

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM
PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2026 – 7:00 PM
9996 WATER STREET**



ACTION ITEMS:

Thorp moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the June 23, 2026, Plan Committee Working Session minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, McClean seconded to approve the June 23, 2026, Plan Committee minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the June 14, 2026, Plan Committee Working Session minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, McClean seconded to approve the New SFR – Design Review for Brian Attar at 9817 Norwegian Wood Drive as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

McClean moved, Bartelt seconded to approve the Landscape/Land Disturbance Plan for 10235 STH 42 for Julia Uihlein, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, McClean seconded to approve the Accessory Structure Design Review Application for 9751 STH 42 for PEA Properties as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Hoyerman moved, Bartelt seconded to adjourn at 8:47 PM, all ayes. Motion carried.

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

Absent: Grace Held.

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

Guests in person: Cora Elquist, Steve and Mary Ohm, Susie Samson, Nick Meissner, Ruann Larson, Sara Glenn, and Brian Reinhardt.

Guests online: Brent (John Joseph Company), John Van Der Vaart, Kathy Pentler, John Cox, John Cultra, “Matt”, “Paul”, and Tim and Nancy Christofferson.

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, Hoyerman seconded to approve the June 23, 2026, Plan Committee Working Session minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, McClean seconded to approve the June 23, 2026, Plan Committee minutes, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Thorp moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the June 14, 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. **Brian Attar– 9817 Norwegian Wood Drive- New SFR – Design Review:**

Bristol introduced the application for a new single-family residence (SFR) on Norwegian Wood Drive. He noted the project complies with the Village's 28-foot over-the-counter building height limit, meets all other dimensional standards, and that the Design Review Checklist had been completed. Representatives from Portside Construction were present and presented material samples, including asphalt shingles, LP Smart Side dark gray siding, black trim board, and natural stone elements.

Committee members expressed no concerns with the application.

Thorp moved, McClean seconded to approve the New SFR – Design Review for Brian Attar at 9817 Norwegian Wood Drive as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

7. **Julia Uihlein – 10235 STH 42– Landscape/Land Disturbance Plan:**

Bristol provided background, explaining this is a landscaping plan for a single-family residence previously approved by the Committee. He noted that for waterfront properties, landscape design is often not finalized at the time of the original building approval. Nick Meissner of Meissner Landscaping had presented the plan in detail at the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) meeting held earlier the same evening, and all Plan Committee members had been present for that presentation.

Thorp summarized the HPC discussion, noting members were impressed with the quality of the plan, the natural stone materials fitting within the Village's palette, and that the only outstanding questions were regarding the dog walk and railing heights, which were to come back before HPC and Plan Committee at a future date.

Bristol added that the plan includes detailed impervious surface calculations and complies with the Village's impervious surface limits, utilizing some permeable options. He confirmed that fencing and the dog run detail are not yet finalized and will return for future review.

A discussion was held regarding the landscape and land disturbance plan for 10235 STH 42. K. Nelson asked Meissner about the project timeline. Meissner indicated a fall start was planned. Hoyerman inquired about the lot size, which was confirmed at approximately 49,000 square feet — just over one acre. K. Nelson asked how the impervious surface calculation was handled for elements such as steppers with grass between them. Meissner explained that steppers are counted at their full surface area, and that floating walkways and similar elements with gaps are treated differently. He noted that retaining walls and steps are not counted into the permeable calculation, consistent with past practice. Bristol added that the intent and construction of the permeable elements is to direct and manage stormwater appropriately. K. Nelson also raised the question of whether drainage improvements could impact adjacent properties. Meissner described the drainage system, including dry creek beds along the north property line functioning as reservoirs and a catch basin that pipes water to a low-lying area on the other side of the pond for larger storm events.

McClean moved, Bartelt seconded to approve the Landscape/Land Disturbance Plan for 10235 STH 42 for Julia Uihlein, as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

8. **PEA Properties – 9751 STH 42 -Accessory Structure – Design Review:**

Bristol presented the application for an Accessory Structure Design Review on the north side of the property, noting it is located approximately 120–125 feet from the edge of the road right-of-way with no setback issues. The applicant, Steve Homa, was present. The project involves modifications and repairs to an existing accessory structure, including a new slab-on-grade foundation to replace the deteriorated existing one.

Thorp summarized the HPC recommendation, noting the Committee felt the plan was an improvement for the property.

