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AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

II. APPROVAL OF MAY 13, 2019 BOA MINUTES

III. PUBLIC HEARING – 6:30 PM PAULY SEPTIC VARIANCE (PL#2019-078)
   A. Request for a Variance From the Required 10 Foot Property Line Setback to a Septic Drainfield to 7 Feet to Replace a Septic System
      Location: Section 30
      Township: Spring Lake
      Current Zoning: UTR

IV. GENERAL & ADJOURN
I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS
Chair Hartmann opened the meeting at 6:30 PM with the following members present: Ray Huber, Donna Hentges, Gary Hartmann, Lee Watson, Thomas Vonhof, and Barbara Johnson. Ed Hrabe was absent with notice.

County Staff Present: Brad Davis, Planning Manager; Marty Schmitz, Zoning Administrator; Greg Wagner, Principal Planner; Nathan Hall, Associate Planner; Deb Brazil, Administration; Tom Wolf, County Board Commissioner; and Deputy Clerk to the Board, Barb Simonson.

II. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 8, 2018 MINUTES.
Motion by Commissioner Johnson; Second by Commissioner Vonhof to approve the October 8, 2019 minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC HEARING 6:30 PM VARIANCE FRANCIS AND COLLEEN BEUCH (PL#2019-015)
1. Request for a Variance to reduce the side setback from thirty (30) feet to four (4) feet to expand a legal non-conforming structure by more than 50%.

   Location: Section 29
   Township: Spring Lake
   Current Zoning: UTR

Nathan Hall presented the staff report for this application. The specific details within the staff report and a video are available on the Scott County Website May 13, 2019 Board of Adjustment Agenda Packet. (To view the staff report on the website, click on the download arrow and click on Agenda, Save and Open. Next open the bookmark at the top of the page and click on the Beuch Variance project.)

The video of this meeting is also available for viewing on the website if you would click on the media button to the left of the agenda.

Comments and Questions from the Commissioners:
Commissioner Johnson inquired about any past variances that may have been issued for other additions.
Staff Nathan Hall replied that he was not aware of any past additions to the home.
Commissioner Hartmann stated he visited the home site and it did not appear to have any additions.
Applicant Colleen Beuch reported there have been no past additions made to the original home, built in 1963.

Chair Hartman opened the meeting up to the public and public comment.
No one approached the podium for comment.
Noting no comments from the public there was a motion by Commissioner Watson; second by Commissioner Vonhof to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Commissioner Johnson; second by Commissioner Watson to approve the variance based on the findings listed in the staff report, to recommend approval to reduce the side setback from thirty (30) feet to four (4) feet and to expand a legal non-conforming structure by more than 50%, noting the Township of Spring Lake approved this request.

The motion carried unanimously.

Criteria for Granting Variance:

1. **Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.**
   The Comprehensive Plan guides this parcel as Urban Transition Reserve. The property will continue to be used as a single-family residence and is not in conflict with the Comprehensive plan.

2. **Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not generally apply to other properties in the same zoning district or vicinity, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since the enactment of this Ordinance had no control.**
   The property was constructed prior to current zoning regulations that would require minimum setbacks.

3. **The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance.**
   The literal interpretation of the ordinance would deprive the applicants of rights enjoyed by other properties in the area. Other properties in the area have homes that do not meet the setback requirements due to aspects of the historic hamlet.

4. **That the special conditions or circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.**
   As stated, the property was developed prior to the current zoning standards; a situation that was out of the control of the applicant.

5. **That granting the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to owners of other lands, structures or buildings in the same district.**
   Granting of the requested variance would not confer the applicant any special privilege, as it would allow them to replace their detached garage (which was closer to the right-of-way) with an attached garage.

6. **The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty.**
   The requested variance alleviates the practical difficulty created by the Scott County Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance would reduce the side yard setback on the property allowing the existing home to be extended.

7. **The variance would not be materially detrimental or will not essentially alter the character of the property in the same zoning district.**
   The variance would not alter the character of the property or the area if granted since neighboring properties have similar sized homes and garages.
8. Economic considerations alone do not constitute a practical difficulty.

Economic considerations are not suggested as a reason for this variance request.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING 6:35 PM VARIANCE TOM AND JANAE VOGEL (PL#2019-017)

1. Request for a Variance to reduce the required front setback from thirty-five (35) feet to ten point three (10.3) feet and to expand a legal non-conforming structure by over 50% of the existing square footage.

