OAK GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
November 13, 2025
6:30 pm

Call meeting to order and roll call

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 30, 2025, SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING
for consideration of amendments to the following chapters of the City of Oak Grove's Code of Ordinances:

1. Chapter 109 Zoning pertaining to Accessory Buildings

ADJOURNMENT

OAK GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Meeting
October 30,
2025

Chairperson Johnson called the Special Meeting of the Oak Grove Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, October 30, 2025. Roll call was taken.

Present:	Brad Johnson	Joel Tjepkes
	Guy Farah	
	Alan Hall	

Also Present: Angie Bray Johnson, City Council Member
Loren Wickham, City Administrator
Chuck Schwartz, City Engineer
Emily Herold, Planner – MSA Professional Services
Chris Janson, Planner – MSA Professional Services (Via Zoom)

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Hall moved to approve the September 22, 2025, minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Farah. Motion carried 4-0.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Preliminary Plat of Wickstrom Estates South at 22303 Saint Francis Blvd NW. Applicant: Jerry Bauer. PID: 06-33-24-31-0002.**

Planner Herold reviewed the staff memo and noted that the applicant, Jerry Bauer – Wickstrom Forest Estates, LLC – has proposed a revised Preliminary Plat and Final Plat to improve approximately 83 acres into a Single-Family Residential (SFR) subdivision on PID # 06-33-24-31-0002. The proposed subdivision would have twenty-one (21) lots. The Planning Commission tabled the item in order to have some revisions, such as ensuring the frontage requirements were met, and to provide more information on the ordinary high water line. Staff received revised plans, and the applicant addressed the engineer's comments. Staff do not have any concerns and recommend approval.

Chair Johnson explained that the item has been in front of the Planning Commission many times, and there have been opportunities for public comment. The applicant has worked through issues along the way.

The following findings were reviewed:

1. The subject property, PID # 06-33-24-31-0002, measures approximately 82.24 acres and is zoned SFR (Single Family Residential).
2. The proposed subdivision contains 21 homesites that will retain the existing SFR zoning.
3. The proposed subdivision abuts SFR and Agricultural lots to the north, south, and west, and the parcels to the east are located in St. Francis and zoned Business B-2 and I-1.
4. The proposed total lot sizes appear to comply with the required 2.5-acre minimum average density, with minimum lot size of two acres. The proposed lot size and average size is calculated below as 3.52 acres and the density of the development is calculated at 3.95.

5. The proposed lots appear to conform to the City's standards on lots size and frontage. Lots 1-4 and 12-14 are double frontage lots.
6. The proposed riparian parcels comply with acreage requirements for area above the OHWL.
7. All proposed lots will be served by Individual Sewage Treatment Systems (ISTS) and private wells.
8. There are four new proposed internal roads/road continuations that form a loop to service the proposed subdivision: 224th Lane NW, 225th Ave NW, 223rd Lane NW, and Jivaro St NW. Sidewalks are not being proposed at this time.
9. The DNR reviewed the proposed development and had no comments related to their review.
10. The proposed subdivision appears to meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

The following exhibits were reviewed and are on file:

Exhibit 1 – Revised (October 2025) Staff Report from MSA Planning Staff
Exhibit 2 – Engineering Comment Memo from MSA (dated 09.11.2025) and annotated by applicant on 09.24.2025.
Exhibit 3 – Wickstrom Estates South Preliminary Plat Plan Set
Exhibit 4 – Wickstrom Estates Final Plat
Exhibit 5 – Wickstrom Estates South Stormwater Management Plan
Exhibit 6 – DNR Correspondence (dated August 21 – October 13, 2025)

MOTION: Commissioner Tjepkes moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the application for the revised Preliminary Plat and Final Plat, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to City Council consideration, the applicant shall supply a screening plan that complies with Section 107-112 of the City's Subdivision Regulations, concerning screening of the proposed double frontage lots (Lots 1-4 and Lots 12- 14) along State Highway 47/St Francis Blvd NW.
2. The applicant shall address any additional unsatisfied comments from the City Engineer and submit an updated Preliminary Plat and Final Plat if requested.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Farah. Motion carried 4-0. This will go to the City Council meeting on October 31, 2025.

2. Variance – to construct an accessory building in front of the house at 19303 and 19343 Rum River Blvd NW. Applicant: RCA Properties, LLC.

Jeremy Anderson, 19436 Fox Street
Mr. Anderson introduced himself as the applicant.

Chair Johnson pointed out that there are no construction components that are closer to the road before the fire. Mr. Anderson replied that it would be further away from the road than it was before the fire.

