

Notice of Public Meeting
Tuesday, January 13, 2026
4:30 p.m.

**DOOR COUNTY
 BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

*Door County Government Center
 Peninsula Room
 (C121, 1st floor)
 421 Nebraska Street, Sturgeon Bay, WI*

USE THE 4TH STREET ENTRANCE, ACROSS FROM THE LIBRARY.

AGENDA

- 1.0 Call to order and declaration of quorum
- 2.0 Final disposition of the following case(s) considered by the Board of Adjustment on December 9, 2026.
 - 2.1 Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC; floodplain fill extent and shoreland setback; Nasewaupsee; PIN 0200228282533P1 (4018 Roalkvam Road)
- 3.0 Read and act on minutes of December 9, 2026, meeting
- 4.0 County Staff Email Address Update
- 5.0 Future meeting schedule:
 - January 27th: If necessary; no public hearings
 - February 10th: If necessary; possible public hearing
 - February 24th: If necessary; possible public hearing
- 6.0 Vouchers
- 7.0 Adjournment

Applicants and others who wish to speak must attend in person.

Members of the public who wish to simply monitor/observe the hearings and meeting may attend in person or do so remotely by using the link below, or via the Zoom smartphone app, or by calling (312) 626-6799.

Link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86936312366?pwd=qGL0z9suhJFZIHj5GBZ0b0ZQRnO60I.1>

Zoom ID: 869 3631 2366
 Passcode: 323452

Deviation from order shown may occur.

Bob Ryan, Chair
 Door County Board of Adjustment
 c/o Door County Land Use Services Dept.
 Door County Government Center
 421 Nebraska St.
 Sturgeon Bay, WI 54235

Notice in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act: 1) Any person needing assistance to participate in this meeting should contact the Office of the County Clerk at (920) 746-2200. Notification 72 hours prior to a meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. 2) Door County is committed to making its electronic and information technology (e.g., website and contents) accessible for all persons. If you encounter difficulty accessing the posted materials for this meeting, located on-line at <https://www.co.door.wi.gov/AgendaCenter> under the committee name, or have trouble accessing the virtual meeting, please call (920) 746-2323, or send a FAX to (920) 746-2387, or send an e-mail to Lriemer@co.door.wi.us so that we may determine how to best assist you.

**DOOR COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Decision – Shoreland Setback Variance**

APPLICANT(S) NAME(S): Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC
PROPERTY ADDRESSES / PIN: 4018 Roalkvam Road / PIN 020-02-28282533P1
HEARING DATE: December 9, 2025
DECISION DATE: December 9, 2025

DESCRIPTION OF VARIANCE REQUESTED:

Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC, requests variances from Section 4.3(1)(a) of the Door County Floodplain Zoning Ordinance (DCFZO) and Section IV.B.2.b. of the Door County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance (DCSZO). DCFZO Sec. 4.3(1)(a) requires fill around a residence to be one foot or more above the regional flood elevation, extending at least 15 feet beyond the limits of the residence. DCSZO Sec. IV.B.2.b. requires accessory structures to be located at least 75 feet from the ordinary high-water mark (OHWM). Applicant proposes to construct a new residence with required floodplain fill extending 14.5 feet to the edge of the private road easement north of the residence and an accessory retaining wall structure located as close as 31 feet from the OHWM.

DECISION:

On the basis of the Decision-Making Worksheets (attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full) and the record in this matter the Board of Adjustment finds and determines that:

- A. The requested variance from Section 4.3(1)(a) of the Door County Floodplain Zoning Ordinance does meet the criteria set forth in Section 59.694(7), Wisconsin Statutes. The Board of Adjustment voted to approve the petition for grant of variance from Section 4.3(1)(a) of the Door County Floodplain Zoning Ordinance by the following vote.

Bob Ryan: Aye
Monica Nelson: Aye
Jeff Schmeckpeper: Aye
Brian Forest: Aye

- B. The requested variance from Section IV.B.2.b. of the Door County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance does not meet the criteria set forth in Section 59.694(7), Wisconsin Statutes. The Board of Adjustment voted to deny the petition for grant of variance from Section IV.B.2.b. of the Door County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance by the following vote.

Bob Ryan: Aye
Monica Nelson: Aye
Jeff Schmeckpeper: Aye
Brian Forest: Aye

Signed _____
Chairperson

Signed _____
Recording Clerk

Dated: January 13, 2026
Filed: January 14, 2026

Appeal: *This decision may be appealed by a person aggrieved by this decision by filing an action in certiorari in the circuit court for this county within 30 days after the date of filing of this decision. The County of Door assumes no liability for and makes no warranty as to reliance on this decision if construction is commenced prior to expiration of this 30 day period.*

The privileges granted by this decision shall become void one (1) year after the filed date unless the zoning permits for the authorized project have been obtained within such time.