   Location: Section 30
   Township: Spring Lake
   Current Zoning: UTR

Nathan Hall presented the staff report for this application. The specific details within the staff report and a video are available on the Scott County Website May 13, 2019 Board of Adjustment Agenda Packet. (To view the staff report on the website, click on the download arrow and click on Agenda, Save and Open. Next open the bookmark at the top of the page and click on the Vogel Variance.)

The video of this meeting is also available for viewing on the website if you would click on the media button to the left of the agenda.

Comments and Questions from the Commissioners:

Commissioner Hartmann commented on his visit to the site, noting the landscape and topography result in the proposed addition being the best location on the property for the project. He also noted the road is not a heavily used roadway. Staff Nathan Hall replied in support of the Commissioner’s comment.

Commissioner Hentges inquired about recommended change in the porch setback to 12.7 feet and where is it located in the staff report. Also asking if it should be a requirement and not just a recommendation. Staff Nathan Hall explained where the recommendation can be found in the staff report and this is part of the suggested motion for the Board, therefore would be addressed in the motion.

Commissioner Johnson inquired if the applicants are aware of the recommendation for the porch setback. Staff Nathan Hall noted the applicants are aware of the new setback criteria for the porch.

Chair Hartman opened the meeting up to the public and public comment.

Applicant Tom Vogel approached the podium and reported he had 3 additional letters from his neighbors indicating support for their project and submitted those to the commission.

Commissioner Huber asked the applicant if he was in agreement with the new setback distance for the porch as recommended by the staff.

Applicant Tom Vogel replied they are willing to make the change to the setback.

Noting no further comments from the public there was a motion by Commissioner Vonhof; second by Commissioner Hentges to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Commissioner Huber; second by Commissioner Watson to approve the variance based on the findings listed in the staff report, to recommend approval of a variance to reduce the required setback from sixty-seven (67) feet to twelve point seven (12.7) feet and to expand a legal non-conforming structure by over 50% of the existing square footage, noting the Township of Spring Lake approved this request.

The motion carried unanimously.
Criteria for Granting Variances:

1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.
   The 2030 Comprehensive Plan guides this parcel as Urban Transition Reserve. The property will continue to be used as a single-family residence and is not in conflict with the Comprehensive plan.

2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not generally apply to other properties in the same zoning district or vicinity, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since the enactment of this Ordinance had no control.
   The property was constructed prior to current zoning regulations that would require minimum setbacks.

3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance.
   The literal interpretation of the ordinance would deprive the applicants of rights enjoyed by other properties in the area. Other properties in the area have homes that do not meet the setback requirements due to aspects of the historic hamlet.

4. That the special conditions or circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.
   As stated, the property was developed prior to the current zoning standards; a situation that was out of the control of the applicant.

5. That granting the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to owners of other lands, structures or buildings in the same district.
   Granting of the requested variance would not confer the applicant any special privilege, as it would allow them to replace part of their existing structure without further encroaching into the front setback.

6. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty.
   The requested variance alleviates the practical difficulty created by the Scott County Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance would reduce the front yard setback on the property allowing the existing home to be rebuilt.

7. The variance would not be materially detrimental or will not essentially alter the character of the property in the same zoning district.
   The variance would not alter the character of the property or the area if granted since neighboring properties are built at a similar distance to the local street.

8. Economic considerations alone do not constitute a practical difficulty.
   Economic considerations are not suggested as a reason for this variance request.
V. PUBLIC HEARING 6:40 PM VARIANCE VERN SCHWARTZ (PL#2019-016)

1. Request for a Variance to replace a non-conforming structure more than 50% of existing square footage and to locate a detached accessory building 5 feet from the local road right-of-way.

Location: Section 17
Township: Helena
Current Zoning: A-1

Greg Wagner presented the staff report for this application. The specific details within the staff report and a video are available on the Scott County Website May 13, 2019 Board of Adjustment Agenda Packet. (To view the staff report on the website, click on the download arrow and click on Agenda, Save and Open. Next open the bookmark at the top of the page and click on the Schwartz Variance.)

The video of this meeting is also available for viewing on the website if you would click on the media button to the left of the agenda.

Comments and Questions from the Commissioners:
Commissioner Watson inquired about backing out of the driveway and if the owners will have room to turn around and then pull on to the street. He asked about the traffic volume on the street.

Staff Greg Wagner replied the drive way will be straight out from the single garage door and is around 24 feet to the road so a car can park there, but will have to back in to the street. Traffic volume is very low.

Commissioner Johnson inquired about the Township citing their right-to-farm ordinance on their recommendation.

Staff Greg Wagner explained a number of Township Board do this and it is primarily for notification purposes to the owners of residential properties they are in an agricultural zone and that agricultural properties have the right to farm.