Planner Janson reviewed the application and read the staff memo. He explained the constraints on the property. He stated staff are recommending to adopt the staff report into the record; accept the application, testimony, exhibits, and other evidence presented into the record; and recommend approval of the request to Construct an Accessory Structure in Front of House at 19303 & 19343 Rum River Blvd NW, Oak Grove MN (PIDs: 30-33-24-13-003 & 30-24-13-004) for the applicant (RCA Enterprises). He reviewed the conditions for approval.

The following findings were reviewed:

1. The properties parcels (30-33-24-13-003 & 30-24-13-004) are currently zoned Single Family Residential.
2. Oak Grove's 2040 Comprehensive Plan does not directly address the applicant's situation, but it appears that the accessory structure will not interrupt the rural residential character of the area, which is supported by the Comprehensive Plan.
3. Section 109-48 (a) of the Oak Grove City Code (in alignment with Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 6) allows for the granting of variances when the applicant demonstrates by factual presentation that all of the following circumstances exist:
    a. "The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the zoning ordinance."
        i. Detached accessory structures are allowed by City Code.
    b. "The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner."
        i. Variance from required front yard setback - because of the proposed replacements home's estimated setback from the road, as well as the steep topography surrounding the building location, it is not possible to locate the proposed detached accessory structure behind the existing home at the proposed location.
    c. "The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality."
        i. Granting the variance will not alter the essential character of the locality, as the use has existed here previously, prior to being destroyed by fire, and the property owner has adequately screened the operations from public view/neighboring residential properties.

The following exhibits were reviewed and are on file:

Exhibit 1 – Conceptual Site Plan
Exhibit 2 – Existing Interim Use Permit for Home Occupation

Chair Johnson explained that the application seems like a good use of a variance.

Laura Ingebrigsten, 19366 Blackfoot Street

Ms. Ingebrigsten asked if there were precautions that were being taken to ensure that there would not be a fire on the property again, and to make the building less flammable.

Chair Johnson replied that the applicant and the fire chief have been consulting throughout the process. Mr. Anderson added that separating the buildings will make the property much safer. Chair Johnson asked Mr. Anderson if there were other practices he would be putting in place to mitigate the possibility of a fire. Mr. Anderson replied that he will be using a fire container to charge his batteries. He added that he would take every step that was needed because he cared more about the lives of people than material things. He added that he is held to a different standard than the kind of shop that he owns.

MOTION: Commissioner Farah moved that the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council approval of the request to construct an Accessory Structure in Front of the House at 19303 & 19343 Rum River Blvd NW, Oak Grove, MN (PIDs: 30-33-24-13-003 & 30-24-13-004) for the applicant (RCA Enterprises), with the following conditions:

1. Prior to building permit close-out and occupancy of the proposed detached accessory structure

for any use, permitting for a single-family home shall be submitted and approved, with construction to begin immediately after the accessory structure completion.

2. Prior to building permit closeout and occupancy of the proposed detached accessory structure for any use, the applicant shall obtain vacation of all portions of the impacted utility and drainage easement(s) necessary for the allowed construction of the proposed accessory structure, proposed single-family home, and all associated grading and paving.
3. Prior to building permit closeout and issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall resolve the non-compliant side yard setback issues by using one or more of the following methods:
    - Adjusting the side yard lot line between the parcels 30-33-24-13-003 & 30-24- 13-004; or
    - Combining parcels 30-33-24-13-003 & 30-24-13-004; or
    - Subdividing the property(s) to negate the non-compliance; or
    - Eliminate non-compliance through another method approved by the City of Oak Grove in accordance with the City's Code.
4. The applicant/owner has a previously issued Interim Use Permit addressing business operations. Any changes to the operation of the home occupation would require an amendment to the existing Interim Use Permit.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hall. Motion carried 4-0.

Commissioner Hall mentioned that there needs to be an approved building plan for the residence before they get occupancy of the building that they are building today.

FINAL PLAT

3. Wickstrom Estates South at 22303 Saint Francis Blvd NW. Applicant: Jerry Bauer. PID: 06-33-24-31-0002.

This item was addressed with Agenda Item 1. Preliminary Plat of Wickstrom Estates South at 22303 Saint Francis Blvd NW.

SKETCH PLANS

1. John Uphoff – Landform -Killdeer

John Uphoff

Mr. Uphoff stated he is interested in a lot line adjustment for a minor subdivision. He added that he would like to split one property into two properties. The property owner would like to build a home for their parents. There are topographic constraints on the property. Killdeer Street ends in a cul-de-sac. He is seeking comment and clarity on lot frontage and what the City would consider the lot frontage to meet the 300 linear feet of lot frontage. He added that he wants to see the City's input before moving forward with a formal application.

