



STATED MINUTES

City of Crosslake Planning Commission/Board of Adjustment

May 22, 2026
9:00 A.M.

Crosslake City Hall
13888 Daggett Bay Road
Crosslake, MN 56442

1. Present: Chair David Fuhs; Vice Chair Jeff McGrath; Joseph O’Leary; Alternate Joel Knippel; Alternate Cooper Hanning; Alternate David Nevin; and Liaison Council Member Jayme Knapp

Absent: Kristin Graham; Jeremy Johnson

Staff: Jody Grund, Planning & Zoning Administrator and Cheryl Stuckmayer, Planner-Zoning Coordinator

2. 4-24-2026 Minutes & Findings – **Motion by O’Leary; supported by McGrath to approve the minutes & findings as written. All members voting “Aye”, Motion carried.**

VARIANCE APPLICATIONS

Staff does not make decisions as to whether a variance application gets approved or denied. Staff’s job is to inform the applicant of the requirements for submitting a variance, assess whether the application is complete when it is submitted and then presenting the facts of the application to the Planning Commission/Board of Adjustment (PC/BOA).

The PC/BOA determines whether they approve or deny an application at the public hearing as per Minnesota Statue 462 and the Crosslake Land Use Ordinance.

Through the process, staff does try to recommend different solutions and gives their opinion as to whether the PC/BOA may approve or deny the application, but they cannot reject a completed application. Even if staff feels that the application may be denied by the PC/BOA, they are obligated to accept the application and bring it to the PC/BOA.

Every property owner has the right to ask for a variance per Article 8 of the Land Use Ordinance.

Anyone that feels the PC/BOA has erred, could appeal their decision, per Article 8 of the Land Use Ordinance.

3. Old Business-Variations are heard on their individual requests, past variations hold no precedents. Commissioners may table the request if needed and an applicant can withdraw their request. If the variance(s) is/are approved, all existing nonconformities will be eliminated and will hereafter be required to follow the variance decision. If a variance is denied the applicant can rebuild the nonconformity as is per the Crosslake Ordinance.

3.1 None

4. New Business

4.1 HEJ Fun LLC – After-the-fact variance for lake setback

4.2 Chris Staley – Variance for bluff setback, & water-oriented accessory structure (WOAS) height

May 22, 2026 Planning Commission/Board Of Adjustment Meeting

- 4.3 Julie A Westra Living Trust – Variance for setbacks to the lake and road right-of-way (ROW)
- 4.4 Land Use Ordinance Amendments – Land Use Tables, Accessory Structures/Storage Buildings, Accessory Structure Standards, temporary/portable structures, density, definitions, and accompanying sections with language that pertains
- 5. Other Business
 - 5.1 Staff report
- 6. Open Forum – No action will be taken on any of the issues raised. If appropriate, the issues will be placed on the agenda of a future PC/BOA meeting. Speakers must state their name and address. Each speaker is given a three minute time limit.
- 7. Adjournment

**HEJ Fun LLC
14170647, 17170646**

Fuhs announced the after-the-fact (ATF) variance request. Grund read the ATF variance request, project details, shoreland district, existing & proposed impervious percentages, stormwater management submitted, septic compliance on file dated 7-20-2023, notices sent out per city ordinance and Minnesota State Statue 462 requirements with no comment received, and history of the parcel including the stop work order notifying the owner that his project needed a variance/permit into the record. Fuhs-the May 21st on-site revealed the visual details of the project; O’Leary-project was not any closer to the lake. Fuhs invited Johnson, the applicant/owner to the podium. Johnson, owner-received the stop work order, stopped the project and proceeded with the ATF variance request. O’Leary-a stormwater management plan (SWMP) discussion is needed. Discussion was held on the SWMP along with how to accomplish the requirements and water runoff flowing down the concrete ramp into the lake; Grund, P&Z Director, will supervise the SWMP; Nevin-existing berm (historic ice ridge) to remain; other areas to be covered in the current SWMP installation; O’Leary-what is process to verify conditions and project are being done as approved; Johnson, owner-approximately 11 yards to accomplish the installation of the SWMP. Fuhs opened the public hearing with no response; therefore, the public hearing was closed. Fuhs asked if any of the commissioners had additional questions, but none were forthcoming. Fuhs requested Grund to initiate the findings of fact procedure with the board members deliberating and responding to each question.

