

**Minutes
of the
Steele County Board of Adjustments
October 29th, 2024**

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Schmidt at 7:00 pm. Members present were Schmidt, Ulrich, Jaster, Hansen, Lammers and staff member Oolman.

Agenda:

Motion by Jaster, second by Ulrich to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion passed.

Minutes:

Motion by Hansen, second by Lammers to approve the September 3rd, 2024 minutes corrections as noted. Motion passed 5 to 0.

Public Hearing – Variance #665 Dilemuth (Front Yard Setback)

This hearing is to consider a variance request from Kevin Dilemuth to construct a residence 900 feet from the center of Rose Street. Steele County ordinances allow residences to be setback no more than 700 feet from the center of a public road.

Questions & Comments by board members:

- Schmidt- Is the submitted sketch of future lots still going to happen?
- Oolman- *No, that was the plan back in the 1970's. It never was developed that way.*
- Hansen- The service road in front of the houses, is that privately owned?
- Oolman- *Yes, there is an easement for all the houses and this parcel to use it.*
- Ulrich- Did the county put the private road in for the houses?
- Oolman- *No it was the developer.*
- Dilemuth- Explained what he has done with the property in the 7 years that he has owned it.
- Ulrich- Why can't you build within the required 700 feet from the road?
- Dilemuth- *There is a deep ditch at 700 feet from the road.*
- Hansen- Was there a house on the property at one time?
- Larson (longtime resident in the area)- *No there was only a barn on the property for livestock.*

The public hearing was opened.

- Lowell Larson, 5247 Dane Road, - Has concerns about the wildlife on along Maple Creek and the effect more development may have on it. He also has concerns about the maintenance of the private road to the property.
Dilemuth- The easement for the road and the responsibility to maintain it is recorded in our deeds.
Larry Schubert (Owatonna Township)- Explained that the township does not own or maintain the road.
Hansen – is also concerned with wildlife preservation but allowing the house at 700 feet instead of 900 feet doesn't have a negative effect on the wildlife.

As there were no other comments the public hearing was closed.

The board reviewed the criteria for considering variance request #665

- 1) Is the variance in harmony with the intent of the comprehensive plan and ordinance?**
Members, Schmidt, Jaster, Ulrich, and Lammers felt the request met the intent of the comprehensive plan and ordinance. Member Hansen felt the request did not meet the intent of the comprehensive plan and ordinance.
- 2) Is the property owner proposing to use the property in a reasonable manner?**
All members felt the property owner was using the property in a reasonable manner.
- 3) The plight of the applicant is due to circumstances unique to the property.**
All members felt the uniqueness of the property contributed to the plight of the applicant.
- 4) Was the plight of the landowner created by someone other than the landowner?**
All members felt the circumstances were created by someone other than the landowner.
- 5) The variance will not alter the essential character of the locality.**
Members, Schmidt, Jaster, Ulrich, and Lammers felt the character of the locality would remain the same. Member Hansen felt the request did not meet the character of the locality of the comprehensive plan and ordinance.
- 6) Economic considerations alone are not the only practical difficulty?**
All members' agreed economics were not the only reason for the request.

Motion by Lammers, second by Jaster to approve variance request #665 based upon the findings of the board. Motion passed, 5 to 0.

Adjournment:

Motion by Hansen, second by Lammers to adjourn. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 7:50 PM.