Chair Johnson asked staff if the proposal had similar issues to those the Planning Commission is seeing on 221st Avenue NW. Engineer Schwartz replied that the application meets the 11,000 square foot building pad requirements.

Commissioner Hall asked if the access points would be on 221st Avenue NW. Chair Johnson replied that there would be shared access from the cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Hall asked Mr. Uphoff if he was familiar with the City's requirements for an accessory dwelling unit. Mr. Uphoff replied that he was familiar with them, and it would be too small for what the property owner is looking for.

Darren Lazan, Landform Professional Services

Mr. Lazan stated he was representing the property owner. He explained that the family is planning on constructing a dwelling for the grandparents. The ADU process is well under the square footage of what they desire for a home on the property. He explained that it is a noncompliant lot because of the right-of-way on the frontage. The entire parcel is relying on 221st Avenue NW. He added that they are not seeking a shared driveway easement, but instead are providing a public easement through the cul-de-sac if it is extended. He mentioned that they have a completed septic design, and the primary/secondary system they are providing will serve the septic area. The house pad will be on modified soil. He asked if it was acceptable to do that.

Chair Johnson noted that the delineated wetland would require DNR involvement. If there is modified soil, it will need to go to the DNR to be reviewed. Mr. Lazan replied that they do not think it will front the DNR wetlands. He added that they re-delineated the area where it would be affected by the house pad.

Chair Johnson asked staff if there was a standard for how far the septic primary/secondary setback could be. Planner Herold replied that she would need to look. She added she believed there was a setback, but not the same as the front yard setback.

Mr. Lazan explained that they have a challenge of having space for septic suitable soil. He explained that the limits for the suitable septic soil are sufficient for the primary and secondary, but if they are close to the right-of-way, then they would need to seek a variance because there is no more room for it. Chair Johnson noted that it is a detail to work through with the City's engineer.

Administrator Wickham pointed out that a potential issue with the wetland on the western edge of the property is not designated as a natural environment, which requires a larger setback if it is designated as one. He suggested checking to make sure that the wetland is not a natural environment.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Met Council System Statements Update

Planner Herold provided a summary of the City's 2025 System Statement from the Met Council. The Met Council requires the City to submit the final Comprehensive Plan by December 31, 2028. She reviewed the population projection and the community designation.

Chair Johnson explained how the City got to the System Statement. Administrator Wickham added that the 2030 Comprehensive Plan required that the City reserve the southeast corner for future MUSA. During the last Comprehensive Plan, showed a continued extension of water and sewer in the southeast corner of the City. The City was unsuccessful in getting the Met Council to change that.

The Commission and staff discussed the intent for the City to be rural residential. Planner Janson noted that there would be a way to include language that would fit the character of the City.

Commissioner Hall mentioned that it does not make sense that the City would be designated rural residential while also being mindful of climate, since more development has an impact on the environment. He added that the City has one of the highest percentages of mature trees in the metro.

Administrator Wickham noted that the City will begin working on the Comprehensive Plan next year.

Chair Johnson recessed the meeting at 7:52 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 7:58 p.m.

2. ORDINANCE DISCUSSION – 109.194 Accessory Building Sizes by Acreage

Chair Johnson explained that the Planning Commission is discussing accessory building sizes by acreage. During the previous Planning Commission meeting, the Commission requested a staff memo to gather facts and have an assessment to compare the City to surrounding cities. He added that the Commission would allow for public comments.

Planner Herold presented the staff report. She reviewed the current conditions, the parcel county size in the City, accessory structure Ordinances in neighboring communities, guidance with State statute and City Code, and an evaluation of the three proposals from staff.

Chair Johnson asked the Commission if there was enough information to consider a change to the Ordinance. The Commission agreed that there is room for change.

Chair Johnson reviewed the table on pages 180 and 181 in the Agenda Packet. He proposed that the Commission discuss each item on the table. The Commission agreed not to include attached garages in accessory structure square footage. Chair Johnson pointed out that the City does not have façade finish standards for building standards. He stated he would be in favor of excluding lean-tos' accessory structure square footage and having more definition on what a lean-to is. Commissioner Tjepkes stated he thinks lean-tos should not be specified in the square footage. The Commission discussed the purpose of lean-to structures. Commissioner Hall stated he is in favor of not counting lean-tos' accessory structure square footage. Chair Johnson summarized that the Commission would like to see the proposal to explicitly remove the lean-tos accessory structure square footage and include a definition of a lean-to structure.

Chair Johnson reviewed setbacks. He mentioned that the City grants variances when they make sense to grant. He added that the community desires to have a rural residential feel. Therefore, a 20-foot setback would make sense in order to maintain the feel of the community. Commissioner Hall added that a 20-foot setback would allow for a lean-to. The Commission agreed to keep the setback requirements.

