

**Minutes
of the
Steele County Board of Adjustments
May 7th, 2024**

Call to Order:

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

Agenda:

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

Minutes:

Motion by Hansen, second by Jaster to approve the April 2nd, 2024, minutes as submitted. Motion passed 5 to 0.

Public Hearing – Variance #661

This hearing is to consider a variance request from Mark and Jessica Oeltjenbruns to develop a new lot with only 75 feet of frontage on a public road. Ordinances require new lots to have 200 feet of frontage on a public road.

Questions & Comments by board members:

- Hansen- Why wasn't more land purchased to have the required frontage?
Oeltjenbruns- We don't need anymore land for the proposed project.
- Schmidt- Why was the proposed parcel drawn up in a flag shape?
Oeltjenbruns- The land in front of the building is to wet for our purpose, we thought that it would be more beneficial to leave it as is. That way it could still be farmed with the rest of the land.
- Schmidt asked why the lot couldn't be 200 feet wide but reduced in other areas not being used for the business.
- There was additional discussion on the shape of the lot and that the additional land needed for the frontage could still be farmed by the family.

The public hearing was opened.

As there were no comments the public hearing was closed.

The board reviewed the criteria for considering variance request #661

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.

Ulrich, Hansen, and Lammers felt the uniqueness of the property contributed to the plight of the applicant. Schmidt and Jaster felt they were not.

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 of the members felt that economics were the reason for the variance request and that the shape of the parcel could be changed to meet the ordinance without a practicality difficulty.

Motion by Jaster, second by Schmidt to deny variance request #661 a based upon the findings of the board that it did not meet all of the criteria.

All ayes. Motion to deny passes.

Adjournment:

Motion by Ulrich, second by Lammers to adjourn. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.