May 22, 2026 Action:

Motion by Nevin; supported by McGrath to approve the after-the-fact variance with the conditions listed below for:

- Lake setback of 49 feet where 75 feet is required to proposed addition

To allow:

- 200 square foot screen porch addition (10’x20’) in the shore impact zone 2 (SIZ2)

Per the findings of fact as discussed, the on-site conducted on 5-21-2026 and as shown on the certificate of survey received at the Planning & Zoning office dated 3-25-2026 for property located at 13061 County Rd 16, City of Crosslake

Conditions:

Chapter 26 – Land Use; Sec. 26-227 Variance Decision - Variances must be substantially completed within two years of receiving approval – the approval of this variance will expire on 5-22-2028

1. To help with the water runoff, the existing historical ice ridge is to remain as is, with no modifications, except as currently allowed by the City of Crosslake land use ordinance.
2. Stormwater management plan to be approved within 90 days.
3. The stormwater management plan is to be documented through photographs during installation, to be retained in the city’s files.
4. Rocks or a product/material to be installed between the concrete lake access and the lake to prevent water runoff into the lake.

Findings: See attached/packet

All members voting “Aye”, Motion carried.

Chris Staley
14060848, 14060849

Fuhs announced the variance request. Grund read the variance request, project details, shoreland district, existing & proposed impervious percentages, stormwater management plan (SWMP) submitted, septic compliance on file dated 10-14-2025, notices sent out per city ordinance and Minnesota State Statue 462 requirements with no comment received, and history of the parcel into the record. Fuhs-yesterday, May 21, 2026 at the on-site it showed the proposed area was pretty flat even though it is within the bluff, location is behind trees, ordinance allows versus the proposed, height increase proposal is to match existing architect; Nevin-at the on-site it was discussed and observed that there appeared to be no erosion, the current structure has been there for many years. Fuhs invited Whirley, the applicant/owner's architect to the podium. Whirley-a french drain will be installed between the two structures to direct both structure runoff to the drain. Nevin-to build a berm would require dirt; Whirley-can use the french drain dirt to create the berm, it would be a swale versus a berm, about 2 yards of material for the SWMP; Nevin-20 feet from the OHW is required, but 48 feet is what is asked for, install in a good flat grass area; Fuhs-12/12 roof pitch structure; McGrath-proposing to have the equipment to install the structure so now is a good time to take care of the runoff; Fuhs-not an unreasonable request by us to ask to install stormwater management; O'Leary-concern how deep to dig before the water table is hit. A discussion on the french drain and/or how to accomplish a good stormwater management plan, with the result being that the owner and authorized agent will work with the staff. Fuhs opened the public hearing with no response; therefore, the public hearing was closed. Fuhs asked if any of the commissioners had additional questions, but none were forthcoming. Fuhs requested Grund to initiate the findings of fact procedure with the board members deliberating and responding to each question.

May 22, 2026 Action:

Motion by McGrath; supported by Hanning to approve the variance with the condition listed below for:

- Bluff setback of 0 feet where 30 feet is required to proposed water-oriented accessory structure (WOAS)
- Building height of 17 feet where 12 feet is allowed for proposed WOAS

To construct:

- 120 square foot water-oriented accessory structure (WOAS) within the bluff
- A WOAS at a height of 17 feet

Per the findings of fact as discussed, the on-site conducted on 5-21-2026 and as shown on the revised certificate of survey received at the Planning & Zoning office dated 4-13-2026 for property located at 11966 Manhattan Pt Blvd, City of Crosslake

Conditions:

Chapter 26 – Land Use; Sec. 26-227 Variance Decision - Variances must be substantially completed within two years of receiving approval – the approval of this variance will expire on 5-22-2028

1. Work with the staff to review, alter and implement a stormwater plan between the primary structure and the proposed water-oriented accessory structure.

Findings: See attached/packet All members voting "Aye", Motion carried.