**DOOR COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
DECISION-MAKING WORKSHEET**

APPLICANT(S) NAME(S): Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC
PROPERTY ADDRESSES / PIN: 4018 Roalkvam Road / PIN 020-02-28282533P1
HEARING DATE: December 9, 2025
DECISION DATE: December 9, 2025

DESCRIPTION OF VARIANCE REQUESTED:

Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC, requests a variance from Section 4.3(1)(a) of the Door County Floodplain Zoning Ordinance (DCFZO). DCFZO Sec. 4.3(1)(a) requires fill around a residence to be one foot or more above the regional flood elevation, extending at least 15 feet beyond the limits of the residence. Applicant proposes to construct a new residence with required floodplain fill extending 14.5 feet to the edge of the private road easement north of the residence.

To grant an area variance, all three of the standards enumerated below must be met. In addressing each standard, express the reasons for the decision, i.e., why the facts did or did not satisfy the standards, the weight and credibility of the evidence presented (or lack thereof), and any other relevant considerations.

1. UNIQUE PHYSICAL PROPERTY LIMITATIONS.

Are there unique physical property limitations such as steep slopes, wetlands, or parcel shape that prevent compliance with the ordinance? The circumstances of an applicant (growing family, need for a larger garage, etc.) are not factors in deciding variances. Property limitations that prevent ordinance compliance and are common to a number of properties should be addressed by amending the ordinance. The variance is not warranted if the physical character of the property allows a landowner to develop or build in compliance with the zoning ordinance.

In order for a variance to satisfy the unique physical property limitation test, the question below must be answered affirmatively.

Does this property contain unique physical property limitations (e.g., wetland presence, parcel shape, steep slope, etc.) that would prevent compliance with the ordinance?
YES X NO

EXPLAIN: Unique physical property limitations exist due to the proximity of the existing residence to two navigable waterways and the private road bisecting the lot. The proximity of navigable waterways to the residence limits buildable area on the lot and the proximity of the private road limits the extent of floodplain fill that can be placed adjacent to the residence.

2. UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP.

Unnecessary hardship exists when a literal enforcement of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or when conformity with ordinance standards would be unnecessarily burdensome.

Considerations:

- Unnecessary hardship should be determined in light of the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance in question, as well as any statute or administrative rule upon which the ordinance is based. (See page 4.) The facts of the case should be analyzed in light of these purposes. Only after considering the purpose(s) of the statute and/or ordinance, and the nature of the specific restriction(s) at issue, may a decision be made as to whether or not failure to grant a variance will cause an unnecessary hardship.
- Unnecessary hardship may arise due to a unique property limitation of a parcel (see #1, above). A variance is not warranted if the physical character of the property allows a landowner to develop or build in compliance with the zoning ordinance.
- Unnecessary hardship does not include considerations personal to the property owner (e.g., personal preference, desire to maximizing the economic value of the property, or financial hardship caused by ordinance compliance).
- Any self-created hardship, and/or any hardship that existed irrespective of the zoning ordinance in question are not proper grounds upon which to grant a variance.
- Alternatives to a variance (e.g., conditional use permit or restrictive covenant) may, as neither runs with the land, be preferable to accommodate a disability of the owner or owner's dependent.

In order for a variance to satisfy the unnecessary hardship test, one of the questions below (A or B) must be answered affirmatively.

- A. Does denial of the variance -- i.e., requiring compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance provision(s) in question (e.g., setbacks, height limitations, etc.) -- unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose?**
 YES _____ NO _____

EXPLAIN:

OR

- B. Is conformity with the regulation(s) unnecessarily burdensome?**
 YES X NO _____

EXPLAIN: Compliance would be unnecessarily burdensome in multiple ways as it would require relocation of the private road or require reducing the size of the proposed residence, which is already limited to the existing residence's building footprint. Compliance would not significantly reduce the residence's risk from flooding.

3. PUBLIC INTEREST/SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

A variance may not be granted which results in harm to public interests, nor thwarts the spirit and intent of the ordinance. In applying this test, the board should review the purpose statements of the ordinance (and any statute or administrative rule upon which the ordinance is based) in order to identify public interests. (See page 4.) The short-term and long-term impacts of the proposal and the cumulative impacts of similar projects on the interests of the neighbors, the community, and even the state, should be considered. Review should focus on the general public interest, rather than just the narrow interests or impacts on neighbors, patrons, or residents in the vicinity of the project.