Chair Johnson reviewed the number of permitted accessory structure requirements. Chair Johnson wondered if it would make sense to add a fourth variation. He pointed out a scenario where someone was taking care of elderly horses in an agricultural zone. He added that they could set the number to four permitted accessory structures, and then if they receive a lot of variance requests, they could change the number. Commissioner Tjepkes replied that he would support adding a fourth variation. Commissioner Hall stated he would be in favor of keeping the requirements the same. He explained that public comment has indicated that people desire to have one bigger structure than four or five smaller structures on their properties. Council member Bray Johnson suggested including the fourth structure in the requirements.

Chair Johnson reviewed the size maximums for accessory structures. He asked Planner Herold what stood out to her from a planning perspective regarding the comparison chart on page 179 of the Agenda Packet. Planner Herold mentioned that the City is more restrictive when it comes to smaller-acre lots. The requirements for larger lot sizes are comparable to other communities in the area.

Chair Johnson discussed square footage lot size maximums. He mentioned that the community does not want the City to look dense. The right number is drawing a line around the 2.25-acre lot size, inclusive of the right-of-way. Commissioner Farah stated he would like to see some flexibility for the 2-3.5-acre lots so

they can have bigger pole barns.

Chair Johnson opened public comment.

Monty Ferguson, 22215 Jivaro Street NW
Mr. Ferguson explained that he moved to the City because it was rural and he wanted to have room to expand his accessories. He added that he has 2.51 acres, including the right-of-way. He is currently looking to add onto his current building and would need to have a second building. He mentioned that side setbacks could be a problem for his property and explained that he thought the City was being too aggressive with side setback requirements. He agreed that many of the proposals would be beneficial to people who have the need and opportunity to build larger pole barns. He added that if the goal was to clean up yards and have a place to store items, it would be a motivating goal for homeowners.

Wade Wendorf, 3257 108th Lane
Mr. Wendorf mentioned that there are some communities that do not have limits on the number of buildings or building sizes. Instead, they set the limits based on the square footage lot size and a percentage of land use. He noted that it was a concept that the Commission could consider. He added that he agreed with the comment about keeping permitting easier. He stated that Rum River Consultants have been difficult to work with because he has not received responses back. Chair Johnson suggested contacting City staff about issues with Rum River Consultants. Mr. Wendorf mentioned that there seems to be a concern regarding the overall look of the community. There are requirements during development that help keep the community looking decent. He stated there could be a benefit in looking at the percentage of the lot being used.

Brianna Gauger, 20342 Lake George Boulevard
Ms. Gauger stated she has a need to build a pole barn because of the number of cars she owns. She requested a wall height increase to a minimum of 18 feet for lots with six acres are more. This way, there could be the potential of combining an ADU with a pole barn. Sheds are limited to 12 feet. She explained that she has been doing research on a shed that did not encroach on the space with a pole barn. A regular lofted barn is one foot too tall. She asked the Commission to consider it since if she purchased a barn, it would encroach on her pole barn space. Chair Johnson mentioned that the 12-foot requirement for sheds is a State requirement.

Aaron Weixel, 19145 Aztec Street NW
Mr. Weixel stated he is in favor of increasing the size of the pole barns. He explained that he was originally in favor of 20-foot setbacks, but the community members have made good arguments. He noted that if someone puts in a 2,400 square foot structure near a neighbor, and the neighbor likes to garden, the structure could encroach on the neighbor's property rights. He mentioned that even if he wants to use 100% of his property, he did not believe he should be allowed to put something 1 foot from someone else's property line. He stated it is smart not to include the lean-tos in the square footage. He stated he was in favor of increasing the pole barn sizes.

Chuck Bydlon, 21007 Butternut Street
Mr. Bydlon noted that he would like to see Oak Grove allow the setback to not be so far away. He mentioned that he saw a pole barn in East Bethel that looked like how he would want a pole barn. The pole barn setback was not as far back as the City requires. He explained that he would like to be able to put something on his property to store his items.

Dan Brown, 22775 Unity Street

Mr. Brown stated he is in favor of proposal number 2. He explained that his property is 2.25 acres, has trees around his property, and has a 30x48 size pole barn. He added that he has collector cars that need to be stored inside and would like to have a structure to store them. He noted that he would like to see a wall height increase to 20 feet.

Kimberly Lindeman, 20600 Xavier Street

Mr. Lindeman agreed with Mr. Brown's comments regarding increasing the wall height. He explained that his house is a rambler, so the requirements affect how high he can build a structure. He added that he would like to be able to put a car lift and an RV into the pole barn, but would not be able to with the current wall height standards.