A discussion was held regarding the Accessory Structure Design Review Application. Hart asked about

the chimney visible in photographs. Homa explained there is an evaporator for maple syrup in the accessory structure with a small stainless steel stack, and a separate chimney on the house. Discussion arose regarding the proposed black metal roof, as the existing structure has a mossy shingle roof that appears green. Homa noted the pitch to the back requires a metal roof. K. Nelson expressed some hesitation about black roofs in the Historic District, though acknowledged the structure is near the south end of the district. Homa indicated the cedar siding would be stained in a natural cedar tone to blend with the surrounding woods.

Thorp moved, McClean seconded to approve the Accessory Structure Design Review Application for 9751 STH 42 for PEA Properties as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

9. PEA Properties – 9751 STH 42 -Addition – Design Review:

Bristol presented the Addition Design Review application for 9751 STH 42, which involves a second-story addition over the existing garage, resulting in a two-story front and single-story rear configuration. He confirmed there are no dimensional, setback, or height issues. Bristol reiterated that a rendering had given the false impression of a blue retaining wall, which is in fact the existing, gray concrete color.

Thorp relayed HPC's recommendation, noting the vote was 4–1 in favor of approval, with the dissenting vote stemming from concern about the proposed black metal deck railing on the rear, which is intended to match the existing grandfathered railing on the front. Thorp also confirmed that the addition will use shingle roofing, while the accessory structure (sugar shack) will receive the metal roof discussed under agenda item 8.

Homa noted that the addition will use LP Smart Side white siding, and that he would prefer a pewter or landmark gray shingle color.

Bristol noted that the color would fall within the village's approved shingle palette.

Thorp moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the Addition Design Review Application for 9751 STH 42 for PEA Properties as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

10. Cora Elquist – Town Line Drive – 121-01-24312714B3 – New SFR – Concept Review:

Bristol introduced the concept review for a new single-family residence (SFR) on a parcel split from a larger parent parcel off Town Line Drive. He noted the project is not adjacent to Town Line Drive but is accessed via an access easement, making it unlikely to be visible from the road. The building height is anticipated to be between 28 and 35 feet, though it has not yet been finalized and will require a special exception. Contractor Brent Heim participated online.

Heim explained that the height is driven primarily by the natural contours of the property. On the main entry side, the building will read as approximately 1.5 stories, while the southeast-facing side, which overlooks an adjacent field, will be the tallest face due to a walkout basement in a natural low pocket of the site. He indicated the maximum height at the southeast face is approximately 32 feet, while the northeast face would be in the low-twenties range, suggesting an average across all four sides could potentially fall under the 28-foot threshold.

A discussion was held on the concept review for parcel 121-01-24312714B3. Bristol confirmed that height is measured from pre-construction grade and that he and Heim would work through the averaging calculations together. K. Nelson noted this is an unusual situation; most Village lots are flat, but this property has significant natural grade changes. Hart commented that the block model drawings appear very busy, with what looked like nine different roof structures. Heim clarified there are really only three main peaks — the garage, the main house body, and a connector link with a fourth shed dormer bump-out on one side to provide height for an upstairs bathroom and walk-in closet. Hart asked whether the bump-out was intended to allow windows; Heim confirmed windows would be included to make it look appropriate. McClean asked about the architectural style. Cora Elquist, the owner, explained the design

is inspired by Swedish and Nordic farmhouse aesthetics with a dark stained wood exterior, dark roof, and that adding the garage connector had made the design somewhat more complex compared to the original, simpler concept.

K. Nelson offered guidance that the Committee would prefer the building to come in at or under the 28-foot average if at all possible, noting that the site's natural topography may allow for that outcome.

11. John Van Der Vaart – 10329 STH 42 – Addition – Concept Review:

Bristol introduced this concept review for a property on the north end of Ephraim, noting the applicant intends to add a second story to an existing commercial structure without expanding beyond its current footprint. New foundation work would be required as the existing foundation is inadequate. The proposed use is commercial on the ground floor and residential above. John Van Der Vaart participated online.

Bristol explained that a variance from the Board of Appeals would be required because the 75-foot front setback, measured from the edge of the road right-of-way, bisects the building. Any new work to a nonconforming structure must comply with current setbacks, hence the need for variance relief.

Van Der Vaart confirmed there would be no footprint expansions to the existing structure, but a new foundation would be needed.

