

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM
PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2026 – 7:00 PM
9996 WATER STREET**



ACTION ITEMS:

Thorp moved, Held seconded to approve the May 26, 2026, Plan Committee Working Session minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Held seconded to approve the May 26, 2026, Plan Committee minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the June 9, 2026, Plan Committee Working Session minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Bartelt seconded to approve the New SFR Design Review Application for Michael Wegner parcel 121-01-13312744B2 for color and material selections as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Hart seconded to approve the New SFR Design Review Application for Uselding/Brandemuehl for parcel 121-56-0007, conditioned upon the project not contributing additional runoff to neighboring properties, all ayes. Motion carried.

Held moved, Thorp seconded to recommend to the Village Board that they approve the intergovernmental agreement and lease with the County of Door for the Emergency Radio Communications Tower and lease, and to waive all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance that are inconsistent with the arrangement as reflected in those documents, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Hart seconded to adjourn at 8:30 PM, all ayes. Motion carried.

Present: Andy Bartelt, Laird Hart, Grace Held, Rick Hoyerman, BD Thorp, Ken Nelson – Chair.

Absent: Monique McClean

Staff: Brent Bristol - Village Administrator, Justin MacDonald - Fire Chief, and Kim Roberts - Deputy Clerk.

Guests in person: Ken Pabich – County Administrator and Kathy Pentler.

Guests online: Michael Wegner, Gary Houchin-Miller, “John C”, and “Paul”.

1. Call to order:

K. Nelson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

2. Quorum:

A quorum of the Plan Committee was present.

3. Approval of previous minutes:

Thorp moved, Held seconded to approve the May 26, 2026, Plan Committee Working Session minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Held seconded to approve the May 26, 2026, Plan Committee minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the June 9, 2026, Plan Committee Working Session minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

4. Changes in agenda: There were no changes.

5. Visitors’ Comments: There were no visitors’ comments.

6. Michael Wegner – County Q- 121-01-13312744B2 – New SFR – Design Review:

Bristol noted that this project received design approval during the May Plan Committee meeting, but final decisions regarding materials, colors, and finishes remained outstanding.

Michael Wegner participated remotely and presented the material and color selections. For the primary siding, Wegner selected LP Smartside Diamond Coat in an aged cedar/medium brown tone, chosen for its ability to mimic the appearance of real wood. He noted the product appears somewhat lighter in direct sunlight and that individual pieces vary slightly. For the fireplace, Wegner chose Door County Cobbles, describing them as lighter and more uniform than fieldstone, yet still in keeping with the kind of stone traditionally found throughout Ephraim. He referenced the fieldstone aesthetic of local barns and the Ephraim Clay Works as design inspirations. The roof will be a standing-seam, matte black metal with ribbed detailing but no exposed screws. Wegner also clarified that the siding orientation had been updated to vertical to better reflect traditional Wisconsin barn architecture, such as the Anderson Barn Museum, a change from the horizontal orientation shown in earlier drawings. The fireplace will be propane-fueled but will feature real stone on both the interior and exterior as a design element.

Material samples were passed among Committee members for review. The Committee expressed general approval of the selections, finding them attractive and appropriate.

Thorp moved, Bartelt seconded to approve the New SFR Design Review Application for parcel 121-01-13312744B2 for color and material selections as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

7. Uselding/Brandemuehl – 121-56-0007 – New SFR – Design Review:

Bristol noted that no representative for the project appeared to be present online or in person. This is the first home to be constructed in the Everett Acres subdivision, which was approved previously for a two-acre minimum lot as a rural residential (RR) district subdivision. Bristol confirmed that all dimensional standards fall within what is allowable in the district and that no significant areas of concern were identified.

Material samples were distributed to the Committee for review, including CertainTeed Series shingles in driftwood, Drexel Blue Door siding in snow white, a white metal finish attributed to the garage door, window cladding, door trim, soffit, and fascia, stone veneer called “Fond du Lac County Squire”, and an iron-colored front door. Bristol confirmed that the CertainTeed Series shingle products are approved for use even within the Historic District.