Cumulative effects are a proper consideration. For instance, in the context of shoreland zoning, the general availability of variances permitting the horizontal expansion of structures so close to the water's edge may have the cumulative effect of enclosing our lakes within a wall of impermeable surfaces to the exclusion of vegetation and impairing the ecological functions of the shoreland buffer.

A variance is not a popularity contest. The mere fact of public support or opposition is not, in and of itself, determinative of whether or not a variance is contrary to the public interest.

The board may grant only the minimum variance needed, i.e., the minimum variance necessary to relieve the unnecessary hardship. For instance, if the request is for a variance of 30 feet from the minimum setback, and a finding is made that a 10-foot setback reduction would allow the petitioner to use the property for a permitted purpose, then only a 10-foot setback reduction may be authorized.

Distinguish between hardships that are unnecessary in light of the unique conditions of the property and the purpose of the zoning ordinance from hardships that are inconsequential or not unique or because a variance would unduly undermine the purpose of the ordinance or the public interest.

In order for a variance to satisfy the public interest test, the question below must be answered negatively.

Does the granting of the variance result in harm to the public interest?

YES _____ NO X

EXPLAIN: There is no harm to public interest. Granting of the variance will improve conformity with floodplain development standards, improve appearance of the lot while maintaining the existing building footprint, and reduce the residence's risk from flooding.

Has the applicant seeking a variance demonstrated that each of the three standards has been satisfied in this case? YES X NO _____. If yes, then substantial justice will be done by granting the variance.

Dated this: December 9, 2025

Door County Zoning Ordinance Purpose Statements

"1.04 Purpose. The purpose of this Ordinance is to promote and protect public health, safety, aesthetics, and other aspects of the general welfare. Further purposes of this Ordinance are to:

- (1) Aid in implementing the county development plan.
- (2) Promote planned and orderly land use development.
- (3) Protect property values and the property tax base.
- (4) Fix reasonable dimensional requirements to which buildings, structures, and lots shall conform.
- (5) Prevent overcrowding of the land.
- (6) Advance uses of land in accordance with its character and suitability.
- (7) Provide property with access to adequate sunlight and clean air.
- (8) Aid in protection of groundwater and surface water.
- (9) Preserve wetlands.
- (10) Protect the beauty of landscapes.
- (11) Conserve flora and fauna habitats.
- (12) Preserve and enhance the county's rural characteristics.
- (13) Protect vegetative shore cover.
- (14) Promote safety and efficiency in the county's road transportation system.
- (15) Define the duties and powers of administrative bodies in administering this Ordinance.
- (16) Prescribe penalties for violation of this Ordinance."

Wisconsin Statutes Purpose Statement

281.31. Navigable waters protection law

"(1) To aid in the fulfillment of the state's role as trustee of its navigable waters and to promote public health, safety, convenience and general welfare, it is declared to be in the public interest to make studies, establish policies, make plans and authorize municipal shoreland zoning regulations for the efficient use, conservation, development and protection of this state's water resources. The regulations shall relate to lands under, abutting or lying close to navigable waters. The purposes of the regulations shall be to further the maintenance of safe and healthful conditions; prevent and control water pollution; protect spawning grounds, fish and aquatic life; control building sites, placement of structure and land uses and reserve shore cover and natural beauty." *(Emphasis added.)*

Examples as to how to use the above in conjunction with analysis of a variance request

When considering a variance request to relax the required ordinary high water mark setback, county zoning ordinance purposes (8), (10), (11), and (13) are likely relevant to consider. Purposes (2), (3), (4), and (5) may also be relevant. Depending upon the nature of the variance request, any of the components of the statutory purposes behind shoreland zoning (above) may be relevant to consider.

When considering a variance request to relax a required yard (setback), county zoning ordinance purposes (2), (3), (4), and (5) are likely relevant to consider.

**DOOR COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
DECISION-MAKING WORKSHEET**

APPLICANT(S) NAME(S): Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC
PROPERTY ADDRESSES / PIN: 4018 Roalkvam Road / PIN 020-02-28282533P1
HEARING DATE: December 9, 2025
DECISION DATE: December 9, 2025

DESCRIPTION OF VARIANCE REQUESTED:

Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC, requests a variance from Section IV.B.2.b. of the Door County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance (DCSZO). DCSZO Sec. IV.B.2.b. requires accessory structures to be located at least 75 feet from the ordinary high-water mark (OHWM). Applicant proposes to construct an accessory retaining wall structure located as close as 31 feet from the OHWM.