A discussion was held regarding the concept review for 10329 STH 42. Hoyerman noted that the Plan Committee's role at this stage is purely advisory on design, as it cannot grant variances. Bristol agreed, adding that having a conceptual design discussion is still useful so that if strong design concerns exist, the applicant can address them before going to the Board of Appeals, and then the project would return for full Design Review if a variance is granted. Hoyerman observed that the design is stylistically reminiscent of old Door County schoolhouses. Van Der Vaart confirmed the intent was to draw on elements of downtown Ephraim's character and tie them to the northern end of the village.

The Committee responded positively to the design overall. Thorp and McClean both indicated the design looks fine and would be an improvement over the existing structure. K. Nelson asked about Van Der Vaart's plans for the other buildings on the property; Van Der Vaart explained that the immediate priority is the front building to serve his architecture/design-build occupation, while the other structures would be cleaned up, landscaping updated, painting, windows and siding replaced over the next three to five years, with future uses to be determined based on market demand.

12. Ephraim Village Cottages – Larson Lane/Water Street – Mixed Use/Multi-Family - Concept Review:

Bristol provided an extensive background on this complex property. The site, historically operated as a cottage rental complex with a manager's residence, was condominiumized in the recent past, a process that does not require Village oversight, so long as the use does not change. One unit, a duplex closest to Highway 42 (the Bayview building), has already been sold under the condominium structure.

Bristol outlined three general paths forward as the property is being brought to market:

Option 1: Sell the entire property as-is to a single buyer who continues operating it as a cottage rental business with an on-site manager. This would require no Village involvement.

Option 2: Sell units individually as single-family condominium homes, which would constitute a change of use to multifamily. This is a conditional use under the Village's multifamily ordinance, requiring four units per acre. The property is approximately 2.23 acres, which rounds down to nine allowable units under the ordinance, while the property currently has 12–13 units. This discrepancy would require a variance from the Board of Appeals before the conditional use could come before the Plan Committee. One duplex unit (units 3 and 4) at 432 square feet per side also falls below the 600-square-foot minimum for individual units and would need to be combined or receive an additional variance.

Option 3: A hybrid approach, where a portion of the units (e.g., the manager's residence plus a few adjacent cottages) are sold together under the existing rental use, and the remainder seek a change of use to individual single-family ownership, potentially meeting the density threshold without a variance.

Sarah Glenn and Brian Reinhardt of True North Real Estate, representing owner Ruanne Larson, appeared before the Committee. Glenn explained that the property was listed for sale as of that day. She acknowledged the preferred outcome is to find a single buyer to continue the existing use, but that given today's property values and market conditions, that may not be realistic. The appraiser's opinion of highest and best use is to sell the units individually as single-family homes. Glenn noted the opportunity to provide more attainable housing in Ephraim, potentially under \$500,000 per unit. She emphasized that no one wants to see the historic cottages demolished, with the oldest dating to 1951. She discussed that if a developer were to acquire the property and tear down the structures, construction of a new multifamily building may be permitted in the district, an outcome less desirable than preserving the existing cottages.

Glenn asked the Committee whether, if a variance were granted for the density issue, the change of use to multifamily could be applied to the entire property at once rather than requiring each individual buyer to return for separate approvals.

Bristol confirmed this would be handled as a single conditional use review before the Plan Committee, so individual buyers would not need to appear separately.

McClellan inquired about year-round occupancy.

Glenn indicated that while some units have historically been used year-round, it has been a long time, and the buildings could be made suitable for year-round use with improvements. She also confirmed that as single-family homes within the historic district, all the protections and restrictions of that district would apply, and a homeowners association with governing documents would provide additional controls.

Hart expressed interest in Option 3, asking whether specific units had been identified for the hybrid cluster.

Glenn said that had not yet been determined and would depend on market demand and buyer interest.

Hoyerman asked about the fire-damaged cottage and whether it would be rebuilt.

Glenn confirmed the intent is to market that lot with the ability to rebuild a cottage of the same size on the existing foundation, at a lower price point to reflect the need for reconstruction.

Hoyerman also asked about the two remaining duplex structures.

Reinhardt clarified that only units three and four are below 600 square feet, while the other duplex — a two-story structure — has units that each exceed 600 square feet.

Hoyerman expressed that he had heard the Committee discuss the value of preserving existing structures frequently and believed the applicants could take that sentiment into account with reasonable confidence, while noting he was speaking only for himself.