Commissioner Hall read the City Code regarding wall heights for pole barns. He mentioned that someone could dig two feet into the ground in order to get higher interior walls. Chair Johnson asked if it made sense to have an interior wall height when there is an exterior wall height requirement. Administrator Wickham replied that it comes down to aesthetics since the accessory building should not be the focal part of the property.

Stacy Lindemeier, 20751 Yellowpine Street

Ms. Lindemeier explained that she lives by the Refuge Golf Course and her property is pie-shaped. If there is a 20-foot setback, it would not affect the golf course, but it would affect her ability to see out the windows. She stated she is in favor of proposal number 1 because she would like to be able to store her trailers inside.

Don Sinniger, 3923 192nd Street NW

Mr. Sinniger explained that he recently moved to the City and did research before purchasing his home. He added that his lot is 2.35 acres. He stated he is trying to figure out what his options are to build an accessory structure. He noted he is hesitant to tear down the current shed because the previous owners paid $23,000 to construct the shed.

Kelly Cecil - Medina, 21330 Ibis Street NW

Ms. Cecil- Medina expressed her appreciation for making the process easier because she has been through the process, and it has not been smooth. She explained that she pays taxes, her mortgage, and she does not have items that are eyesores on her property. She added that she does not understand the cap on the maximum height of a structure if the only reason is for aesthetics. She noted that they have various items that people do not want to see outside, but the City will not allow them to build an accessory building to put them in. She stated that she would like the City to consider that she bought the property and owns it, and would like to use her property the way she wants to.

Gerry Marko, 1960 191st Avenue NW

Mr. Marko thanked Council member Bray Johnson for putting the item back in the spotlight to be discussed. He thanked the Planning Commission for the discussion. He explained that he hoped the City would lead instead of following what other cities are doing. He asked that the Commission consider the comments from the people.

Mr. Brown asked if there was a different permit to pull to put up a steel structure instead of a pole barn. Chair Johnson replied that there is a different permit. Administrator Wickham added that the zoning requirements are the same.

Chair Johnson closed the public comment portion of the meeting and opened an opportunity for the Commission to discuss. Administrator Wickham noted that staff would post a Public Hearing notice tomorrow.

Chair Johnson read comments that were emailed to the Commission. He noted that Mark Nordin called him and expressed support and discussed the lean-to issue. He added that the Commission received an email from Eric and Kayleen Grui , 80 210th Ln NW who supported the proposed increases in pole barn sizes. They would like to see 2.5-3.9 acre lots be able to have 3,000 square feet pole barns, and to change the rule about being able to build in front of the primary dwelling. He added that Joe Howe wrote an email to the Commission explaining that he would like to be able to have a 2,400 square foot pole barn. He noted that Zach Drayna emailed to say that he was in favor of increasing the lot size and has a 2.4-acre lot, and brought up the idea of doing a percentage of usable lot space. He explained that Eddie Grahamer is in favor of increasing lot sizes and including landscaping and screening requirements.

Chair Johnson noted that impervious surface percentages are usually used for drainage and water issues. He added that it can increase the cost for planning since there are a lot of calculations involved.

Council member Bray Johnson read an email from Jess Goetz, who expressed her opinion that people on 2-acre lots have just as much stuff as people with 2.5-acre lots, and she stated she was in favor of larger pole barn sizes.

Chair Johnson stated that he did not think there needed to be a wall height and building height requirement. He added that he would be in favor of removing the sidewall restriction since there was already a building height restriction. He suggested that the calculation for a building height could be the building height to minimally meet the snow load, with a 16-foot interior side wall. Council member Bray Johnson pointed out that there are ramblers, and they should have the right to have a structure that is taller than their house.

Commissioner Hall wondered if they were being too restrictive on what people would have in ten years. Chair Johnson stated he was not in favor of getting rid of a building height requirement.

The Commission discussed how to calculate a building height requirement. Commissioner Hall suggested allowing 18-foot buildings up to 4 acres, and then 20-foot buildings on 4-acre lots and up. Planner Janson stated that the Code mentioned that the exterior wall cannot be higher than the primary structure. He mentioned that the Commission could consider striking the entire section. Those with ramblers would construct pole barns on the side or behind their house. The height of pole barns could be controlled by covenants and private development. The Code notes that the height restrictions in residential zones are 35 feet. He wondered if the Commission could have the maximum height be 35 feet since it is a residential zone. The Commission agreed.

Commissioner Hall noted that the point of not having tall pole barns is so that it is not the focal point of the property. He pointed out that, based on public comment, the majority of people are spending their time in their pole barns. Therefore, the primary structure is not the focal point for many residents. Council member Bray Johnson added that the focal point is an opinion.

