences between any areas of disturbance (if there will be any) and the lake as well as to any neighboring properties which are downslope of the disturbed areas. Once disturbed areas are no longer being used for construction purposes, these shall be covered with mulch, erosion control blankets, hydroseed or other forms of temporary cover until vegetation is re-established.
2. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan designed to minimize the potential for ongoing erosion or sedimentation and to allow adequate time for infiltration or other treatment of rainwater from the lot prior to it flowing into the lake, wetlands, road right-of-way or

onto adjoining properties. These may include directing rain gutters to appropriate areas, rain barrels, establishing or maintaining a buffer of native vegetation along the shoreline, or other acceptable best management practices. Once approved, the plan should be implemented at the time of construction or within a reasonable time period after construction is completed and maintained indefinitely.

3. The updated dwelling structure shall have its lowest floor at an elevation of no lower than 997.7 (NGVD29) so as to ensure compliance with floodplain requirements.

Applicable Statutes/Ordinances: See Appendix A.

Findings of Fact: The following findings of fact are presented by Staff for consideration by the Board of Adjustment:

- 1) **Variations shall only be permitted when they are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the official control.**

The spirit and intent of the relevant ordinances are as follows:

The spirit and intent of the ordinance's setback requirements between a building or structure and a lake or river, according to the DNRs SONAR statement in 1989, is: "In general, structure setbacks are needed to provide an adequate distance between the development of a shoreland area and the adjacent waterbody or near blufftops to control the resource damaging effects of non-point source pollution. Soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation in water bodies and the loading of nutrients, toxics and other pollutants to the water body from shoreland area surface water runoff are examples of non-point source pollution."

The spirit and intent of the ordinance's setback requirements between a building or structure and a side lot line is to require some space between buildings and other improvements and the adjacent lot and to maintain space between structures. Its' intent is also to maintain consistency from one property to the next in this setback.

The spirit and intent of the ordinance's limitation on lot coverage by impervious surfaces is to help minimize the amount of stormwater that runs off a property where it would be more likely to negatively impact nearby properties and public right-of-way. In shoreland areas, it is also intended to help protect lake water quality by allowing more stormwater runoff to infiltrate into the ground rather than into the lake.

Findings Supporting Approval

The proposed improvements would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the requirements because it represents largely a replacement of what previously existed, with the expansion away from the lake and upward. The increased impervious coverage from the addition will be more than offset by the reduction in impervious coverage elsewhere on the property.

Findings Supporting Denial

The proposed improvements would not be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the requirements because it would add more impervious coverage closer to the lake than what is

being removed, thereby worsening the potential for stormwater impacts on the lake.

2) Variances shall only be permitted when they are consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Findings Supporting Approval

The granting of the requested variance(s) is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan because it would represent an anticipated use within the relevant zoning district(s). A stormwater management plan is required as part of the approval so as to address issues related to stormwater, the project will not require the removal of substantial numbers of trees and any grading and filling for the project can be adequately managed through the required erosion control practices.

Findings Supporting Denial

The granting of the requested variance(s) would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan because it would allow more impervious coverage within the required lake setback. This would be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan's goal of consistent enforcement of regulations when a practical difficulty has not been shown.

3) The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by an official control.

Findings Supporting Approval

The proposed use of the property is reasonable because it represents primarily a replacement of what was there, with reasonable expansions to add more living space without a net increase in impervious coverage on the lot as a whole.

Findings Supporting Denial

The proposed use of the property is not reasonable because it would expand impervious coverage within the lake setback.

4) The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.

Findings Supporting Approval

The plight of the landowner is due to factors that they did not create because the need for the variance(s) is due largely to the location of the existing house (originally built in 1970) and the limited ability to move the home back due to the septic system being located in that area.

Findings Supporting Denial

The plight of the landowner is due to factors that they created themselves because their ability to move the home back as it is rebuilt is impinged by their construction of a detached garage further to the east, which limited the space available for a septic system and for the house to move back.

5) The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

Findings Supporting Approval

The essential character of the area would not be altered because both the current and the proposed use are residential in character.

Findings Supporting Denial

The essential character of the area would be altered because the proposed improvements would increase the height of the structure and its visual impact as viewed from the lake.

6) Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.

Findings Supporting Approval

Economic considerations are not the only reason the applicant cannot meet the requirements of the ordinance because there are non-economic factors involved, as mentioned above.

Findings Supporting Denial

Economic considerations are the only reason the applicant cannot meet the requirements of the ordinance because the proposed layout of the home and septic system is intended largely to maximize the value of the property.

7) No variance may be granted that would allow any use that is not allowed in the zoning district in which the subject property is located.

Findings Supporting Approval

The proposed use is identified as a permitted use in the zoning district where the applicant's property is located.

Findings Supporting Denial

None

8) The practical difficulty cannot be alleviated by a method other than a variance.

Findings Supporting Approval

Avoidance of the need for a variance is not possible because of the need to accommodate a septic system as well on the property.

Findings Supporting Denial

The applicant could minimize the need for variances by moving the new home further back and not adding on to the rear of the home. Or possibly moving the home further back and putting the septic system between the house and the lake.

9) The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the environmental quality of the area.

Findings Supporting Approval

The proposal will not have any significant adverse impact on the environmental quality of the area provided proper measures are taken to manage stormwater and erosion. The proposed conditions of approval require such a plan.

Findings Supporting Denial

The proposal would increase the potential for adverse impacts on the environment by increasing the amount of impervious coverage within the normal building setback.

Appendix A

Applicable Statutes and Ordinances

Minnesota Statutes

462.357 (2016) OFFICIAL CONTROLS: ZONING ORDINANCE.

