**CITY OF INDIANOLA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING**
October 1, 2025
6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
Minutes

## 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

## 2. Roll Call

All members present: Jane Whalen, Rene Soldwisch, Lee Bash, Deidre Hoover.

Staff members present: Bryce Johnson, Bill Mettee, Tara Bosteder.

## 3. Agenda Approval

A. Approval of the October 1, 2025 agenda.

Soldwisch made a motion to approve the agenda.
Whalen seconded the motion.
Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

## 4. Minutes Approval

A. Approval of the September 3, 2025 meeting minutes.

Soldwisch made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.
Hoover seconded the motion.
Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

## 5. New Business

A. Consider Variance Request from Marshall Hildreth at 902 West Clinton Avenue to permit an accessory structure that would not meet required setbacks.

Mettee presented the variance request and related staff report.

The floor is not planned to be concrete at this time, but the applicant commented that it might get done in the future.

Whalen made a motion to approve the request as submitted.
Soldwisch seconded the motion.
Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

B. Consider Variance Request from Sandquist Investments, LLC at 203 South D Street to permit an accessory structure that would not meet required setbacks.

Mettee presented the variance request and related staff report.

This residence is in an older part of town where the primary structure already does not meet setback requirements per today's ordinance requirements.

There is an approximately six foot by ten foot garden shed that exists in the proposed location today which will be removed to construct the proposed accessory structure.

There is a fence that runs between properties, so there would be no fire truck access.

Soldwisch made a motion to approve the request as submitted.
Hoover seconded the motion.
Motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

C. Consider Variance Request from Clinton Beneke at 101 Apple Circle to permit an accessory structure that would not meet required setbacks and to permit a driveway expansion that exceeds maximum allowable width.

Mettee presented the variance request and related staff report.

The applicant, Clinton Beneke, clarified that he was looking to only add a winged portion of concrete off his existing driveway. He also added that there is an existing shed on his property that would be removed for construction of this proposed accessory structure, so that there would only be one accessory building in addition to the attached garage. He explained that he is a hobby mechanic and has children with vehicles, thus creating the desire for the extra space.

Barbara Ramos, neighbor to applicant, voiced opposition to the proposed variance. She explained that with her property sitting at a higher elevation, their view looks down onto the applicant's property; the proposed accessory structure would create an undesirable view for them, specifically mentioning the size of the structure, proximity of the structure, and the amount of concrete. Ramos also voiced concern that it would negatively affect any potential future sale of their home. Board member Soldwisch asked if the applicant were to be able to house some of the items currently outside within the new structure, potentially cleaning up her view, if that would affect her viewpoint. Ramos said she was unsure of what their intentions were and also that she was not aware of anything that would require them to do so; therefore, it would not guarantee a "cleaned up" view.

Bob Ormsby, neighbor to the applicant, also voiced his opposition to the proposed variance. He explained that the lot lines are unique for his and the applicant's properties, leaving most of the applicant's lot abutting his front yard. This unique positioning of parcels means it would create an obstructive view from his front yard. He does not believe this accessory structure is in line with the intent of the zoning ordinance. The proposed structure width could be changed to better comply with the ordinance, but he acknowledges that it would likely be the difference between a two car and three car garage. He also mentioned the walls for the proposed structure would be taller than the rest of the garages in the neighborhood by a couple of feet. He continued that he was also concerned with the widening of the driveway. He summarized his opposition stating an undesirable view, a negative impact potential for the future sale of his home, and a negative impact on the future sales of other homes if this property is overdeveloped. He further stated that adding this proposed structure would be excessive and would not be consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Ormsby went on mentioning that screening was proposed, but with the limited space to plant screening and the height of

garage walls, there would not be any screening effective enough for this purpose. He suggested scaling down the accessory structure, eliminating the need for the additional concrete driveway and that he would be more in support of this project.

Beneke responded that he was seeking additional space to better the space and movement capability for his hobby, to increase his ability to house his/his children's vehicles, and to be able to move two family heirloom vehicles out of storage and into his own garage. He added that the additional concrete for the driveway was requested to accommodate the ordinance requirement of a paved surface.

Board member Whalen asked for clarification of the ordinance requirements regarding accessory structures, attached and/detached. Mettee explained the ordinance did not limit the number of attached garages as long as setback requirements were met, and that two accessory structures are allowed up to 1,800 square feet. There is no restriction or requirement related to the number of garage doors.

Beneke also spoke to the potential screening of the proposed structure. He said he was willing to place screening in between his and Ormsby's property and that he was looking as some bushes that grow to 20 foot tall. He also acknowledged that the Ramos' already have some bushes in place on their property for screening purposes. Ramos commented that she has had those bushes planted for approximately five years and that the bushes she selected were recommended to her as fast-growing bushes, but they are still not at a size that is effective for screening.

Ormsby wanted to clarify that they weren't against the bushes for screening, they would just want to have input on what was planted there. They would want something that would be tall enough and grow quickly enough to be effective for screening purposes. Ormsby also wanted to bring to the attention of the board the ordinance requirement of accessory structures occupying no more than 10 percent of the parcel and that there were other structures existing on this parcel that would diminish the acceptable size of this proposed accessory structure. Board Member Whalen elaborated on this, as she had asked about this requirement as well. The ordinance requires 20 percent green space on each parcel and no more than 10 percent in accessory structures on each parcel.

Beneke also wanted to point out the size variety of the other garages and accessory structures in the neighborhood. He said he was also planning on building this proposed accessory structure to match the existing house. Therefore, it would fit it and be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

Board Member Bash highlighted the unique perspective that the neighbors would have of Beneke's property as compared to other neighboring houses in that neighborhood. Beneke did provide that he will be digging into the ground on the back side of the proposed structure. So that way, the structure would be lower that the top of his existing residence.

Board Member Hoover asked if the concrete was planned to be large enough to include a place for his trailer to be parked on. Beneke confirmed that it would be.

Board Member Soldwisch suggested storage unit availability as a potential way to help with the storage Beneke was looking to achieve. Beneke answered that he already had storage units rented for the items he was looking to relocate to his home. He further noted they don't want to move in order to achieve this goal as they enjoy their current neighbors and neighborhood.

The Board acknowledged the unique situation of this parcel, as it's in a cul-de-sac and the positioning of the parcels are unusual.

Bryce Johnson, Director of Community and Economic Development, added that the Board should consider proof of hardship, whether it was self imposed. The applicant is asking for a structure that is larger than what's allowed. It could be reduced to comply with the City's zoning code. Also, to be mindful of setting precedent if this structure is allowed.

Whalen made a motion to approve the request as submitted.
Soldwisch seconded the motion.
Motion was denied with a unanimous vote.

Applicant was encouraged to re-examine the building plans and work with Community Developement to determine something that would be approved.

**6. Comments**

Bryce Johnson was introduced as the new Director of Community and Economic Development.

Sue Edwards has applied to fill the vacant position on the Board of Adjustment, and upon approval by City Council, will begin with the November Board of Adjustment meeting.

There were no other comments.

**7. Adjourn**

Whalen made a motion to adjourn the meeting.
Hoover seconded the motion.
The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 PM.