Chair Johnson reviewed the lot size and building size requirements. Commissioner Tjepkes stated he leans towards proposal number 3. He wondered if the lot sizes were correct and if there should be some lot sizes included. Commissioner Farah agreed and added that proposal 3 allows more flexibility. Chair Johnson

suggested that 1.5-2.24-acre lots be allowed 1,800 maximum building square footage. 2.25-3-acre lots are allowed 3,200 maximum building square footage. 3-5.9-acre lots will be allowed 4,000 maximum building square footage. 6-9.99-acre lots will be allowed 7,200 maximum building square footage. 10+ acre lots will be allowed 14,000 maximum building square footage. He stated his proposal is more generous. Council member Bray Johnson asked why there needed to be another proposal when there were already three options.

Commissioner Farah stated he is in favor of proposal 3 because it is a gradual increase. Administrator Wickham noted that those with 2.03-acre lots and up will get to 2.25 acres with the right-of-way. Council member Bray Johnson noted that the right-of-way causes confusion and asked to make it more concrete.

Chair Johnson noted that he is not in favor of proposal 3 because it would make 1 acre or smaller more restrictive. Council member Bray Johnson mentioned that those with 1 acre or less are by the golf course, and they are not going to want pole barns.

The Commission discussed how to simplify proposal 3. Chair Johnson suggested allowing 1,200 square feet for 1 acre or less. Commissioner Hall mentioned that they removed the lean-to requirements, which increases the cubic feet allowed on a property. He explained that the Commission does not need to make giant changes to accommodate everyone, but they can make it more pliable. He added that they have increased everyone's size a little bit, greatly reduced the cubic space of the building, and increased the covered space of the property.

Chair Johnson suggested allowing up to .99 acre lots, 1,200 square feet, and 1-1.99-acre lots, 1,800 square feet. 2-2.49 acres would be allowed 2,400 acres. 2.5-3.99 acres would be allowed 3,200 square feet. He recommended having 4-7.99-acre lots be allowed 5,200 square feet. 8-9.99-acre lots would be allowed 7,200 square feet, and 10+-acre lots would be allowed 14,000 square feet.

Chair Johnson reviewed the code issue memo. He suggested including professional language to harmonize the definition section with the Code. He wondered if gazebos should be included. Administrator Wickham replied that it may be counted if someone lives on a lake. He added that he did not think Rum River was permitting gazebos. Chair Johnson asked for a definition of gazebos and explained that the city is not interested in regulating the height of more building structures.

Chair Johnson asked Administrator Wickham to have a larger discussion regarding noise complaints regarding motocross tracks, since it is a bigger change. Administrator Wickham replied that the Code does not seem correct to him. Chair Johnson asked for a memo for the December meeting.

Chair Johnson stated the next Planning Commission meeting will be a Special Meeting on November 13, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Tjepkes made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Farah. Motion carried 4-0. The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Loren Wickham, City Administrator

CITY OF OAK GROVE
COUNTY OF ANOKA
STATE OF MINNESOTA

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
REGARDING PROSPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 109 ZONING
OF OAK GROVE'S CODE OF ORDINANCES PERTAINING TO ACCESSORY BUILDINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a public hearing will be held by the Oak Grove Planning Commission at a special meeting at Oak Grove City Hall, 19900 Nightingale Street, Oak Grove, on November 13 2025, at 6:30 p.m. The purpose of this public hearing is for consideration of amendments to the following chapters of the City of Oak Grove's Code of Ordinances:

1. Chapter 109 Zoning pertaining to Accessory Buildings

All written and oral statements will be considered at the public hearing and all those desiring to be heard will be heard at the public hearing. Questions or comments may be made to the City at 763-404-7000. Written comments prior to the public hearing may be sent to the City at 19900 Nightingale Street Northwest, Oak Grove, MN 55011-9204, or via email at clerk@oakgrovemn.gov.

Britt Pease
Deputy City Clerk

Subject: **Accessory Structure Size Ordinance Proposed Amendments**

To: City of Oak Grove Planning Commission

CC: Loren Wickham, City Administrator

From: MSA Planning Staff

Date: November 7, 2025

Summary

In response to the Oak Grove City Council's initiative to evaluate residential accessory structure size regulations, and the direction from the Planning Commission at their October meeting, this staff memo provides a summary of the changes brought forward in the updated ordinance for your consideration.