**Julie A Westra Living Trust
14310586, 14310585, 14310584**

Fuhs announced the variance request and invited Schmidt, the applicant/owner's builder to the podium. Grund read the variance request, project details, shoreland district, existing & proposed impervious percentages, stormwater management plan (SWMP) submitted, updated septic design on file dated 4-10-2026, compliance inspection dated 8-6-2025, notices sent out per city ordinance and Minnesota State Statue 462 requirements with five comments received, and history of the parcel into the record. Fuhs-at the on-site the area for the proposed structure was observed, we like to see the owner's first concern of design to be looking at constructing within the building envelope as much as possible, more of the structure should be in the building envelope, current structure has 600 sf in the setback, request is moved back but new amount in the setback is 1250 sf; septic system makes the design difficult, current design could be moved back from the lake, setback to the septic/well taken into consideration could still be moved toward the road, prefer to have the lake protected more than the road right-of-way (ROW), as it sits not in favor of the proposed location; O'Leary-invited Schmidt to the podium for some questions. Schmidt, builder from Brainerd-at the development review team meeting (DRT) last fall there was a discussion on: flipping the design-but difficulty with drainfield and MPCA involvement concerning the septic system in relation to the neighbors, understand the need to move back from the lake but tried to balance the setbacks, survey says less in the setback, SWMP was thought over, will work with Grund to get the SWMP signed off, design opens up the view for the west neighbor-considered the neighbor to the east as well, the well is about 8' from the proposed project; Fuhs-maybe possible to turn and move back; O'Leary-were there any changes made from the DRT as suggested from the discussion; Schmidt-did look at it but very small change, more or less the same as presented at the DRT; Fuhs-went through details on structure and the patio; Nevin-I am a builder, but concerned with your request, 4 bedrooms with a septic designed for it, above the garage area has a potential for cots and/or bathroom and/or 2 bedrooms, moving it back would eliminate the alternate location for the septic, northwest corner trees are part of the neighborhood, demo cabin area could be rain garden; Schmidt-explained what would happen with moving it back in relation to the SWMP, the structure and the look; Nevin-need equipment so use it for the SWMP during construction, center of the driveway for stormwater by using a draitile to direct runoff to it, septic tank to be removed and replace after construction, better to work with constraints of lot, neighbors not approved; O'Leary-not a difficult lot to build-they are wanting 10 lbs. on a 5 lb. lot, asking for too much. Discussion on the options of moving the project back and possibly turning it as much as the well and septic would allow, the cost of a new well, layout/design of the structure, redesign to get more into the building envelope, SWMP for the amount of impervious increase, lake side trees and removal of those trees. Schmidt-tried to limit the ask when designing and locating; Nevin-concern on the structure versus the septic use; McGrath-no alternate spot for the septic if it would fail, circle driveway area could help for room if needed for the septic; Hanning-the building envelope is the driveway, wrong house for this lot; Fuhs-would like to see it moved back; O'Leary-don't see any change from the DRT, beautiful structure but not at this location; Schmidt-what if it is moved back; O'Leary-amend to move it back; Fuhs-no redesign but move back; Schmidt-requested 4' back versus the suggested 9' at 63'; Fuhs-9' will increase the move back from the lake and decrease sf outside of the building envelope; Nevin-suggested alternative options; O'Leary-63' gain would be what; Fuhs-would help eliminate the amount of square footage or decrease the square footage in the setback, we are working backwards, start design with putting as much as you can in the building envelope; O'Leary-all demo, why give a little, why not just deny; Fuhs-goal is for a possibly redesign; O'Leary-goal is to protect the water and stay within the ordinance

requirements; Schmidt-existing is 643 sf in setback, moved 7' plus, 150 less, 4' move back 478'; Fuhs- A. are we comfortable as is, B. if farther back what distance; Nevin-ok as is if good SWMP; McGrath-4' back helps with SWMP, owner to determine if it works; Hanning-existing versus moving it back; Schmidt-owner not willing to change the request; O'Leary-comfortable as requested; Fuhs-O'Leary & Nevin ok as presented with good discussion on SWMP and keep trees, Fuhs, McGrath & Hanning-not good as is. Nevin motioned to table with no second, so motion dies.