To grant an area variance, all three of the standards enumerated below must be met. In addressing each standard, express the reasons for the decision, i.e., why the facts did or did not satisfy the standards, the weight and credibility of the evidence presented (or lack thereof), and any other relevant considerations.

1. UNIQUE PHYSICAL PROPERTY LIMITATIONS.

Are there unique physical property limitations such as steep slopes, wetlands, or parcel shape that prevent compliance with the ordinance? The circumstances of an applicant (growing family, need for a larger garage, etc.) are not factors in deciding variances. Property limitations that prevent ordinance compliance and are common to a number of properties should be addressed by amending the ordinance. The variance is not warranted if the physical character of the property allows a landowner to develop or build in compliance with the zoning ordinance.

In order for a variance to satisfy the unique physical property limitation test, the question below must be answered affirmatively.

Does this property contain unique physical property limitations (e.g., wetland presence, parcel shape, steep slope, etc.) that would prevent compliance with the ordinance?

YES X NO

EXPLAIN: Unique physical property limitations exist due to the required setbacks from two navigable waterways and lot depth between the navigable waterways. The navigable waterways and lot depth limit buildable area on the lot.

2. UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP.

Unnecessary hardship exists when a literal enforcement of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or when conformity with ordinance standards would be unnecessarily burdensome.

Considerations:

- Unnecessary hardship should be determined in light of the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance in question, as well as any statute or administrative rule upon which the ordinance is based. (See page 4.) The facts of the case should be analyzed in light of these purposes. Only after considering the purpose(s) of the statute and/or ordinance, and the nature of the specific restriction(s) at issue, may a decision be made as to whether or not failure to grant a variance will cause an unnecessary hardship.
- Unnecessary hardship may arise due to a unique property limitation of a parcel (see #1, above). A variance is not warranted if the physical character of the property allows a landowner to develop or build in compliance with the zoning ordinance.
- Unnecessary hardship does not include considerations personal to the property owner (e.g., personal preference, desire to maximizing the economic value of the property, or financial hardship caused by ordinance compliance).
- Any self-created hardship, and/or any hardship that existed irrespective of the zoning ordinance in question are not proper grounds upon which to grant a variance.
- Alternatives to a variance (e.g., conditional use permit or restrictive covenant) may, as neither runs with the land, be preferable to accommodate a disability of the owner or owner's dependent.

In order for a variance to satisfy the unnecessary hardship test, one of the questions below (A or B) must be answered affirmatively.

- C. Does denial of the variance -- i.e., requiring compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance provision(s) in question (e.g., setbacks, height limitations, etc.) -- unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose?**
 YES _____ NO X

EXPLAIN: An alternate retaining wall solution (i.e., unstructured vegetated walls, a.k.a. bio-retaining walls) negates the need for a variance.

OR

- D. Is conformity with the regulation(s) unnecessarily burdensome?**
 YES _____ NO X

EXPLAIN: An alternate retaining wall solution (i.e., unstructured vegetated walls, a.k.a. bio-retaining walls) negates the need for a variance.

3. PUBLIC INTEREST/SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

A variance may not be granted which results in harm to public interests, nor thwarts the spirit and intent of the ordinance. In applying this test, the board should review the purpose statements of the ordinance (and any statute or administrative rule upon which the ordinance is based) in order to identify public interests. (See page 4.) The short-term and long-term impacts of the proposal and the cumulative impacts of similar projects on the interests of the neighbors, the community, and even the state, should be considered. Review should focus on the general public interest, rather than just the narrow interests or impacts on neighbors, patrons, or residents in the vicinity of the project.

Cumulative effects are a proper consideration. For instance, in the context of shoreland zoning, the general availability of variances permitting the horizontal expansion of structures so close to the water's edge may have the cumulative effect of enclosing our lakes within a wall of impermeable surfaces to the exclusion of vegetation and impairing the ecological functions of the shoreland buffer.

A variance is not a popularity contest. The mere fact of public support or opposition is not, in and of itself, determinative of whether or not a variance is contrary to the public interest.

The board may grant only the minimum variance needed, i.e., the minimum variance necessary to relieve the unnecessary hardship. For instance, if the request is for a variance of 30 feet from the minimum setback, and a finding is made that a 10-foot setback reduction would allow the petitioner to use the property for a permitted purpose, then only a 10-foot setback reduction may be authorized.

Distinguish between hardships that are unnecessary in light of the unique conditions of the property and the purpose of the zoning ordinance from hardships that are inconsequential or not unique or because a variance would unduly undermine the purpose of the ordinance or the public interest.