Changes to Accessory Structure Ordinance:

- **109-194 (f)** had Specific height regulations of accessory structures by lot size. This was removed and the language now references the maximum height as permitted in section 109-214 which is 35 feet in most residential districts.
- **109-194 (g) (2)** has the maximum square footage allowed by property acreage, the new sizes are shown below

Property Acreage	Maximum Building Square Footage
<0.99	1,200
1.0 – 1.99	1,800
2 – 2.49	2,400
2.5 – 3.99	3,200
4 – 7.99	5,200
8 – 9.99	7,200
10+	14,000

- **109-194 (m)** Lean to's are no longer incorporated into the square footage measurements of an accessory structure. The language now reads as –
    - *A Lean-to is an extension of an enclosed building, sheltered by a roof that has rafters leaning against the building's wall or as an extension of the building's rafters, supported only by posts, columns, or end walls and open along the outside or longest edge. For the purposes of this ordinance, the lean-to may be as large as twenty-five (25) percent of the square footage of the building to which it is attached, and the square footage under the lean-to will not be counted toward the maximum accessory structure square footage allowed on the property. Lean-to square footage will count toward the maximum allowable impervious surface on a property and shall meet all setbacks and other applicable accessory structure regulations.*
- Side/rear yard setbacks for accessory structures stayed the same
- 109-194(g)(3) language was clarified following Rum River's recommendation that "sidewall" should be added and language was removed pertaining for the need for a building permit as it conflicted with 109-194(g)(1) which does not require a building permit for buildings smaller than 144 square feet.

CITY OF OAK GROVE
ANOKA COUNTY, MINNESOTA
ORDINANCE NO. 2025-xx

AN ORDINANCE REPEAL AND REPLACE SECTION 109-194 SUBDIVISION G OF THE CITY OF OAK GROVE ZONING ORDINANCE

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OAK GROVE ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Repeal and Replace. Section 109-194 is here by repealed and replaced as follows:

(a) No accessory building or private garage shall be constructed or developed on a lot prior to the time of construction of the principal building to which it is an accessory.

(b) Any new home shall have a garage as an accessory use, whether such garage is attached or detached.

(c) An attached garage may be remodeled for use as living quarters integrated with an existing home, provided that an attached or detached garage is constructed concurrently with such building remodeling or there is an existing detached garage or accessory building which is in compliance with the dimensional standards contained in subsection (h)(1) of this section.

(d) No accessory building or detached private garage shall be located nearer the front lot line than the principal building except when the lot is three acres or greater and the existing principal building is located a minimum of 200 feet from the front lot line. Then the accessory building or detached private garage may be located closer to the front lot line than the principal dwelling, but not closer than 50 percent of the principal dwelling's setback. In the case of a corner lot, the front lot line shall be located on the side on which the principal building is addressed. The remaining lot side with street frontage shall meet the minimum front yard setback of 40 or 50 feet on roads classified as collector and arterial. See *Lot line* in section 101-3.

(e) Accessory buildings shall not be the focal point of the property and the material and/or architecture must be complementary to the principal structure.

(f) No accessory building or detached private garages shall exceed the maximum elevations as permitted in Section 109-214, except as permitted in 109-191 (4), other than lots located in a master planned golf course community (MPGCC) or the Lake George 3 (LG-3) zoning district.

(g) Requirements for accessory buildings with total acreage to include to the center of the road.

(1) Construction of any accessory buildings pursuant to this section shall require a building permit except as follows:

a. No building permit shall be required for a storage building that is equal to or less than 200 square feet in floor area and not more than 12 feet in building height.

b. Storage buildings 196 square feet or less existing prior to enactment of the ordinance from which this section is derived shall be legally nonconforming.

(2)

Property Acreage	Total Floor Area for Accessory Buildings	Maximum Number of Accessory Structures	Maximum Number of Storage Sheds	Maximum Number of Accessory Dwelling Units	Maximum Number of Detached or Attached Garage
<0.99	1,200	1	2	1 not more than 700 sq ft	1
1.0 – 1.99	1,800	1	2	1 not more than 700 sq ft	1
2 – 2.49	2,400	2	2	1 not more than 700 sq ft	1
2.5 – 3.99	3,200	2	3	1 not more than 700 sq ft	1
4 – 7.99	5,200	2	3	1 not more than 700 sq ft	1
8 – 9.99	7,200	2	3	1 not more than 700 sq ft	1
10+	14,000	3	4	1 not more than 700 sq ft	1

(3) On lots located in a master planned golf course community (MPGCC) or the Lake George 3 (LG-3) zoning district, the total building floor area shall not exceed 200 square feet, the sidewall height shall not exceed eight feet and not more than 12 feet in building height. Only one such building shall be allowed per lot.

(4) On lots abutting Lake George, one water-oriented accessory building in accordance with article VIII of this chapter may be constructed to be included in the total maximum number of allowed accessory buildings per lot.

(h) Requirements for detached garages.

