2015 ANNUAL SHORELAND ORDINANCE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES REPORT



2015 Shoreland Block Grant Amount: \$2,615.00

Directions: Please answer the following questions for your county's 2015 activities within the shoreland area (1000 feet from lakes & 300 feet from rivers or the extent of the floodplain, whichever is greater).

Variances

1. List the number of shoreland variances you issued in 2015:

	Variance Type	#	#	# Denied
		Approved <u>w</u>	Approved <u>wi</u>	
		<u>ith</u>	<u>thout</u>	
		Conditions	Conditions	
a.	OHWL setback	0	0	0
b.	Bluff setback	0	0	0
с.	Impervious surface	0	0	0
d.	Building height	0	0	0
e.	Combination of contiguous nonconforming lots of			
	record in common ownership for sale or			
	development (Minn. Stat. § 394.36, Subd. 5(d))	0	0	0
f.	Subdivision of land not meeting lot area/width			
	standards	0	0	0
g.	Other (please specify):	0	0	0

2. For approved structure specific variances (items a. – d., with or without conditions), approximately what percentage were for new structures? n/a%

- 3. For approved structure specific variances (items a. d., with or without conditions), please characterize the range of deviation from the required standard(s): n/a
- 4. For all variance requests, did your Board of Adjustment develop findings of fact for <u>each of the five</u> <u>variance criteria</u> in Minn. Stat. § 394.27, Subd. 7? <u>n/a</u> (yes or no). If yes, do the findings include detailed explanation or rationale for how the criteria were/were not met? (*If your Board of Adjustment uses an evaluation form or checklist for making decisions, please attach.*)
- 5. For variances approved with conditions, what are some examples of typical conditions for the different types of variances? Please indicate in table below:

Variance Type	Typical Conditions
OHWL setback	N/A
Bluff setback	N/A
Impervious surface	N/A
Building height	N/A
Other:	N/A

- 6. If variances are approved without conditions, why not? $\underline{n/a}$
- 7. For approximately what percent of variance inquiries in 2015 were alternative solutions found (thus reducing the actual number of variance applications)? <u>100</u>%
- 8. If alternative solutions were found, what are some typical examples? -Size or move structure to meet setback -Discontinue activity

-Change from open lot to confined feedlot

Lots & Land Subdivisions

9. List the number of lots created in 2015:

Type of subdivision or conversion:	Total # of Lots Created	How many of these lots were part of Conservation Subdivisions?	How many of these lots were part of Resort Conversions?
PUD Plats	0	0	0
Non-PUD Plats (standard lot and block)	0	0	0
Lot Splits (administrative subdivision)	2	0	0

- 10. In the past year, has your county modified/amended <u>shoreland PUD</u> provisions in your ordinance? <u>No</u> (yes or no)
- 11. Has your county updated its ordinance to comply with 2009 legislative changes regarding existing nonconforming lots in shoreland areas in Minn. Stats, § 394.36, Subd. 5? <u>No</u> (yes or no)
- 12. Has your county approved variances to this statutory requirement in 2015? <u>No</u> (yes or no) If yes, how many variances in 2015? <u>N/A</u>

Permits

- 13. How many land use permits did your county issue in shoreland areas in 2015 for the following:
 - a. New construction on previously undeveloped lots: $\underline{1}$ (total # of permits)
 - b. Redevelopment (e.g., expansion of structures, substantial improvements, new structures added to developed lots): $\underline{4}$ (total # of permits)
- 14. How many permits for grading, excavation, filling, or soil disturbance within the shore impact zone were issued in 2015? <u>0</u>
- 15. Does your county generally inspect the work? <u>Yes</u> (yes or no)

If so, how and when (check all that apply):

- \Box on-site inspection prior to construction
- \Box on-site inspection during construction
- \Box on-site inspection after construction
- □ as-built drawings and measurements required after construction
- X other (please describe): Inspections performed as needed to ensure setbacks are met.

Planning and Enforcement

- 16. Did your county update or amend its comprehensive plan in 2015? <u>No</u> (yes or no) If yes, describe any changes affecting shorelands:
- 17. Did your county update or amend its shoreland ordinance in 2015? <u>No</u> (yes or no) If yes, describe the nature of the change:
- 18. Does your county have any plans to update, amend, or adopt a comprehensive plan or shoreland ordinance in 2016? <u>Maybe</u> (yes or no, and if yes, plan or ordinance) (both) Plan AND Ordinance
- 19. Does your county notify the DNR at least 10 days prior to public hearings for variances, CUPs, and ordinance amendments, and within 10 days after final decisions? <u>Yes</u> (yes or no) If yes:
 - a. Who do you notify? *Lucas Youngsma* (name of DNR staff person)
 - b. How do you notify them? <u>*E-mail and/or US Mail*</u> (mail, e-mail, other)
 - c. What information do you provide? (notice, application, site plans, etc.): *-Notice, Application, and Planning Commission Packet*

