

LE SUEUR COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
88 SOUTH PARK AVENUE
LE CENTER, MINNESOTA 56057
January 8, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Wolf, Jeanne Doheny, and Russel Anderson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Mladek and Colin Harris

OTHERS PRESENT: Aaron Stubbs and Trevor Rudenick

1. **Call to Order:** Chairperson Jeanne Doheny called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

2. **Agenda:** Additions/Corrections: NONE.
Motion to approve the agenda was made by **JOHN WOLF**.
Second by **RUSSEL ANDERSON**.
MOTION APPROVED. MOTION CARRIED.

3. **Minutes:** **November 6, 2025** Meeting, Additions/Corrections: NONE.
Motion to approve the minutes was made by **RUSSEL ANDERSON**.
Second by **JOHN WOLF**.
MOTION APPROVED. MOTION CARRIED.

4. **Applications:**

ITEM #1: CHRISTOPHER & BROOKE MOORE, CLEVELAND, MN (APPLICANT/OWNER):
Requests the County grant a Variance from the Le Sueur County Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required setback to a the Ordinary High Water Level (OHWL) from 100 feet to 55 feet and increase the maximum allowed Impervious Surface coverage on a lot to 36.3% to accommodate a 36' x 16' in-ground pool in a Recreational Residential "RR" Shoreland District of Lake Jefferson, a Recreational Development "RD" Lake. The subject property is Lot 10 and part of Lot 9, Beaver Dam Plat of Section 5, Elysian Township.

**VARIANCE IS FOR OHWL SETBACK AND IMPERVIOUS SURFACE. ITEM WAS
TABLED FROM NOVEMBER 6, 2025 BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING**

Trevor Rudenick presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Brooke Moore was present for the applicants.

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE:

A letter of correspondence in opposition of the request received November 5, 2025 was read into the record. In the letter, the neighbor expressed concern with existing stormwater runoff and drainage issues resulting from the existing impervious surface coverage. They were concerned about the addition of more impervious surface. They questioned how the applicants would access the lake if existing stairs were removed, and whether the new access would also be impervious surface.

They believed the applicant should be required to reduce impervious surface on the southerly side of the driveway and capture excess stormwater that flows to their property. They submitted a picture of a rock area next to the driveway that was being parked on. They were concerned with how the pool would be drained and filled, and submitted a copy of a shared well agreement limiting the use to household use.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

Mr. Rudenick read each of the proposed conditions from the presentation into the record.

There were no questions or objections from the applicant.

INITIAL COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT:

Ms. Moore stated they are looking to install a pool for personal use only. She stated she felt it was safer for their kids to swim in than the lake. In regards to the runoff from the driveway, Ms. Moore stated that a Land Alteration Permit from the previous owners addressed the concern. She stated she was not aware that parking on the rocks made the area impervious, and she did not have any issue mitigating it by converting it to pervious. She stated that she believed they were removing enough impervious surface to balance the increase from the pool.

INITIAL QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Chairperson Doheny asked how the applicant would access the lake with the removal of the steps. Ms. Moore stated she would work with her contractor to develop a pervious option when they work on the Zoning Permit. Chairperson Doheny asked if they have considered other options to reduce surface runoff on the property. Ms. Moore stated that she would be willing to work with her contractor to develop options in order to meet the proposed conditions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Member Wolf asked whether the applicant would use pervious pavers for replacing the stairs. Ms. Moore stated that they did not have a plan for that yet. Member Wolf asked staff whether pervious pavers would require a permit. Mr. Rudenick clarified that it would be done with the Zoning Permit, and that the specs for any pervious pavers would need to be reviewed and approved by staff. Chairperson Doheny asked about other impervious removals such as the Water Oriented Accessory Structures as stated in the proposed conditions. Ms. Moore stated that she could remove the lake shed and lake deck. Mr. Rudenick displayed a chart indicating the square footage of impervious that would be removed.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT DISCUSSION: NONE

FINDINGS:

- The request is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the official control. (3-0 in support)*
 - If the applicant meets all proposed conditions- Members Wolf and Anderson in support*
 - Still concerned with impervious surface and runoff to lake. Would like to see it reduced further- Chairperson Doheny in support.*
- The request is consistent with the comprehensive plan. (2-1 in support, Chairperson Doheny in dissent)*
 - If the applicant meets all proposed conditions- Members Wolf and Anderson in support*
 - Still concerned with runoff to lake, more can be done- Chairperson Doheny in dissent*
- The property owner is proposing to use the property in a reasonable manner, not permitted by an official control. (3-0 in support)*
 - Still question need for pool if you live on the lake- Chairperson Doheny*

4. *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property, not created by the landowner. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *When the lots were originally created, a Zoning Ordinance was not in effect, and therefore no lot size standards existed.*
 - *The septic absorption area is located in the front yard of the property, which restricts the pool from being put in that area.*
 - *Based on the above information, the plight of the landowner was not created by the landowner.*
5. *Whether the variance would alter the essential character of the locality. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *The locality is lakeshore residential lots.*
 - *The applicant is proposing to add a pool on the lake side of their house, not visible from the road.*
 - *Pools are a permitted accessory structure for the Recreational Residential zoning that the parcel is current zoned.*
 - *There are accessory structures located similarly in the area.*
 - *Based on the above information, the request would maintain the essential character of the locality.*
6. *Whether the request for the variance involves more than economic considerations. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *If approved, the applicant would be able to construct a pool on their property for personal use.*
 - *Based on the above information, the request does involve more than economic considerations.*

Motion made by JOHN WOLF to recommend Approval of the application with the conditions read into the record from the Powerpoint presentation.