(1) A detached private garage size shall contain not less than 576 square feet total building floor area. An accessory building used for vehicle storage as permitted in subsection (c) of this section shall contain not less than 576 square feet of floor area. A detached garage shall not exceed 1,200 square feet.

(2) Detached private garages shall be of woodframe construction and shall be of similar design and building materials as the principal building, including, but not limited to, siding and the pitch of the roof, and shall not be the focal point on the property. In cases where the roof pitch of the principal building cannot be determined, the roof pitch shall be the minimum required by the uniform building code. Detached private garages shall incorporate building materials used on the principal building.

(i) No accessory building or detached private garage may be placed on an easement.

(j) Proposed accessory buildings which meet the definition of the term "agricultural building" in Minn. Stats. § 326B.103, subd. 3 may be exempt from the requirement to obtain a building permit but are subject to all standards of this section, with the exception of size restrictions, building without a primary structure, and total number restrictions. A site plan must be submitted and administratively approved by the building official or city administrator or designee prior to commencing construction on any accessory which qualifies as an agricultural building.

(k) Semi-trailers, truck boxes, and similar storage containers are prohibited on lots containing less than seven acres. Temporary uses may be allowed with city council approval for up to 60 days within an 18-month period. On lots containing more than seven acres, no more than two such storage containers shall be allowed.

(l) No home occupation shall be conducted in any accessory building without a permit.

(m) A lean-to is an extension of an enclosed building, sheltered by a roof that has rafters leaning against the building's wall or as an extension of the building's rafters, supported only by posts, columns, or end walls and open along the outside or longest edge. For the purposes of this ordinance, the lean-to may be as large as twenty-five (25) percent of the square footage of the building to which it is attached, and the square footage under the lean-to will not be counted toward the maximum accessory structure square footage allowed on the property. Lean-to square footage will count toward the maximum allowable impervious surface on a property and shall meet all setbacks and other applicable accessory structure regulations.

(n) A storage building that is equal to or less than 200 square feet in floor area and not more than 12 feet in height shall be allowed per lot and shall not be included in the maximum number of accessory buildings allowed per lot.

(o) The following requirements shall govern all accessory dwelling units (ADUs):

(1) Not more than one ADU shall be allowed on a single-family lot;

(2) An ADU is permitted within a principal single-family dwelling or in a detached accessory structure in the A, LG1, LG2, MPGCC and SFR districts;

(3) An ADU shall require a building permit that may either be applied for concurrently with the application for a building permit for construction of the principal structure on the lot, or after construction of the principal structure;

(4) A detached ADU shall be counted towards the total number of allowed accessory structures on a parcel;

(5) An ADU must be clearly a subordinate part of the principal single family dwelling unit on the lot, and the ADU living area shall not be more than 700 square feet in size;

(6) No more than one sleeping room shall be allowed in an ADU;

(7) ADUs shall be compatible with the primary dwelling exterior materials.

(8) ADUs (in combination with their associated principal single family dwelling unit) must conform to all City Code requirements for single family dwellings, including but not limited to setback, height, impervious surface, and accessory structure standards;

(9) Detached ADU's must be located 40 feet from the side yard and a maximum 100 feet from the primary dwelling;

(10) In addition to the parking required for the principal single family dwelling unit, there shall be one off-street parking space provided for or in the ADU;

(11) The property owner must reside in the principal single family dwelling unit or in the ADU;

(12) A property may not be subdivided or otherwise segregated to provide separate ownership of an ADU;

(13) The principal single family dwelling unit and ADU shall have one postal address;

(14) An ADU must have its own cooking, sleeping, and sanitary facilities;

(15) The principal single family dwelling unit and ADU may be served by a single well, septic system, and municipal water, sanitary sewer, gas and/or electric utility service line, but separate meters for the respective utilities are allowed;

(16) The ADU and the associated principal single family dwelling unit must meet all current state building, plumbing, electrical, mechanical, and fire code provisions including emergency vehicle access to the ADU.

(17) A certificate of occupancy from the Building Official must be issued before an ADU can be inhabited.

Section 2. Summary Publication. Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 412.191, in the case of a lengthy ordinance, a summary may be published. While a copy of the entire ordinance is available without cost at the office of the City Clerk, the City Council approves the following summary and the City shall publish the summary in lieu of publishing the entire ordinance:

This is repeal and replace of section 109-194 of the Oak Grove Zoning Ordinance pertaining to accessory structures.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its adoption and publication as provided by law.

Passed in regular session of the City Council on the ____day of _____, 2025.

CITY OF OAK GROVE

By: _____
Weston Rolf
Its: Mayor

Attested:

By: _____
Loren Wickham
Its: City Administrator