

**Minutes
of the
Steele County Board of Adjustments
May 6th, 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 with the addition of the Code of Conduct Oath. Motion passed.

Minutes:

Motion by Ulrich, second by Lammers to approve the April 1st, 2025, minutes as printed. Motion passed 5 to 0.

Public Hearing – Variance #669 Kruckeberg (Front Yard Setback)

This hearing is to consider a variance request from Tyler Kruckeberg to reconstruct an existing dwelling that does not meet the required setback from the center of the road. The property is located in the corner of the SW ¼, of the SE ¼ of Section 32, Summit Township. The property address is 2640 SW 168th St.

Questions & Comments by board members:

Schmidt: Is the current dwelling going to be eliminated?

Kruckeberg: Yes

Schmidt: What kind of construction will the new dwelling be?

Kruckeberg: Slab on grade

Schmidt: Is this a township road?

Kruckeberg: Yes

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 #669

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

Members. Jaster, Ulrich, Hansen and Lammers felt the request met the intent of the comprehensive plan and ordinance. While Schmidt 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.

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

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

Members' Jaster, Ulrich, Hansen, and Lammers agreed economics were not the only reason for the request. While Schmidt felt that economics was a reason for the request.

Motion by Hansen, second by Lammers to approve variance request #669 based upon the findings of the board. Motion passed, 5 to 0. With the following conditions:

The landowner acknowledges that the minimum setback requirements from which he or she is requesting a variance are in place to provide for the general safety and welfare of the residents of Steele County. The landowner also acknowledges that his or her request for a variance from those standards places the landowner and landowners' property at increased risk of damage due to the decreased distance from the public right-of-way. With that knowledge, the landowner agrees to hold Steele County, its employees and officials, Freeborn County, its employees and officials, harmless from any claims, demands or actions or causes of action, including reasonable attorney's fees and expenses, arising out of any act or omission by Steele County or Freeborn County in the normal course of its business, which results in damage to the landowner's property. Activities in the normal course of business include, but are not limited to, snow removal, maintenance of ditches, maintenance of any County maintained culverts, and road work including patching, grading, or resurfacing, regardless of whether such activities are performed negligently or not.

Public Hearing – Variance #670 Kopperud (Side Yard Setback)

This hearing is to consider a variance request from Derek Kopperud to construct a 32' x 60' shed, 10 feet from an internal property line. The property is located in the SW ¼ of the NE ¼ of the SW ¼, Section 18, Lemond Township. The property address is 9908 SW 78th St.

Questions & Comments by board members:

The Board had discussion about the property lines and why the pole shed could not be moved back.

Kopperud (owner of the property) is worried about some of the trees on the property and did not want to have to cut them down. Also had concerns about backing in trailers and thought this was the only option for placement of the pole shed.

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 #670

- 1) Is the variance in harmony with the intent of the comprehensive plan and ordinance?**
All Members felt the request is not with 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.**
Members Hansen, and Lammers felt the uniqueness of the property contributed to the plight of the applicant. While Schmidt, Jaster, and Ulrich felt that the uniqueness of the property did not contribute 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 not 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 Jaster, second by Ulrich to deny variance request #670 based upon the findings of the board. Motion passed, 5 to 0.

Adjournment:

Motion by Hansen, second by Ulrich to adjourn. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.