Shoreland Buffers

20. What buffer distance does your county's shoreland ordinance currently require for shorelands in agricultural areas? *150' Structure Setback*

300' Manure Spreading and Stockpiling (50' if incorporated or injected)

21. Please describe your efforts to achieve and maintain 50 foot buffers around streams and water bodies on agricultural land in 2015. Please check and describe ALL that apply (feel free to attach additional materials):

\checkmark	Effort	Please describe:
х	No special effort	Inform enquiring landowners of the rule.
	Some action taken	
	Condition variance and/or permit approvals with measures to establish/restore buffers	
	Condition financial or other assistance with measures to establish/restore buffers	
	 Specific program to achieve voluntary compliance including some/all of the following strategies (check all that apply): Aerial mapping/inventory of buffers Evaluation/assessment of compliance Outreach to property owners (letters, literature, site visits, inspections, etc.) Technical and financial assistance (with SWCDs and other resource agencies) 	
	Code enforcement (penalties and/or legal action to achieve compliance/restoration	
	Other:	

- 22. What has your county found to be effective in achieving and maintaining 50 foot buffers? -*Conservation Programs*
- 23. How does your county determine which stretches of public water watercourses fall under the "Tributary" class under your local shoreland ordinance? *Tributary waters listed on the projected waters inventory by the Commissioner of Natural Resources.*
- 24. Please refer to the "Shoreland and Riparian Buffer Law (Minn. Stat. §130F.48) Comparison" FAQs on the DNR's buffer mapping project website: <u>http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/buffers/index.html</u>.
 - a. What additional questions do you, property owners, or elected officials in your county have with respect to the buffer law and shoreland requirements?
 -Will a ditch that is an altered natural watercourse need a 50' buffer, or a 16 ¹/₂' buffer?
 -Will violation be assessed each day of non compliance?
 - b. Is your county considering any changes to its shoreland requirements in response to the new buffer law?
 -Yes
- 25. Which department or agency is responsible for <u>ag-related</u> buffer compliance activity in your county? Has the new buffer law resulted in any changes in responsibilities, and if so how? *-Soil and Water- No change*

26. Does your county require compliance with shoreland vegetation management standards for <u>non-agricultural</u> properties? <u>Yes</u> (yes or no)

If yes, describe 2015 activities in the space below (permit requirements, restoration orders, etc.): -Permit to remove vegetation, or vegetation removal not allowed -Silt Fence

-Restore/Plant Perennial vegetation

Resources/Training

27. What shoreland-related training, guidance, or tools do your staff or Board of Adjustment need? -General Shoreland Training

Other

28. In the past year, has your county adopted into its shoreland ordinance any new "higher standards" that exceed the statewide minimums in Minnesota Rules, Chapter 6120? Please check and describe ALL that apply (feel free to attach additional information): *No new standards*

\checkmark	Higher Standard Type	Please describe:
	Use of a special protection district or lake	
	classification for which higher standards apply	
	Lot size & width	
	Structure setback from OHWL	
	Structure setback from bluff	
	Septic system setback from OHWL	
	Impervious surface coverage limits	
	Special standards applied to nonconforming	
	structures or lots	
	Vegetation protection/restoration and/or	
	permitting requirements (in the shore impact	
	zone, bluff impact zone, or elsewhere in the shoreland district)	
	Storm water/land alteration	
	Shoreland PUD (i.e. conservation design)	
	Mitigation for variances	
	50-foot vegetative buffer on public ditches	
	Other:	

29. Have any new or unanticipated issues arisen in the past year that you would like the DNR to address or provide guidance on?
-Why are some ditches on the PWI and some not on the PWI?

-Are waters on the PWI required to be in the Shoreland District? What about PWI Wetland? -Can waters be removed from the PWI? If so, how?

30. Did your county pursue or consider pursuing any special initiatives or outreach efforts to protect shorelands in 2015? Please describe below:
 -Performed site visits and provided information to affected landowners.

Contact Information

County: <u>Redwood County</u>

Contact Person: Nick Brozek Title: Land Use and Zoning Supervisor

E-Mail Address: nick b@co.redwood.mn.us

Phone Number: <u>507-637-4023</u>

To receive a shoreland grant in 2016, this form must be completed by February 29, 2016.

Any questions, please contact: Kathleen Metzker, DNR Land Use Hydrologist, 500 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155-4032. Tel. 651-259-5694. Please e-mail the completed form to <u>Kathleen.metzker@state.mn.us</u>. Alternatively, you may fax it to 651-296-1811 or mail it to the above address. E-mail is preferred.