A discussion was held regarding the design review application for parcel 121-56-0007. K. Nelson noted it was somewhat unusual to see a full basement rather than a walkout given Door County's rocky terrain. Bristol explained that the egress window wells appeared compliant with state code requirements, with approximately three egress points corresponding to the number of bedrooms. K. Nelson raised a concern regarding the scale of land disturbance noted on the plans — approximately forty-five thousand two hundred thirty square feet (45,230 ft²), or over one (1) acre of a two (2) acre lot — and asked whether the grading plan had been reviewed to ensure no additional runoff would be directed onto neighboring properties. Bristol acknowledged the concern, noting that the subdivision's stormwater design includes detention basins and swales that may already account for this. He indicated he could follow up when construction begins and silt fencing is installed. The Committee agreed it was prudent to include a condition in the motion requiring that grading not result in additional runoff onto adjoining properties.

Thorp moved, Hart seconded to approve the New SFR Design Review Application for Uselding/Brandemuehl for parcel 121-56-0007, conditioned upon the project not contributing additional runoff to neighboring properties, all ayes. Motion carried.

8. County of Door – 121-02-19312831A- Communications tower, shelter, and generator:

Bristol provided background, noting that the Plan Committee, the Community Protection Committee (CPC), and the Village Board had been engaged with the County of Door on this project for several months. The county's representative, Ken Pabich, was present to speak about the project details.

Pabich described the proposed installation, which includes a lattice-style communications tower, an equipment shelter, a generator pad, and an optional pad for future cellular carriers. The tower will be 180 feet tall, including the antennas, bringing the total height to just under the two-hundred-foot (200') FAA lighting threshold, thereby avoiding the need for tower lighting — a deliberate design choice to respect the county's dark sky values. Pabich noted that Vertical Bridge would be constructing the tower and that Nsight may co-locate on the structure to improve cellular coverage in the Village, though this is not yet confirmed.

The equipment shelter is a pre-specified concrete or composite structure, earth-toned in color, housing radio and communications equipment that runs continuously and requires active cooling. The site would be enclosed with a clear chain-link fence, approximately eight feet (8') tall, with transparency maintained intentionally so that activity behind the fence remains visible.

Thorp asked about the FAA requirements relative to the nearby airport; Pabich confirmed that the project will undergo full FAA licensing and permitting review, including geotechnical and archaeological assessments, and that initial flight pattern analysis suggested the site should be acceptable.

Discussion arose regarding access to the site. K. Nelson noted the desire to discourage public access to the area near the old village dump. Pabich indicated the rear of the site would be gated and secured, and expressed openness to adding a gate near the front entrance as well. MacDonald suggested a simple chain between posts near the front would be sufficient.

K. Nelson referenced the site selection process, noting that the current location had been chosen in part to be farther from neighboring residences and to avoid disturbing the old dump site. He suggested the county consider shifting the tower slightly — approximately twenty feet (20') to the northwest — to preserve an existing tree line around the installation as a visual buffer. Pabich expressed flexibility on this, noting the lease agreement could be adjusted accordingly and brought back to the Village Board for approval. Thorp asked whether trees needed to be cleared to a minimum distance from the equipment; Pabich suggested that approximately a ten-foot (10') clearance around the fence line would be sufficient.

Hoyerman addressed the procedural and zoning implications, referencing section §17.18 of the zoning code and the public property provisions.

Bristol clarified that the primary zoning inconsistency being waived is the requirement that private towers be monopole or alternate-design structures rather than lattice-style — a requirement written with private development in mind, but technically applicable across the board, with the specific provision allowing the village to waive it for projects on village-involved land.

Bristol noted that the Committee's role at this stage is to recommend to the Village Board that it approve the Intergovernmental Agreement and lease and waive any zoning ordinance requirements inconsistent with the arrangement. He emphasized that the finer points of the agreement are being handled by the county's legal counsel and the Village attorney.

Held moved, Thorp seconded to recommend to the Village Board that they approve the Intergovernmental Agreement and lease with the County of Door for the Emergency Radio Communications Tower and lease, and to waive all requirements of the zoning ordinance that are inconsistent with the arrangement as reflected in those documents, all ayes. Motion carried.

9. Beart Family Cottage – 10439 N. Shore Road – Addition – Concept Review:

Bristol introduced this item as a concept review, non-binding, for the property located at 10439 N. Shore Road. He noted he had been working with the contractors on the project for approximately two (2) months, and that the owners chose to seek concept review before committing to a final design.

