

MINUTES FOR MINSTER ZONING BOARD OF APPEAL

7:00 PM

09/22/2026

Zoning Board Present (P) or Absent (A):

Steve Bruns	P	Brad Garmann, Pres	P
Ned Sielschott	P	Eric Schmiesing	P
Jean Hinker	A	Jim Hearn	P
Don Harrod ZA	P		

Also Present:

Representatives from Purpose Energy	Jessica Ralston
Kevin Ralston	

- I. The public hearing was called to order by Brad Garmann at 7:00 pm.
 - a) A variance request by Purpose Energy – Minster LLC owners of a building located at 80 Columbia Drive in Minster. Purpose Energy would like to erect a 200 square foot wall sign onto their building. The proposed 200 Square Foot sign is 136 square feet larger than what is permitted in the zoning code. A variance of 136 square feet is needed to allow Purpose Energy to erect the sign. Representatives from Purpose Energy stated that the requested sign was proportional to the size of the building and the proposed sign would allow people to identify the Purpose Energy Building while driving down the street. The proposed sign also met the corporate standards established by Purpose Energy. N. Sielschott asked if the intention of the sign was to make it visible from State Route 66. With the addition of Spring Creek Building Supplies' Building, it will make it very difficult to see the Purpose Energy Building from State Route 66. N. Sielschott asked if the sign was to be illuminated. Purpose Energy stated that it would not be lit but would be painted on the side of the building in white letters. S. Bruns stated that a directional sign out on State Route 66 would perhaps be a better identifier for trucks into Purpose Energy because the proposed wall sign doesn't meet village standards. B. Garmann reiterated that the proposed wall sign would not be seen from State Route 66 and that a directional sign would be a better way to identify the facility.
 - b) A variance request by Kevin and Jessica Ralston, owners of the residential property at 161 South Hanover Street. The Ralston's would like to erect a pool house/garage at the rear of their property. The proposed pool house/garage would be set back 3 feet off the property line on the south side of the property. The Zoning Code calls for a 7.5 feet setback from the south property line. A variance of 4.5 feet would be necessary for the Ralston's to erect their garage/pool house. Kevin Ralston explained that they would like to erect a garage/pool house in line with an existing fence. Moving the proposed building over to comply with zoning would call for additional fencing and the Ralston's are unable to find the same style of fencing. N. Sielschott asked about the house on the south side if it would be close to the proposed building. The Tebbe's house sits further towards Hanover Street so it would not be impacted. B. Garmann asked how far the building would be off the alley. K. Ralston replied that it would be eleven to twelve feet off of the alley. B. Garmann also asked about the bedroom and bathroom in the building. K. Ralston

stated that it would be used for family and would not be rented out. Also discussed was the lean-to and how big that was. Ralston's replied that the lean-to was not going to be installed. S. Bruns asked whether there were comments from any neighbors and Harrod replied that there were not. N. Sielschott asked that given the building across the alley, was there enough space to turn a vehicle into the garage. K. Ralston replied that there would be.

- II. The regular meeting was called to order by President Garmann at 7:17 pm.
- III. The minutes from June 9, 2026, meeting were read. There were no changes to the minutes. N. Sielschott motioned and E. Schmiesing seconded to approve the minutes. All voted in favor of the motion to approve the minutes.
- IV. New Business
 - a) A variance request by Purpose Energy – Minster LLC owners of a building located at 80 Columbia Drive in Minster. Purpose Energy would like to erect a 200 square foot wall sign onto their building. The proposed 200 Square Foot sign is 136 square feet larger than what is permitted in the zoning code. A variance of 136 square feet is needed to allow Purpose Energy to erect the sign. The board questioned who Purpose Energy was trying to reach. No other businesses in the community have a sign as big as what was proposed by Purpose Energy. B. Garmann again stated that a directional sign on State Route 66 would be more appropriate. N. Sielschott stated that once a variance is granted it sets a precedent. Being no further discussion, N. Sielschott motioned and S. Bruns seconded a motion to deny the request. All voted in favor.
 - b) A variance request by Kevin and Jessica Ralston, owners of the residential property at 161 South Hanover Street. The Ralston's would like to erect a pool house/garage at the rear of their property. The proposed pool house/garage would be set back 3 feet off the property line on the south side of the property. The Zoning Code calls for a 7.5 feet setback from the south property line. A variance of 4.5 feet would be necessary for the Ralston's to erect their garage/pool house. N. Sielschott stated that given the limitations of the older lots in town the request was not out of line. B. Garmann questioned how close the south wall of the proposed building would be to the lot line and that if the building was moved over, which the Ralston's could do, they would then be in compliance with the zoning code. E. Schmiesing asked how far the roof overhang on the south side would be. K. Ralston replied that it would be one foot. K. Ralston was asked if the building would be a pole barn, he replied that it would be stick built with a steel siding. Being no further discussion, E. Schmiesing motioned to approve the request. N. Sielschott seconded the motion. A vote was taken with three members voting for the motion and one opposed.
- V. Old Business
 - (a) The topic of auto-covers for pools was discussed. Harrod stated that he had talked with Stolly insurance and that pool covers were fine as a replacement to fencing. N. Sielschott asked about liability if the cover was left off. J. Hearn stated that there would be no liability for the village. Harrod said that several communities are doing away with the fence requirement as long as an auto-cover are installed, however, no one has requested a pool cover in the village. Discussion also took place regarding the definition

of a pool and hot tub. J. Hearn stated that there was a clear definition of a hot tub in case law but not a pool.

VI. Comments:

There were no comments.

VII. Adjournment

N. Sielschott motioned and S. Bruns seconded a motion to adjourn at 7:35 pm. Motion passed.