Commissioner Hartmann noted he is familiar with the property and the area and believes it to be a fairly isolated area and has no concerns about the owners backing out on to the road.

Chair Hartman opened the meeting up to the public and public comment.

No one approached the podium for comment.

Noting no further comments from the public there was a motion by Commissioner Watson; second by Commissioner Huber to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Commissioner Watson; second by Commissioner Huber to approve the variance based on the findings listed in the staff report, to recommend approval of the requested variance to replace a non-conforming structure more than 50% of existing square footage and to locate a detached accessory building 5 feet from local right-of-way, noting the Township of Helena approved this request.

The motion carried unanimously.

Criteria for Granting Variance:
1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan guides this parcel as Agricultural Area, which allows single family residential structures and accessory buildings

2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not generally apply to other properties in the same zoning district or vicinity, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other
circumstances over which the owners of property since the enactment of this Ordinance had no control.
The property was created and the home built in 1930 prior to current Zoning Ordinance standards. The property owner has also combined the three parcels that make up the property into a single parcel to eliminate any other property line encumbrances.

3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance.

This home and previous single stall accessory building were developed when garage sizes were largely smaller. The applicants could replace to the same size and specifications; however, they have chosen to build a larger garage that would allow them to keep more items stored inside for security and site aesthetics.

4. That the special conditions or circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.

The lot and home were not created by the applicant as this area was developed prior to the applicant owning the lot.

5. That granting the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to owners of other lands, structures or buildings in the same district.

Granting of the requested variance would not confer on the applicant any special privilege, as it would allow them to build a reasonable sized garage on a property that does not have any garage storage building.

6. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty.

The proposed structure meets the side yard setback, will be 8 feet further from the DNR Stream than the previous garage, and will be set 8 feet further back from the road than the existing home. This will allow for off-street parking of a vehicle in the driveway without extending onto St. Benedict Road.

7. The variance would not be materially detrimental or will not essentially alter the character of the property in the same zoning district.

The variance would not alter the character of the property or the area as many of the other homes in the St. Benedict area have detached garages or other detached accessory buildings.

8. Economic considerations alone do not constitute a practical difficulty.

Economic considerations are not a reason for this variance request; the variance allows the applicants to make a reasonable use of the property by constructing a garage

VI. ELECTIONS OF OFFICERS FOR THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Motion by Commissioner Johnson; second by Commissioner Vonhof to nominate the same Officers as the prior year. Commissioner Hartmann read the nominations on the record and requested 3 times for any further nominations. No further nominations were made. Motion to close the nominations made by Commissioner Johnson and second by Commissioner Vonhof. Both motions carried unanimously. A vote was held and the vote was unanimous. The Officers elected are Chairman Gary Hartmann, Vice Chair Ray Huber and Secretary of the Board Barb Simonson.
VII. GENERAL & ADJOURN

Motion by Commissioner Hentges; second by Commission Huber to adjourn the meeting at 6:55 PM. The motion carried unanimously.

_____________________________   __________________________
Gary Hartmann                           Date
Chair, Board of Adjustment

_____________________________
Barbara Simonson
Deputy Clerk to the Board
Pauly Septic Variance #PL2019-078

Request:

A Variance from the required ten (10) foot property line setback to a septic drainfield to seven (7) feet to replace a septic system.

Greg Wagner, Principal Planner, is the project manager and is available for questions at 952-496-8653.

General Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James &amp; Marcella Pauly</td>
<td>20466 Langford Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owners</th>
<th>Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Philips</td>
<td>Section 30, Spring Lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Hearing Date</th>
<th>Action Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2019</td>
<td>November 23, 2019 (60 Day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning/Comprehensive Plan Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Comprehensive Land Use Plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Transition Reserve</td>
<td>Urban Transition Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed District</th>
<th>School District:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Lake-Spring Lake</td>
<td>Jordan #717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Procedures Ordinance:

Section 6

Report Attachments:

1. Site Location Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Application Narrative
4. Property Survey
5. Septic Mound Design, Location, & Elevation
6. Spring Lake Township Recommendation
7. Scott County Environmental Services review memorandum dated Oct 22, 2019

Request-

A three (3) foot variance from the required ten (10) foot property line setback to install a replacement septic system.
Adjacent Land Use/Zoning -

**North** – 10 acre residential parcel, zoned UTR

**South** – ¼ acre residential parcel, zoned UTR

**West** – ½ acre residential parcel, zoned UTR

**East** – ½ & 5 acre residential parcels, zoned UTR

Existing Conditions -

The property is an .22 acre parcel in the hamlet area of Lydia. It and the surrounding parcels are small lots created before current land use standards. The site has the existing home on the east and has removed two small accessory buildings for the replacement septic location.