Bristol explained that the standard ordinary high water mark setback is seventy-five feet (75'). However, the Village zoning ordinance permits the Plan Committee, at its discretion, to allow setback averaging

based on adjacent properties. The neighbor to the north has a setback from the ordinary high water mark of twenty-eight feet (28') and the neighbor to the south has a setback from the ordinary high water mark of sixty-one feet (61'), producing an average of forty-five feet (45'). The proposed bedroom addition to the east side of the home falls behind the 45-foot average setback line but within the 75-foot standard setback, making it non-compliant under the standard rule but potentially approvable through setback averaging. Bristol confirmed that setback averaging has been allowed in the past for projects of similar and even greater scope, including new construction, and that it applies on a case-by-case basis.

Bristol reviewed the existing structure referred to in the plans as a "screen porch," which the owners propose to convert into conditioned living space (labeled as a bedroom/flex room). Bristol clarified that this structure, while called a screen porch, is built with a knee wall beneath the windows and screens, is covered by the full roof system of the house above, and includes an attic hatch within its ceiling. It is not a typical open or shed-roofed porch. This portion of the structure falls closer to the water than even the 45-foot average setback line, meaning it sits within the most restricted zone.

The Committee sought clarification on the purpose of the seventy-five-foot (75') setback, and Bristol explained that it likely serves multiple goals, including ecological protection, limiting sedimentation and runoff, and establishing general spatial buffers.

K. Nelson asked whether the entire existing house carries grandfathered status. Brent confirmed that any existing nonconforming structure retains its grandfather rights in perpetuity for maintenance, repair, and replacement, but that any new work or expansion is subject to current code. Therefore, the bedroom addition requires setback averaging approval, while the conditioning of the screen porch raises a separate question about intensification of nonconformity. Brent noted that even though the screen porch would not become dimensionally larger, converting it to conditioned space could arguably intensify the nonconformity.

Hart raised a broader procedural concern: it struck him as unusual that the Plan Committee could exercise discretionary approval on setback averaging without it being a conditional use or special exception proceeding, which would require neighbor notification.

Bristol suggested it could be discussed in future ordinance refinements, potentially by making setback averaging a conditional use, and perhaps distinguishing between modest additions to existing structures versus full teardown-and-rebuild scenarios.

Committee members expressed a range of views. Bartelt indicated he had no significant concerns with the project, noting that closing in the screen porch would not change the overall external dimensions of the structure and that the roofline already envelops that space. He argued that adding a larger addition to the east in lieu of closing in the porch would actually add more overall mass to the home. Held agreed there were no issues with either the addition or the screen porch, noting the continuous roofline. Hart expressed comfort with the project and noted he would need to review the ordinance provision allowing setback averaging. Thorp expressed comfort with the addition but raised concern about closing in the screen porch, stating that doing so would open precedents the Committee is actively trying to address through the ongoing Protective Waterfront (PW) work. Hoyerman questioned whether it might actually be simpler for the applicant to forgo the screen porch conversion and instead make a somewhat larger addition to the east, though Bartelt and K. Nelson noted this could result in greater overall bulk. K. Nelson noted that his discomfort with the screen porch conversion stemmed primarily from its location within the most restricted zone — had it been anywhere else on the property, he would have no objection to a homeowner enclosing a porch.

The Committee also briefly discussed the conversion of a "sleeping porch" into a kitchen as shown on the interior plans, with Bristol noting this raised no red flags, as it involves only interior reconfiguration, not expansion of the footprint.

The concept review resulted in a consensus of feedback for the applicants. The bedroom addition to the east was broadly supported; the enclosure of the screen porch was more contested, with a majority leaning toward approval but with reservations. Some Committee members suggested enlarging the proposed addition to the east and leaving the screened porch as is. K. Nelson noted the Committee would be willing to entertain another concept review if the applicants wished to further refine their approach, or they could proceed to design review.

10. New business for next meeting / next meeting date:

The next meeting date of the Plan Committee is July 28, 2026, at 7:00 PM.

11. Adjournment:

Thorp moved, Hart seconded to adjourn at 8:30 PM, all ayes. Motion carried.

Recorded by Kim Roberts – Deputy Clerk