

Minutes of the Todd County Board of Adjustment Meeting

March 26th, 2026

Completed by: Sue Bertrand P&Z Staff

Site Visits conducted by Adam Ossefoort and Ken Hovet on March 24th, 2026.

Meeting attended by board members: Chair Russ Vandenheuvell, Vice Chair Bill Berscheit, Mike Soukup, Danny Payton, alternate Larry Bebus and Planning Commission Liaison Ken Hovet.

Staff members: Adam Ossefoort and Sue Bertrand

Other members of the public: Sign-in Sheet is available for viewing upon request.

Russ called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Each board member introduced themselves and Russ explained the process for those attending.

Danny motioned to have agenda approved as amended with Hartmann tabled to next month. Ken seconded voice vote, no dissent heard. Motion carried.

Ken motioned to have the February 26th, 2026 meeting minutes approved. Larry seconded, voice vote, no dissent heard. Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM 1: Mathew Parker – PID 03-0072000 – Birchdale Township

Request(s):

1. Request to reduce the lake setback from 150' to 90.3' for a dwelling addition
2. Request to reduce the lake setback from 150' to 90.3' for the addition of an attached garage
3. Request to increase the height limit from 18' to 28' for non-conforming dwelling addition all in Natural Environment Shoreland Zoning District.

Mathew and Jessica were present as the applicants.

Staff Findings: Adam reminded the board, from the last meeting, the applicants were informed to complete the EARTH assessment, which they did with Deja Anton and Josh Votruba, which he read the new information for the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning & Zoning Office.

Updated Conditions:

1. Maintain a minimum of 50% screening as viewed from the lake during leaf on conditions.
2. Implementation of recommendations cited by the Soil and Water Conservation District.
3. Applicant shall obtain additional permitting from other government agencies as necessary including but not limited to the Sauk River Watershed District.

Mathew confirmed the staff report was accurate, and stated they plan to maintain everything they have going on and adding what is recommended by Soil and Water.

Correspondence received: Nothing new.

Public comment: None

Board discussion:

Danny was trying to determine what all is being added to the structure, and why the 28' height increase when this is a single family?

Adam showed on overhead the survey with the drawn in portion in red.

Mathew explained currently the house is 21 feet tall and they want to get rid of one level that drops down from the garage, so they have just one level and not walking up and down steps all over the house, so they want to raise that level up and they will need 5-7 feet, to do it.

Jessica stated the twenty eight feet is to match the addition to the current level of the garage and it will be one "main level" living.

Jessica reviewed plan in detail. Raising the entire lower level up, leaving the garage the same level.

Danny, so, garage is the second level and you are raising the whole house up.

Russ asked if there were any questions with the addition of the EARTH report. He asked the Parkers if they were okay with all of the proposed conditions.

Mathew, yes, and explained what is currently in place already. He also described the entire areas that help contain water and a culvert allowing west water to drain through a driveway culvert into the east side of the yard where it is contained. Planning on adding shrubs back in. He also explained the water flow and the elevations around the lot.

Adam showed photos of both sides of the driveway.

Russ asked how far from the property line was the garage addition?

Mathew, 11'.

Bill noticed the buildable area is currently being used as a water retention area, however, logically he agrees not to move the house back into the water retention area, however, he is not convinced if there was a total rebuild, it cannot be moved back 10 – 15 feet and at least gain some distance from the lake and still have the retention area.

Russ agreed.

Mike asked if the total foundation would have to be torn out anyway?

Mathew, yes, it is a wood foundation.

Mike agreed with the board pushing it back a little closer to the road. Jessica mentioned the driveway is already steep, and to shorten that is not ideal. We will lose any place to put a vehicle as it will all be on a hill.

Russ, in his opinion, ten feet would be from him to applicants away and put the house at the 100' mark and if they agree with the stipulations, he would have no problem with this.

Bill made the motion to grant the two variances at 105' from the lake, the peak height variance request as is, with conditions, and to include recommendations put together by staff.

Adam repeated to clarify.

Ken stated he is having trouble with the effort needed to move the entire house back 15' and is it worth any gain? They already have a good water management plan put together by good, qualified people.

