

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM PLAN COMMITTEE
WORKING SESSION MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, MAY 26, 2026 - 12:00 PM
9996 WATER STREET**



Present: Andy Bartelt, Grace Held, Rick Hoyerman, Monique McClean, BD Thorp, and Ken Nelson – Chair.

Absent: Laird Hart.

Staff: Brent Bristol - Village Administrator and Kim Roberts - Deputy Clerk.

Guests: John Cox (online).

Call to Order: K. Nelson called the working session to order at 12:00 PM.

K. Nelson provided an update on last month's discussion regarding signs. He explained that during the quarterly meeting with the Ephraim Business Council (EBC), he learned that they had sent out an email to get reactions on the “sail” signs.

Bristol noted that he would be reaching out directly to businesses with the current ordinance language pertaining to signs and inviting businesses to participate in the upcoming dialogue regarding signs.

K. Nelson reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule: June 9, June 23, July 14, July 28, August 11, and August 25.

K. Nelson reviewed the summary of the comments submitted by Plan Committee members regarding the Protected Waterfront Ordinance. He invited discussion on how to best tackle the list of definitions and considerations listed.

Committee members agreed they would like to work through the ordinance with a group approach.

The Committee reviewed the ordinance. They spent considerable time reviewing the intent section (§17.20(1) of the ordinance. Bristol encouraged the Committee to define “open viewing space” to include the vantage point from which the views are being protected. Committee members engaged in extensive discussion about the meaning and application of open viewing space. Hoyerman suggested that the intent should focus on views toward Eagle Harbor in between structures, emphasizing that the concern was primarily about lateral views between buildings rather than vertical views affected by building height.

The Committee discussed possible definitions of “open viewing space”. Hoyerman proposed that it could be defined as “views between structures toward Eagle Harbor”, with this language to be incorporated into the intent statement. They discussed whether this should remain general in the intent statement or be further specified in the design criteria sections.

Hoyerman suggested adding language in the intent section after the current language “*for as much open viewing space*” to insert possible language such as, “*particularly when views of Eagle Harbor are especially limited between homes/structures from the street.*”

The Committee discussed the existing language stating “structures shall be restricted to those in existence as of January 1, 1998.” Members noted this language was confusing and potentially contradictory to current practices, since modifications and replacements that perhaps weren't originally contemplated have been approved. Hoyerman suggested clarifying this to specify that vacant properties as of that date shall remain vacant, while allowing modifications to existing structures under the section's provisions. A starting point for suggested language was discussed as “*Properties that did not have a structure as of January 1, 1998, shall remain vacant; there shall be no new buildings or structures.*” Hoyerman agreed to further work on the language to present to the Committee at the June 9th meeting.

The Committee reviewed §17.20(2) – Permitted Uses, noting that §17.20(3)(b)(2) should likely be moved under permitted uses with the addition “*subject to design review.*” Additionally, the word “*replaced*” would be struck and substituted with the word “*reproduced.*”

The Committee reviewed §17.20(3) – Conditional Uses. No further changes were noted besides moving

§17.20(3)(b)(2) to the Permitted Uses - §17.20(2) and creating subsection (2)(c) for the previous §17.20(3)(b)(2).

§17.20(5) Design Review. Section A – General Requirements. Bristol explained that §17.20(5)(a)(1) essentially defines the building envelope. Significant discussion centered on whether to restrict increases in building width parallel to the shoreline to preserve open viewing space. The Committee debated various approaches, from completely prohibiting width increases to allowing width modifications only when total obstruction was reduced. Bartelt questioned the original intent of the ordinance, suggesting that buildings should not be allowed to become wider than their existing dimensions, as this would be consistent with the baseline principle that "nothing changes" except as specifically allowed.

Committee members explored scenarios where combining accessory structures with principal residences might either help or harm open viewing space objectives. Bristol noted that some properties could benefit from consolidating multiple small structures if done without increasing the total width obstruction. The Committee considered allowing footprint modifications and even combinations of structures, provided the principal structure's width parallel to the road did not increase. They discussed potential benefits when projects actually reduced total width obstruction by eliminating separate accessory buildings.

Discussion of footprint modifications revealed complexity in balancing multiple objectives. The current ordinance prohibits increases to the total footprint of individual structures and prohibits combining structures, but members questioned whether these restrictions always served the open viewing space objective. Bristol suggested including dimensional standards directly in the Protected Waterfront Ordinance rather than referencing other ordinance sections, making the requirements clearer and more accessible.

The Committee discussed §17.20(5) Design Criteria- Section B. §17.20(5)(b)(2). The Committee noted that a clear definition of visual impact was required. Further, §17.20(5)(b)(3), Thorp suggested discussing lowering the height to twenty-two feet (22') to deter a full second floor.

The Committee discussed §17.20(6) – Other Requirements. The consensus was that the information in section six, not the subsections of the section, should be moved into the Design Criteria section §17.20(7). (*“Up to fifty percent (50%) of the total roof pitch square footage can be made up of dormers that may be less than 6/12, but in no case may be less than 3/12”*). Additionally, the Committee determined that the percentage needed to be decreased, as well as the need for a definition of a one and a half story as well as living space. Thorp suggested reaching out to get the assistance of a local architect for input on creating a definition. Thorp and K. Nelson agreed to work on the definition and present it at the June 9th meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 PM.

Recorded by Kim Roberts – Deputy Clerk