Short Break

Fuhs-4' with conditions can be considered; Schmidt-worth a conversation; Fuhs-4' what are the conditions with this. Discussion: SWMP could be altered to save lakeside trees; Grund-Schmidt could turn in a new SWMP; McGrath-58' lake 26.8 ROW, patio at 400 sf; Fuhs-use the center of the driveway for the stormwater control; McGrath-shoreline assessment; Grund-will do at the time of permitting; Fuhs-the future water-oriented accessory structure will need to be permitted. O'Leary-the comment that was submitted asking about the path to the lake; Schmidt-a barefoot path, no developed path. Fuhs opened the public hearing with no response; therefore, the public hearing was closed. Fuhs asked if any of the commissioners had additional questions, but none were forthcoming. Fuhs requested Grund to initiate the findings of fact procedure with the board members deliberating and responding to each question.

May 22, 2026 Action:

Motion by Nevin; supported by O'Leary to approve the variance with amendments and conditions listed below for:

- Lake setback of 54 feet AMENDED TO 58 FEET where 75 feet is required to proposed dwelling structure
- Road right-of-way (ROW) setback of 30.8 feet AMENDED TO 26.8 FEET where 35 feet is required to proposed dwelling structure
- Size increase of 414 square feet (sf) AMENDED TO THE ALLOWABLE 400 FEET where 400 sf is allowed for a patio in the SIZ2 with a stormwater management plan

To construct:

- 3,463 sf structure consisting of 2,139 sf dwelling with a 1,071 sf attached garage and 253 sf entry
- 414 sf patio in the SIZ2 AMENDED TO 400 SF PATIO

Per the findings of fact as discussed, the on-site conducted on 5-21-2026 and as shown on the certificate of survey received at the Planning & Zoning office dated 4-30-2026 for property located at 12210 Ivy Lane, City of Crosslake

Conditions:

Chapter 26 – Land Use; Sec. 26-227 Variance Decision - Variances must be substantially completed within two years of receiving approval – the approval of this variance will expire on 5-22-2028

1. Work with the staff to review, alter, and implement as suggested by a landscaper's input, in accordance with the City of Crosslake land use ordinance

May 22, 2026 Planning Commission/Board Of Adjustment Meeting

2. Work with staff to implement and maintain erosion/sediment control during and after construction
3. Attention be given to preserve the lake side trees to include the northwest corner-2 large red pines.
4. All items as stated to be removed on the revised certificate of survey dated 4-30-2026 shall be removed off of the parcel and any nonconforming setbacks for those items are to be eliminated.
5. Provide an elevation certificate by a licensed surveyor showing that the lowest floor meets the regulatory flood protection elevation (RFPE) listed in the City of Crosslake land use ordinance (Supplemental Data Form)

Findings: See attached/packet

4 members voting “Aye”, 1 member voting “Opposed” Motion carried.

**Crosslake Planning & Zoning
City of Crosslake, Chapter 26 Land Use Revisions**

Fuhs-no June applications were submitted, try to keep the June meeting either on Thursday or Friday at the same time for an ordinance discussion, Thursday-June 25, 2026 at 9:00 AM will be to work on the worksheets submitted pertaining to the ordinance, 4 submitted, may not get to all of them, my priority is the temporary storage section in relation to the end date; discussion on moratorium/temporary storage structure in the commercial districts along with the procedure. Looked at the presented worksheets (temporary storage structures) for a discussion on clarification, possible changes to the worksheet and/or ordinance, action that can be done, enforcement concerns, not allowing new ones, allow pods or not, how renting a pod works, if on a parcel for a day is a permit needed, location of allowing pods if any. Fuhs-good work has been done here today, but we need to continue this at the next meeting. Look at the handouts and make any changes you would like to talk about at the June meeting.

May 22, 2026 Action:

No action taken:

Other Business:

Staff report by Grund:

Development Review Team (DRT) had 2 May monthly meetings

Permits – nothing significant to report (NSTR)

Permit activity comparison:

New builds –	2026 YTD = 24	2025 total = 45
--------------	---------------	-----------------

Additions –	2026 YTD = 33	2025 total = 95
-------------	---------------	-----------------

Accessory Structures –	2026 YTD = 16	2025 total = 50
------------------------	---------------	-----------------

Online permitting being implemented. Staff takes the paper permit and enters it into the online application website format to get familiar with it, no in person needed if the applicant doesn't need or want it, details of what the program has available

Open complaints – contacted the city attorney on the process to be used for fees and/or citations, number of complaints are about the same, focus is on solid waste items.

Talked about the fine/fee process

Fuhs-May 14th attended open meeting & data practices session – concerned that personal devices could be requested to be handed over if they were used for PC/BOA; Grund-will bring this to the city council; Jayme-go through Lori; Fuhs-bring the details of what we should do after a discussion with Lori.