Jessica, this is what we wanted to do, but if we do not get approved for this, we have to pivot.

Mike seconded the motion.

Proposed conditions:

1. Maintain a minimum of 50% screening as viewed from the lake during leaf on conditions.
2. Implementation of recommendations cited by the Soil and Water Conservation District.
3. Applicant shall obtain additional permitting from other government agencies as necessary including but not limited to the Sauk River Watershed District.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Mike Soukup	Yes
Bill Berscheit	Yes
Dan Peyton	Abstained as he is not familiar enough with the application and previous discussions.
Ken Hovet	No
Larry Bebus	Yes
Russell Vandenheuvel	Yes

AGENDA ITEM 2: Paul Hartmann: – PID 17-0050300 – Little Sauk Township
This item is tabled until the April 23rd, 2026 meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Vertical Bridge: – PID 13-0025100 – Iona Township

Request: to decrease the required setback from 230' to 82' 6" for proposed construction of a communications tower in AF-1 Zoning District.

Alex Trumann was present as the applicant on behalf of Vertical Bridge.

Staff Findings: Adam read the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning & Zoning Office.

Proposed Condition:

1. Applicant shall abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Alex agreed with the staff report.

Ken went over his site visit report. This report may be viewed, in full, upon request at the Planning and Zoning office.

Alex added the tower is engineered and designed with a fail point, should a catastrophic event happen. It will not topple over like a tree, it is designed to collapse within a footprint that will not reach the right of way.

Correspondence received: None

Public comment: None.

Board discussion:

Bill asked to see any neighboring housing, population density and possible traffic.

Danny asked who lives the closest to this structure?

Alex, south property, but property is only used recreationally, no body resides there according to the township.

Adam showed on GIS the surrounding properties and explained the nearest building site is approximately 800 plus feet away.

Mike asked if this means they are going to go from 2G to 3G or 3G to 5G?

Alex, it is really about coverage and capacity, overall. It is just very limited in that area. It is driven by customer demand since more people are using their phones not to make phone calls but it is more data driven applications that are using up the band width, and it has been really hard on the network. That capacity has been decreasing, so we have been having to build these other cell phone sites in between other towers to improve that coverage and capacity. This area has been struggling for quite a while. He met with the township on this, and the clerk is dispatch for the area ambulance as first responder and will attest this is a very difficult area for ambulance and emergency response coverage. The primary goal here is to provide that necessity to the community.

Mike asked where they would be targeting your antennas.

Alex stated there will be three sectors going completely around at the top.

Dan asked if there were fiber optic cables coming in or is it transmitted right back out to another location? Alex stated he would have to double check but usually, in this area, fiber optics would be brought in along the right of way.

Mike asked if there was some other company bringing in the fiber optic cable or does Vertical provide that?

Alex stated Vertical Bridge just builds and manages the tower and manages the lease premises and the access drive. The carriers themselves are responsible for the cable. Verizon, T-Mobile or AT&T would contract out with their service provider, and they bring it into the right of way.

Mike, so you don't have a say on who uses the fiber, in case the community would like to tie into that, Vertical Bridge has nothing to say about that?

Alex, correct. If they are going to bring it out this far, Vertical would like to provide it to as many customers as possible, and we are strictly about the steel, the ground and the management of that leased space. Everything with the utility side and service is between the carrier and their provider. It has been his experience that when they bring fiber out there, they have been capable of providing services to other homes and businesses in the area.

Larry, the variance is 82'6" and should it fall, it requires 90', that will reach the right of way then.

Alex stated the "fall zone" is engineered and structurally designed from the center of the tower structure, 90'. The measurement to the right of way is from the nearest leg of the tower, so no, it will not reach the right of way or property lines and poses no risk to either.

Bill made the motion to grant with the condition set forth by staff and Dan seconded.

1. Applicant shall abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Mike Soukup	Yes
Dan Peyton	Yes
Bill Berscheit	Yes
Larry Bubus	Yes
Ken Hovet	Yes
Russ	Yes

Motion carried.

Ken motioned to adjourn and Dan seconded. Voice vote, no dissention heard. Motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 6:43 PM.