Subd. 6. Appeals and adjustments.

Appeals to the board of appeals and adjustments may be taken by any affected person upon compliance with any reasonable conditions imposed by the zoning ordinance. The board of appeals and adjustments has the following powers with respect to the zoning ordinance:

(1) To hear and decide appeals where it is alleged that there is an error in any order, requirement, decision, or determination made by an administrative officer in the enforcement of the zoning ordinance.

(2) To hear requests for variances from the requirements of the zoning ordinance including restrictions placed on nonconformities. Variances shall only be permitted when they are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance and when the variances are consistent with the comprehensive plan. Variances may be granted when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance. "Practical difficulties," as used in connection with the granting of a variance, means that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the zoning ordinance; the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner; and the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties. Practical difficulties include, but are not limited to, inadequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems. Variances shall be granted for earth sheltered construction as defined in section 216C.06, subdivision 14, when in harmony with the ordinance. The board of appeals and adjustments or the governing body as the case may be, may not permit as a variance any use that is not allowed under the zoning ordinance for property in the zone where the affected person's land is located. The board or governing body as the case may be, may permit as a variance the temporary use of a one family dwelling as a two family dwelling. The board or governing body as the case may be may impose conditions in the granting of variances. A condition must be directly related to and must bear a rough proportionality to the impact created by the variance.

394.36 (2016) NONCONFORMITIES

Subd. 5. Existing nonconforming lots in shoreland areas. (a) This subdivision applies to shoreland lots of record in the office of the county recorder on the date of adoption of local shoreland controls that do not meet the requirements for lot size or lot width. A county shall regulate the use of nonconforming lots of record and the repair, replacement, maintenance, improvement, or expansion of nonconforming uses and structures in shoreland areas according to this subdivision.

(b) A nonconforming single lot of record located within a shoreland area may be allowed as a building site without variances from lot size requirements, provided that:

(1) all structure and septic system setback distance requirements can be met;

(2) a Type 1 sewage treatment system consistent with Minnesota Rules, chapter 7080, can be installed or the lot is connected to a public sewer; and

(3) the impervious surface coverage does not exceed 25 percent of the lot.

(c) In a group of two or more contiguous lots of record under a common ownership, an individual lot must be considered as a separate parcel of land for the purpose of sale or development, if it meets the following requirements:

(1) the lot must be at least 66 percent of the dimensional standard for lot width and lot size for the shoreland classification consistent with Minnesota Rules, chapter 6120;

(2) the lot must be connected to a public sewer, if available, or must be suitable for the installation of a Type 1 sewage treatment system consistent with Minnesota Rules, chapter 7080, and local government controls;

(3) impervious surface coverage must not exceed 25 percent of each lot; and

(4) development of the lot must be consistent with an adopted comprehensive plan.

(d) A lot subject to paragraph (c) not meeting the requirements of paragraph (c) must be combined with the one or more contiguous lots so they equal one or more conforming lots as much as possible.

(e) Notwithstanding paragraph (c), contiguous nonconforming lots of record in shoreland areas under a common ownership must be able to be sold or purchased individually if each lot contained a habitable residential dwelling at the time the lots came under common ownership and the lots are suitable for, or served by, a sewage treatment system consistent with the requirements of section 115.55 and Minnesota Rules, chapter 7080, or connected to a public sewer.

(f) In evaluating all variances, zoning and building permit applications, or conditional use requests, the zoning authority shall require the property owner to address, when appropriate, storm water runoff management, reducing impervious surfaces, increasing setback, restoration of wetlands, vegetative buffers, sewage treatment and water supply capabilities, and other conservation-designed actions.

(g) A portion of a conforming lot may be separated from an existing parcel as long as the remainder of the existing parcel meets the lot size and sewage system requirements of the zoning district for a new lot and the newly created parcel is combined with an adjacent parcel.

Corinna Township/Wright County Regulations

502. APPEALS AND BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

502.4 Findings

(1) The Board of Adjustment must review variance petitions and consider the following factors prior to finding that a practical difficulty has been presented. The applicant must provide a statement of evidence addressing the following elements to the extent they are relevant to the applicant's situation.

(a) The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the County Land Use Plan.

(b) The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by an official control.

- (c) The plight of the owner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the owner.
- (d) The proposal does not alter the essential character of the locality.
- (e) The practical difficulty cannot be alleviated by a method other than a variance; and.
- (f) The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the environmental quality of the area.

The Board of Adjustment may grant a variance if it finds that all of the above factors have been established. The Board of Adjustment must not approve a variance request unless the applicant proves all of the above factors and established that there are practical difficulties in complying with official controls. The burden of proof of these matters rests completely on the applicant.

403. LOT COVERAGE

Not more than fifteen (15) percent of a lot may be covered by buildings (including covered porches or other roofed structures) and not more than twenty-five (25) percent of lot may be covered by impervious surfaces, including all structures, decks and pavement areas except as provided in Section 608, 609, and 610.

612.5 (1) General Performance Standard for Lakes

Performance standards in shoreland areas are additional to standards of the primary zoning district. In case of a conflict, the stricter standard shall apply as well as any additional requirements if flood plain elevations have been established.

(c) General Development Minimum Standards:

Structure setback from OWHL	75 ft.
Structure setback from Bluff	30 ft.
Structure setback from unplatted cemetery	50 ft.
Lot Size	As per underlying zoning district
Lot Width	As per underlying zoning district
Height	2 1/2 stories (35 ft.)
Elevation of lowest floor above highest known water level (livable structures only)	4 ft.
Water Oriented Accessory Structure setback from OWHL	10 ft.

The lot width may be reduced to 100 feet if public sewage treatment facilities are provided.