In order for a variance to satisfy the public interest test, the question below must be answered negatively.

Does the granting of the variance result in harm to the public interest?

YES NO

EXPLAIN: Granting of the variance is not supported by the purpose and intent of the Door County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

Has the applicant seeking a variance demonstrated that each of the three standards has been satisfied in this case? YES NO . If yes, then substantial justice will be done by granting the variance.

Dated this: December 9, 2025

Door County Zoning Ordinance Purpose Statements

"1.04 Purpose. The purpose of this Ordinance is to promote and protect public health, safety, aesthetics, and other aspects of the general welfare. Further purposes of this Ordinance are to:

- (17) Aid in implementing the county development plan.
- (18) Promote planned and orderly land use development.
- (19) Protect property values and the property tax base.
- (20) Fix reasonable dimensional requirements to which buildings, structures, and lots shall conform.
- (21) Prevent overcrowding of the land.
- (22) Advance uses of land in accordance with its character and suitability.
- (23) Provide property with access to adequate sunlight and clean air.
- (24) Aid in protection of groundwater and surface water.
- (25) Preserve wetlands.
- (26) Protect the beauty of landscapes.
- (27) Conserve flora and fauna habitats.
- (28) Preserve and enhance the county's rural characteristics.
- (29) Protect vegetative shore cover.
- (30) Promote safety and efficiency in the county's road transportation system.
- (31) Define the duties and powers of administrative bodies in administering this Ordinance.
- (32) Prescribe penalties for violation of this Ordinance."

Wisconsin Statutes Purpose Statement

281.31. Navigable waters protection law

"(1) To aid in the fulfillment of the state's role as trustee of its navigable waters and to promote public health, safety, convenience and general welfare, it is declared to be in the public interest to make studies, establish policies, make plans and authorize municipal shoreland zoning regulations for the efficient use, conservation, development and protection of this state's water resources. The regulations shall relate to lands under, abutting or lying close to navigable waters. The purposes of the regulations shall be to further the maintenance of safe and healthful conditions; prevent and control water pollution; protect spawning grounds, fish and aquatic life; control building sites, placement of structure and land uses and reserve shore cover and natural beauty." *(Emphasis added.)*

Examples as to how to use the above in conjunction with analysis of a variance request

When considering a variance request to relax the required ordinary high water mark setback, county zoning ordinance purposes (8), (10), (11), and (13) are likely relevant to consider. Purposes (2), (3), (4), and (5) may also be relevant. Depending upon the nature of the variance request, any of the components of the statutory purposes behind shoreland zoning (above) may be relevant to consider.

When considering a variance request to relax a required yard (setback), county zoning ordinance purposes (2), (3), (4), and (5) are likely relevant to consider.

These minutes have not been reviewed by the oversight committee and are subject to approval or revision at the next regular committee meeting.

**MINUTES OF MEETING
DOOR COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

December 9, 2025

1.0 Call to order and declaration of quorum

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Ryan at 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, December 9, 2025, in the Peninsula Room (C-121) of the Door County Government Center, Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin.

Present:

BOA Members

Bob Ryan, Chairperson
Monica Nelson
Jeff Schmeckpeper
Brian Forest, First Alternate

Staff

Jeff Kussow, Planner
Adam Ferrell, Code Administrator

2.0 Discuss and arrive at a decision on Petition(s) for Grant of Variance

2.1 Craig Larson, on behalf of CC Larson Family LLC; floodplain fill extent and shoreland setback; Nasewaupsee; PIN 0200228282533P1 (4018 Roalkvam Road)

Motion by Schmeckpeper, seconded by Nelson, to approve the Variance from Section 4.3(1)(a) of the Door County Floodplain Zoning Ordinance, as requested. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

Motion by Schmeckpeper, seconded by Forest, to deny the Variance from Section IV.B.2.b. of the Door County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

The basis for the decision(s) is set forth in the Board of Adjustment decision document.

3.0 Read and act on minutes of October 14, 2025, meeting

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Schmeckpeper, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously (4-0).

4.0 Future meeting schedule

- **December 23rd: Cancelled**
- **January 13th: Business meeting; possible public hearing**
- **January 27th: If necessary**

Future meeting schedule discussed as noted. All members present stated they are available for the January 13th meeting. All members present, except Schmeckpeper, stated they are available for the January 27th meeting.

5.0 Vouchers

All BOA members' vouchers reflect a 1-hour meeting.

6.0 Adjournment

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Schmeckpeper, to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously (4-0). Chairperson Ryan declared the meeting adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Adam Ferrell, Code Administrator