Fuhs-how is the garbage enforcement going; Grund-no time to deal with that.

Open Forum:

1. There were no open forum items

Matters not on the Agenda:

1. There were no matters not on the agenda

Motion by Nevin; supported by McGrath to adjourn at 12:00 P.M.

All members voting “Aye”, Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Stuckmayer

Cheryl Stuckmayer
Planner-Zoning Coordinator

CHAPTER 26 LAND USE

TEMPORARY STORAGE STRUCTURES

ARTICLE 11 SHORELAND DISTRICT STANDARDS

Sec. 26-322 Temporary Structures on Riparian Lots

(2) Temporary Storage Structures

- a) One temporary storage structures not to exceed 300 square feet may be allowed with a permit for no more than 180 days within a year provided there is a principal structure on the property.
- b) Temporary storage structures shall meet all structural setbacks, and may not be located over a septic drainfield.
- c) The maximum impervious surface limits for the lot shall not be exceeded.
- d) The structure shall not be used for human habitation.

Sec. 26-323 Temporary Structures on Non-Riparian Lots

(2) Temporary Storage Structures

- a) One temporary storage structures not to exceed 300 square feet may be allowed with a permit for no more than 210 days within a year provided there is a principal structure on the property.
- b) Temporary storage structures shall meet all structural setbacks, and may not be located over a septic drainfield.
- c) The maximum impervious surface limits for the lot shall not be exceeded.
- d) The structure shall not be used for human habitation.

ARTICLE 12 RURAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT STANDARDS

Sec. 26-346 Rural Residential 2 (RR 2) Performance Standards

(5) Temporary Storage Structures

- a) One temporary storage structure not to exceed 300 square feet may be allowed with a permit for no more than 210 days within a year provided there is a principal structure on the property.
- b) Temporary storage structures shall meet all structural setbacks and may not be located over a septic drainfield.
- c) The maximum impervious surface limits for the lot shall not be exceeded.
- d) The structure shall not be used for human habitation.

Sec. 26-349 Rural Residential 5 (RR 5) Performance Standards

(6) Temporary Storage Structures

- a) One temporary storage structures not to exceed 300 square feet may be allowed with a permit for no more than 210 days within a year provided there is a principal structure on the property.
- b) Temporary storage structures shall meet all structural setbacks, and may not be located over a septic drainfield.
- c) The maximum impervious surface limits for the lot shall not be exceeded.
- d) The structure shall not be used for human habitation.

ARTICLE 13 COMMERCIAL DISTRICT STANDARDS

Secs. 26-381 Corridor Overlay District Standards

- (3) The corridor overlay district prohibits the use of commercial storage, mini/self-storage, and personal storage.

Crosslake Planning and Zoning Ordinance

Proposal: Immediate – P and Z Administrator may restrict all permits for temporary storage structures to have a maximum duration of 180 days (to allow for the adoption of the pending changes outlined below).

Review Worksheet

Ordinance Section:	26-322, 26-323,	
Reason for review:	P & Z staff requested we review portable/temporary storage	
P & Z Commission:	David Fuhs	Jeff McGrath

Current Land Use Table:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Proposed Land Use Table Change:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	p

Current Ordinance:

Riparian

One temporary storage structure not to exceed 300sq ft may be allowed with a permit for no more than 180 days with a permit within a year provided there is a principal structure

Non-Riparian, RR2, RR5

One temporary storage structure not to exceed 300sq ft may be allowed with a permit for no more than 210 days with a permit within a year provided there is a principal structure

Proposed Ordinance Change:

Riparian

(2) 14-day permits are available within 1 year. Must meet all set back requirements.

Non-Riparian

One temporary storage structure not to exceed 300sq ft may be allowed with a permit for no more than 180 days within a year provided there is a principal structure. Must meet all set back requirements.

