

**Minutes
of the
Steele County Board of Adjustments
April 1st, 2025**

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 Brooks.

Agenda:

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

Minutes:

Motion by Hansen, second by Jaster to approve the January 14th, 2025, minutes as printed. Motion passed 5 to 0.

Public Hearing – Variance #668 (Jacobsen -Fence Height)

This hearing is to consider a variance request from Theo and Leah Jacobsen have requested to construct a six (6) six-foot fence around the house and play area. The east 325 feet of fencing will be privacy fencing. The fence is to be on property located in the SE ¼ of the NE ¼, Section 32, Meriden Township. The property address is 4202 82nd Ave SW. Steele County ordinances limit the height of the fence in the front and side yards to 3 ½ feet.

Questions & Comments by board members:

Schmidt- Amber did you state that the Highway department has no issue with the height of the fence if it is out of the right of way?

Brooks- *The highway did not have an issue with the height of the fence.*

Hansen- Did you think of going any higher with the fence?

Jacobsen- *No if we were to do that, we would have to use commercial fencing.*

Schmidt- Instead of spending money on a survey, have you considered moving the fence back 5 to 10 feet to ensure that you are out of the right of way?

Jacobsen- *The reason we decided to put the fence where it is pictured, is that is the top of the ditch. Also, for the convenience of maintenance on the other side of the fence.*

Schmidt- If you are going to keep the fence as pictured that is a foot and a half away from the right of way, if you move the fence back 5 to 10 feet then we know you are well out of the right of way.

The public hearing was opened.

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

The board reviewed the criteria for considering variance request #668

1) Is the variance in harmony with the intent of the comprehensive plan and ordinance?

All Members felt the request met 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.

All members felt the character of the locality would remain the same.

6) Economic considerations alone are not the only practical difficulty?

All members' agreed economics were not the only reason for the request.

Motion by Hansen, second by Ulrich to approve variance request #668 based upon the findings of the board. Motion passed, 5 to 0. With the following conditions:

1. A licensed surveyor shall be retained by the property owner to determine that the fence is entirely outside of the highway right of way unless the fence is set back at least five feet from the road right-of-way.

Adjournment:

Motion by Lammers, second by Ulrich to adjourn. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 7:32 PM.