Second by RUSSEL ANDERSON.

MOTION APPROVED (3-0). MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM #2: STEVE & PAULA HAUGDAHL, INVER GROVE HEIGHTS, MN (APPLICANT); PAULA C HAUGDAHL TRUST, ST. PETER, MN (OWNER): Request the County grant a Variance from the Le Sueur County Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required setback to a side yard lot line (Southerly) from 50 feet to 33 feet to accommodate a Single-Family Dwelling, and reduce the required setback to a side yard lot line (Easterly) from 50 feet to 20 feet to accommodate a 30' x 50' shed in a Conservancy "C" District. The subject property is in the NW 1/4 of the SW 1/4, Section 23, Kasota Township.

VARIANCE IS FOR SIDE YARD SETBACKS.

Trevor Rudenick presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Steve and Paula Haugdahl were present for the applicants.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

Mr. Rudenick read each of the proposed conditions into the record.

There were no questions or objections from the applicant.

INITIAL COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT:

Mr. Haugdahl stated that the lot had been created in 2003. He stated he and his wife had always planned to retire to this parcel. Mr. Haugdahl stated that they had designed a house layout last winter, but there was confusion with the surveyor about the Bluff setback. The initial setback shown was 30 feet, when the requirement is 50 feet for undeveloped lots. Mr. Haugdahl stated that after discussion with County staff, the request was changed to reduce the Side Yard setbacks instead of Bluff setbacks for the dwelling and the shed.

INITIAL QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Chairperson Doheny asked what the applicants timeline was. Mr. Haugdahl stated they planned to start as soon as road restrictions were off in the spring, and they planned to be done with the structure by the fall of 2026. Chairperson Doheny asked which side of the shed the doors would be on. Mr. Haugdahl presented his shed plan to the Board and explained the main doors would be on the west side of the structure. Chairperson Doheny asked whether there would be a concrete drive up to the shed doors. Mr. Haugdahl stated there would only be a small concrete apron. Mrs. Haugdahl added that there would be tile to move stormwater to the bottom of the Bluff instead of running down it and causing erosion.

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE: NONE

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Member Wolf thanked the applicant for moving the structures away from the bluff.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT DISCUSSION: NONE

FINDINGS:

1. *The request is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the official control. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All Members adopted proposed findings*
 - *The official controls in the request are the required setback to a side yard lot line.*
 - *The setback from the side yard lot line is to prevent infringement of structures onto neighboring properties.*
 - *For both the shed and dwelling, the neighboring properties are either vacant or have sufficient open space between them and the proposed structures.*
 - *It is unlikely that the proposed structures will cause an impact to neighboring properties.*
2. *The request is consistent with the comprehensive plan. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All Members adopted proposed findings*
 - *The Le Sueur County Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2007) lists the protection of bluff areas in the Conservancy district in Goal #2, Objective 1.*
 - *The applicant has revised their proposal so all structures and septic system meet the required bluff setback.*
 - *This request appears to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.*
3. *The property owner is proposing to use the property in a reasonable manner, not permitted by an official control. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All Members adopted proposed findings*
 - *This parcel has never been developed.*
 - *The bluff represents a sensitive characteristic that would require additional consideration during development.*
 - *The applicant has revised their site plan from an earlier plan and moved both of their proposed structures to meet the bluff setbacks and instead is requesting a side yard setback. This is less impactful compared to potential impacts to the sensitive feature of the bluff.*
 - *This request appears to be a reasonable request not permitted by official controls.*

4. *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property, not created by the landowner. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *This request is a result of significant bluff areas on a majority of the subject parcel.*
 - *Through discussions with County staff, the request was revised to meet bluff setbacks and instead request a Variance to the side yard.*
 - *Due to the amount of bluff on the property, this request appears to be unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner.*
 - *Appreciate they revised their plan to consider the bluff setback-Chairperson Doheny in support*
5. *Whether the variance would alter the essential character of the locality. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *The subject property has been an undeveloped lot for over sixty years.*
 - *The essential character of the locality is rural, with scattered dwellings and Shoreland Country Club to the south.*
 - *Approving the variance would not alter the essential character of the locality.*
6. *Whether the request for the variance involves more than economic considerations. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *This request is related to improved personal use on an existing lot.*
 - *The applicant is proposing to develop this property and build a single-family dwelling for personal use.*
 - *The basis for this request does not appear to be exclusively economic in nature.*

Motion made by JOHN WOLF to recommend APPROVAL of the application with the conditions proposed in the staff report.

Second by RUSSEL ANDERSON.