**Subsurface Sewage Treatment System Ordinance Requirements**

**Property Line Setback:** 10 feet to drain field absorption area and septic tanks.

**Proposed Setback:** 8.5 feet to the drain field absorption area and 7 feet to the septic tank.

**Public Hearing Notice:** Required public hearing notices were mailed to all adjacent property owners within 500 feet of the project.

Site Photo: View looking north at the Pauly parcel.

---

**Background/Zoning/Roads:**

James & Marcella Pauly are applying for a variance to replace a non-compliant septic system located at 20466 Langford Way in section 30, Spring Lake Township. The applicants have recently sold this home to David Phillips with the agreement that the septic system would be brought into compliance, and they would apply for the necessary variance. The parcel is a ¼ acre property located in the hamlet of Lydia with the home being built in 1973 and septic system installed that same year as a cesspool system.

The County Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) Ordinance regulates the location, installation, and management of septic systems within Scott County according to Minnesota State Rules Chapter 7080. Under these regulations septic system tanks
and absorption areas are required to be set back 10 feet from a property line. Under the SSTS Ordinance all variance requests are to be considered by the Scott County Board of Adjustment according to Scott County Administrative Procedures Ordinance No. 13.

As proposed the replacement septic system would have a septic tank located 7 feet from the south property line and the drain field absorption area at 8.5 feet from the west property line. Grading for the mound will extend to the west property line. Due to the high water table this new system would be a mound approximately 4.5 feet tall, 33 feet wide and 62 feet long paralleling the west property line. To accommodate the new system two small accessory structures and concrete pad were removed. This would also be a Type III septic system, which is non-standard due to the compacted soils. A Type III system requires annual monitoring to ensure the septic treatment is occurring with no discharge.

**Environmental:**
Scott County Environmental Services has met with the applicants, reviewed the proposed septic design, and conducted a site visit to verify soils. They have provided a review memorandum attached to this report where they are recommending approval of the requested variance. The other factor in the septic system location is that the system must be at least 50 feet from a well, which is located just west and north of the home. Based on the well location the septic needs to be in the area proposed by the applicants. Staff indicated that since this is a Type III system it will require the annual monitoring, and that in the event of a discharge there is a mitigation plan that would make the system a Type IV with additional treatment at the septic tank.

Staff supports the variance as it will benefit the property owner and adjacent parcels by eliminating an imminent health threat from a failing septic system.

**Township Recommendation:**
The Spring Lake Town Board recommended approval of the variance at their October 10, 2019 monthly meeting. A copy of the recommendation is attached.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Based on the representations, information, and site drawing provided by the applicants, staff recommends approval of the requested variance based on the criteria for granting a variance listed below.

**Criteria for Granting a Variance:**

1. *The conditions causing the hardship are unique to the property, applicant, or licensee*

   The conditions causing the hardship are due to the small size of the property, the location of the home and well, and the status of the existing septic system. The conditions are unique to the subject property.

2. *The variance is proved necessary in order to secure for the applicant right of rights that are enjoyed by other persons in the same area or district.*

   The variance would allow the applicant and new owner to have a compliant sewage treatment system for the home similar to the systems utilized by other owners in the same neighborhood and zoning district.
3. *Granting of the variance will not be contrary to the public interest or be damaging to the rights of other persons or properties in the same area or district.*

Granting of the variance will allow a replacement system and help eliminate a potential failing system or discharge that could impact neighboring properties.

4. *The granting of the variance will not be contrary to the policy and intent of the ordinance or detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.*

Granting the variance is not contrary to the intent of the ordinance and will be a benefit to the public health, safety, and general welfare by eliminating a non-compliant septic system.

5. *No variance shall be granted simply because there are no objections, because those who do not object outnumber those who do, or for any reason other than a proved hardship.*

The small lot size and necessary replacement of the septic system appears to be a hardship and that sanitary sewer service is not available to this area of the County.

**Board of Adjustment/Township Alternatives:**

1. Approve the request as recommended by staff based on the criteria for granting a variance as detailed in this report.

2. Approve the request with amendments to the requested variance and to the criteria for granting a variance.

3. Table the request for a specific reason.

4. Deny the request for a specific reason.

**Suggested Motion for Planning Advisory Commission or Township Board:**

Based on the criteria for granting a variance I recommend approval of the requested variance from the required ten (10) foot property line setback to a septic drainfield to seven (7) feet to replace a septic system.
SPRING LAKE TOWNSHIP
SECTION 30
JAMES & MARCELLA PAULY
REQUEST FOR VARIANCE
SPRING LAKE TOWNSHIP
SECTION 30
JAMES & MARCELLA PAULY
REQUEST FOR VARIANCE
The existing lot has very little space for a septic system with the location of the present well.