	All commercial districts One temporary storage structure not to exceed 300sq ft may be allowed with a permit for no more than 180 days with a permit within a year provided there is a principal structure. Must meet all set back requirements. If a temporary storage structure is intended to remain on the property for more than the 180 days, it must be screened from view from any public road by a fence (must meet all fence requirements) that is 2 feet taller than the container/structure. Alternative action is to build an approved auxiliary structure. Corridor Overlay District None or (2) 14-day permits are available within 1 year
--	--

Pros and Cons

Pros and Cons

Pro: Con: No limit on time with a permit	Pro: Regulates storage with temporary structures Decreases prolonged use of temporary structures (storage container) which do not meet desirable architectural appearance Allows currently unpermitted temporary structures to be used for up to 180 days or then to be screened by a fence. Con: may increase costs for business owners (for fence, or to build an auxiliary structure)
--	---

Notes from staff/questions to be addressed:

Do not allow semi trailers as temporary storage

Premade sheds?

**Crosslake Planning and Zoning Ordinance
Review Worksheet**

Ordinance Section:	26-346/26-349 and DC, LC, MU, & C/I
Reason for review:	P & Z staff requested we review mulit-family dwellings in commercial land districts
P & Z Commission:	Jeff McGrath Cooper Haning

Current Land Use Table:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU

Proposed Land Use Table Change:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU
				PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD

Current Ordinance:

Living quarters are currently not allowed in any commercial land districts.

Proposed Ordinance Change:

Multi-family would be permitted in all commercial land use districts

- Current densities for each zone would remain the same
- Example LC 20,000 sq ft = 1 unit
- 1 Unit = 900 sq ft. could be (2) 450 sq ft studios
- PUD would be required for all commercial applications that are requesting more than 1 unit or bonus sq ft.
- 25% bonus sq ft for city sewer
- 25% bonus sq ft for commercial-to-commercial land
- 2 parking spaces for every 900sq ft of living space

	• .5 parking spaces for every 900 sq ft for guest parking • Additional parking may be required for public or common spaces, gym, pool, pickle ball courts etc • NO VRBO/short term rental • Existing multi-family commercial properties could apply for additional bonus sq ft only thru the PUD process
--	---

Pros and Cons

Pro:

Con: doesn't allow business or personal storage owners to have any living quarters on their property

Pros and Cons

Pro: Allows for businesses to have employee or owner housing

Allows for personal storage buildings to have minimal living quarters for entertaining

Landowners wanting more than 900 sq ft would have to go thru the PUD process

Con:

**Crosslake Planning and Zoning Ordinance
Review Worksheet**

Ordinance Section:	26-344, 345, 346, Article 27
Reason for review:	P & Z staff requested we review Multi-family Housing in RR2 & RR5
P & Z Commission:	Jeff McGrath Cooper Haning

Current Land Use Table:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU

Proposed Land Use Table Change:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU
	PUD							

Current Ordinance:

Proposed Ordinance Change:

Planned Unit Developments currently lack details • Current density allows 1 duplex on RR2 and RR5 •	Planned Unit Development only in RR2 • 4 acre minimum • Bonus density only if on city sewer or • Bonus Density if 4 or more dwelling units share the same septic system • All buildings must be duplexes and share a wall • Max density of 1.5 dwelling units per acre
	Short term rental? Review park and rec Review conservation plan in ordinance

Pros and Cons

Pro:

Con:

Pros and Cons

Pro: Allows higher density in certain areas.

Only allowed in RR2, if currently rr5, need to be redistricted, chance to say no if location is bad

Con:

**Crosslake Planning and Zoning Ordinance
Review Worksheet**

Ordinance Section:	26-346/26-349 and DC, LC, MU, & C/I	
Reason for review:	P & Z staff requested we review auxiliary quarters in commercial land districts	
P & Z Commission:	Jeff McGrath	Cooper Haning

Current Land Use Table:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU

Proposed Land Use Table Change:

SD	RR2	RR5	SS	LC	DC	WC	CI	MU
				PP	PP	PP	PP	PP

Current Ordinance:

Auxiliary quarters are currently not allowed in any commercial land districts.

Proposed Ordinance Change:

Auxiliary Quarters would be permitted in all land use districts

- 900 sq ft maximum size
- PP for all commercial land uses
- 2 parking spaces
- No short term rental

Pros and Cons

Pro:

Con: doesn't allow business or personal storage owners to have any living quarters on their property

Pros and Cons

Pro: Allows for businesses to have employee or owner housing

Allows for personal storage buildings to have minimal living quarters for entertaining

Landowners wanting more than 900 sq ft would have to go thru the PUD process

Con: