

**Minutes
of the
Steele County Board of Adjustments
July 11th, 2023**

Call to Order:

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

Agenda:

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

Minutes:

Motion by Nelson, second by Ulrich to approve the May 2nd, 2023, minutes as submitted. Motion passed.

Public Hearing - Variance #656

This hearing is to consider a variance request from Leland Schmidt to subdivide a lot with less than the minimum lot width located in the S ½, SW ¼, Section 13, Deerfield Township.

Questions & Comments by board members:

- Schmidt- Will the property need to be surveyed to subdivide?
Oolman indicated that the subdivision ordinance requires a survey anytime a parcel is subdivided.
- Nelson- If the variance would be granted, does the land meet set back requirements of 20 feet from the property line?
Oolman- The property owners have indicated it would.
Debra Schmidt responded they have had a survey completed already.
- Leland Schmidt explained they bought the property along with John Cramer 30 years ago. At that time there were 3 dwellings on the property. They were told they could not subdivide the property at that time. Now, apparently ordinances have changed, and they could subdivide the property if they obtained a variance from the required driveway width.

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 #656

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 member's agreed economics were not the only reason for the request.

Motion by Jaster, second by Nelson to grant variance request #656 a based upon the findings of the board with the following condition.

1. An easement shall be recorded on both parcels allowing shared ingress and egress to the properties. No additional accesses will be allowed onto NW 52nd Ave.

Motion to approve passed 4 to 0

Adjournment:

Motion by Ulrich, second by Nelson to adjourn. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 07:17 PM.