Two small sheds were removed from the mound area and there is cement and other debris mixed with the soil. One foot of soil should be removed below the entire absorption area of the mound and one foot of clean washed sand should replace the fill soil. 2 feet of washed sand should than be placed over the fill giving the mound 3 feet of washed sand.

The system will be a Type 111 system due to the fill soil. The system should be monitored for 2 years after installation for leakage in the spring and fall. A mitigation plan should the system leak would be to add ATU.

A 1000/500/750 Belle Plain tank will be installed with the 1000/500 the septic and the 750 the pump. The tank will need to be 7 feet from the property line to meet the 50 foot well setback.
DESCRIPTION OF RECORD
All that part of the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 30, Township 114, Range 22, Scott County, Minnesota, described as follows: Commencing at the southeast corner of said Southeast Quarter of Northeast Quarter; thence North (assumed bearing) along the East line of said Southeast Quarter of Northeast Quarter a distance of 161.05 feet to the point of beginning of the tract to be described; thence continuing North along said East line a distance of 67.55 feet; thence South 89 degrees, 29 minutes, 18 seconds West a distance of 166.00 feet; thence South 35 degrees, 05 minutes, 00 seconds East a distance of 84.05 feet; thence North 88 degrees, 41 minutes, 26 seconds East a distance of 117.71 feet to the point of beginning.

LAND SURVEY FOR
JIM & MARCY PAULEY
PART OF SE1/4 - NE1/4
SEC. 30, T114, R22 SPRING LAKE TOWNSHIP
SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA

DENOTE SCOTT COUNTY MONUMENT
DENOTE IRON PIPE FOUND
DENOTE IRON PIPE SET BY RLB NO. 15475
SCALE: 1 INCH = 100 FEET

SEP, 2019 FILE NO. 4023

I hereby certify that this survey, plan, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Surveyor under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

AVERY GROCHOW, LS
DATE 9/3/19 REGISTRATION NO. 15475
Part of mound area is on 8-10 inches of fill soil. Will need to remove fill soils and replace with clean wash sand.

Mound 24" sand
7X36 rock bed
14' absorption area 7'
both ways from center of rock bed

0% slope

Septic tank will need to be 7' from property to meet 50' set back from well.
TOWNSHIP RECOMMENDATION

REQUEST FOR SUPPORT

On October 10, 2019, the Town Board of Spring Lake Township met with Marcella Pauly, 20466 Langford Way (PID 119300120), to discuss a request for a variance for a new septic mound. Current septic setback requirement is 10ft. Per Scott County, the base of the mound will be at the property line, a 0ft setback, with the septic tank at a 7ft setback. This is necessary to maintain the required 50ft setback to the well.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

After reviewing the Request, the Town Board made the following recommendation:

☑ Recommends approval of the request as presented

☐ Recommends approval of the request with the following conditions:

☐ Recommends disapproval of the request for the following reasons:

☐ Has no recommendation, but will forward the request to the Planning Commission or Board of Adjustment:

Affirmation of Board Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstained</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Berens</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Kelley</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Kowalski</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stipulations

I hereby attest that the information provided above is an accurate account of the actions taken by the Spring Lake Town Board on October 10, 2019.

Melissa Hanson, Town Clerk

Date: 10/10/19
This memo regards the proposed variance request for James and Marcella Pauly located at 20466 Langford Way in Spring Lake Township. The variance is to allow a replacement septic system to be installed closer than the 10’ required setback to the property line. The proposed septic design shows the new tank being located 7’ to the South property line, as well as the absorption area of the mound being 8.5’ to the SW property line.

Septic systems are required to meet the 50’ setback to the well, thus the proposed septic system needs to be located closer to the property line. The septic system is no longer in compliance and this is the only suitable site on the lot for a replacement system due to the location of the well. All components of the proposed septic system will meet the 50’ required setback to the existing well.

The proposed septic tank will be located ~7’ to the property line, and the proposed mound absorption area will be ~8.5’ to the property line. The proposed mound cover will go up to the property line, but the entire mound footprint will be on the lot.

The applicants and County Environmental Services staff have a mitigation plan if there is a system discharge, which would be to add an Aerobic Treatment Unit (ATU) to the tank.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (952) 496-8354.