MOTION APPROVED (3-0). MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM #3: SEAN MCCASLIN, WATERVILLE, MN (APPLICANT); MCCASLIN PROPERTIES LLC, WATERVILLE, MN (OWNER): Request the County grant a Variance from the Le Sueur County Zoning Ordinance to expand a nonconforming structure to accommodate a 24' x 32' attached garage and a 15' x 20' attached office in a Recreational Commercial "RC" Shoreland District of Lake Sakatah, a Recreational Development "RD" Lake. The subject property is located in Government Lot 4, Section 23, Waterville Township.

VARIANCE IS FOR EXPANDING A NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE.

Trevor Rudenick presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Sean McCaslin was present for the applicant.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

Mr. Rudenick read each of the proposed conditions into the record.

There were no questions or objections from the applicant.

INITIAL COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT:

Mr. McCaslin stated that on September 9, 2025, fire damaged the office, detached garage, and part of the dwelling on the property. He stated that the Variance was due to attaching the structures to the house. He stated the reason for this was to alleviate congestion for vehicles in that area of the campground.

INITIAL QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Chairperson Doheny asked what the applicants timeline was. Mr. McCaslin stated he would like to start the next Monday if the variance was approved. Chairperson Doheny asked Mr. Rudenick if the Zoning Permit would be ready that soon. Mr. Rudenick stated that the applicant had submitted the Zoning permit with the Variance application and that it would be ready to issue after Variance approval.

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE: NONE

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT: NONE

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT DISCUSSION: NONE

FINDINGS:

1. *The request is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the official control. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All Members adopted proposed findings*
 - *The official controls in the request are the expansion of a Nonconforming structure.*
 - *The subject property is a conforming lot, and the existing dwelling was built closer to the road Right-of-Way (ROW) than what is allowed under the current standards.*
 - *Whenever nonconforming structures are expanded, a variance is required and steps should be taken to bring the lot into compliance with current regulations. In this request, the applicant is proposing to rebuild a previously detached garage and office as attached onto the existing dwelling. The garage and office were completely destroyed and the house damaged by a fire in September of 2025.*
 - *No part of the project is getting closer to the road ROW than what is currently existing.*
 - *The proposed addition meets required setbacks.*
 - *It appears that the proposed additions would be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the official controls.*
2. *The request is consistent with the comprehensive plan. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All Members adopted proposed findings*
 - *The Le Sueur County Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2007) lists the protection of natural resources and improving water quality as two of its goals.*
 - *The proposed dwelling additions will not be getting any closer to the sensitive feature of the lake, and would not add any additional hard-surface and cause runoff issues.*
 - *This request appears to be consistent with the comprehensive plan.*
3. *The property owner is proposing to use the property in a reasonable manner, not permitted by an official control. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All Members adopted proposed findings*
 - *This area was originally developed in the 1960's. In that time, there have been no reported issues with the existing dwelling on the campground.*
 - *Attaching the garage and office to the dwelling area will resolve traffic congestion and a parking issue in this area.*
 - *The proposed additions meet the required 100 foot road ROW setback.*
 - *This appears to be a reasonable request not permitted by official controls.*
 - *Improvement to efficiency of movement in the area.-Chairperson Doheny in support.*

4. *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property, not created by the landowner. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *This request is a result of changing standards in the County's Zoning Ordinance.*
 - *This area was developed in the 1960's. Since that time, minimum standards have been created or increased for road ROW setbacks. For these reasons the dwelling is considered to be a lawful non-conforming structure.*
 - *This request appear to be due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.*
5. *Whether the variance would alter the essential character of the locality. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *The subject property has been a campground lot for over sixty years.*
 - *The essential character of the locality is residential and commercial. The applicant is proposing to rebuild the two structures but attach to the existing dwelling.*
 - *This appears to maintain the essential character of the locality.*
 - *Improvement to movement in campground- Chairperson Doheny in support*
6. *Whether the request for the variance involves more than economic considerations. (3-0 in support)*
 - *All members adopted proposed findings*
 - *This request is related to improved personal use on an existing Lot.*
 - *The existing structures and dwelling were damaged by fire, and the applicant is looking to rebuild and repair.*
 - *The basis for this request does not appear to be exclusively economic in nature.*

Motion made by JOHN WOLF to recommend APPROVAL of the application with the conditions proposed in the staff report.

Second by RUSSEL ANDERSON.

MOTION APPROVED (3-0). MOTION CARRIED.

5. B.O.A. Discussion Items:

- 2026 Board of Adjustment Dates
- Comp Plan Update
 - DRAFT complete
 - Public Hearing with the Planning Commission January 15, 2026
 - Public Hearing with the County Board tentatively scheduled February 17, 2026
- New Planner Position filled – Meghan Bajula-Hagen
- Open Position – Environmental Programs Administrator
 - Posted December 29, 2025

6. Warrants/Claim-signatures:

7. Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn meeting by **JOHN WOLF**.

Second by **RUSSEL ANDERSON**.

MOTION APPROVED (3-0). MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Jeanne Doheny at 4:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Trevor Rudenick

*Recording of the meeting not available due to technical error with recording device.
Minutes created from notes taken during meeting.*

DRAFT