Bristol emphasized that regardless of use, physical expansion of the existing structures will be extremely constrained due to multiple road frontages on Larson Lane, Hidden Spring, and Birch — each carrying its own front setback — plus a 25-foot commercial building separation requirement, effectively limiting any significant enlargement without individual variances.

Bartelt raised the question of building separation requirements; Bristol confirmed that for the existing structures as-is, building separation is moot, but would become relevant for any new construction.

Thorp asked how the property is currently being marketed.

Glenn confirmed it is listed as one property with the caveat that any change of use requires Village approval, noting that eleven (11) units remain available as the two Bayview units have already been sold.

Bristol explained that the sale of the Bayview units had already set a precedent for the individual sale concept under the existing condominium structure, making the continuation of that path a logical next step. Bristol noted the process going forward would likely involve a Board of Appeals hearing for the variance, followed by a conditional use review before the Plan Committee.

13. Doug Evans – 9807 Brookside Lane – Additions – Concept Review:

Bristol introduced this concept review for three existing cottages on a property along Brookside Lane near Ephraim Creek. Bristol noted the item also went before HPC earlier in the evening.

Thorp summarized the HPC discussion: The Committee agreed the proposed improvements to Cottage 1 would be an improvement over the existing conditions, but a couple of members felt the darker wood exterior treatment proposed would look better in white to maintain the Ephraim aesthetic. Thorp summarized his own guidance as "keep it looking like Ephraim." HPC recommended that the design be refined accordingly.

Bristol explained the broader context: Cottage 1 has the cleanest path forward from a setback standpoint, being more centrally located on the property. However, the other two cottages are in proximity to a potential wetland delineation and Ephraim Creek, which is likely a navigable waterway carrying additional setback requirements. Any physical improvements to those structures beyond routine repair-and-replace would require a variance from the Board of Appeals, as they appear to be nonconforming relative to those setbacks.

Bristol noted that Evans is interested in re-roofing all three structures at the same time, since the roofs are in significant need of repair, but does not want to invest in new roofs on Cottages 2 and 3 before understanding whether the larger improvement plans have viability. He is using the concept review to gather as much Committee feedback as possible before investing in full construction drawings for the board of appeals.

A discussion was held regarding the concept review for 9807 Brookside Lane. McClean commented that she strongly supports the renovations in concept but encouraged the applicant to keep the exterior character of the cottages as close as possible to their current appearance while achieving the height and livability improvements. She acknowledged the appeal of metal roofing for practical reasons, but noted it should still read as a traditional Ephraim cottage. K. Nelson echoed that sentiment, noting the proposed design had a somewhat modern or "mountain" aesthetic and suggesting the applicant look more closely at the historic district design guidelines. Bartelt expressed concern about the variance prospects for Cottages 2 and 3 given their apparent location relative to the creek setback, suggesting it would be a significant stretch. He asked whether the proposed renovations could be characterized as repair rather than expansion. Bristol confirmed that given the extent of the proposed work — including loft additions — the projects clearly exceed what could be classified as routine maintenance and would require variances as currently proposed. Bartelt acknowledged that while he would not have a problem with Cottage 1 subject to the HPC caveats, it would make more practical sense to address all three roofs simultaneously. Hoyerman and others noted this is ultimately the applicant's decision and that the Committee can only review items as they are brought forward.

K. Nelson asked whether the two noncompliant cottages could be relocated within the compliant portion of the property to avoid the variance need.

Bristol indicated that he did not believe Evans was strongly interested in relocating structures, and noted that Evans's design approach for the additions had already been modified to direct expansion toward the more inland, meadow side of the property rather than toward the creek.

K. Nelson also asked whether there was any way to avoid the Board of Appeals for the other two cottages. Bristol confirmed that given the scope of proposed improvements, there is no path that avoids a variance application for those structures.

The Committee's collective guidance was that it supports the concept of improving the cottages, encourages Cottage 1 to move toward a formal Design Review Application with refinements to better align with the Ephraim Historic District aesthetic, and acknowledged that Cottages 2 and 3 will need to navigate the Board of Appeals process before Design Review can proceed.

14. Discussion and Consideration Regarding PW Ordinance Amendment

Chair Nelson noted this item was placed on the agenda in the event the Committee was ready to discuss it, and determined that further preparation was needed before the discussion could proceed. The item was passed over.

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

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

16. Adjournment:

Hoyerman moved, Bartelt seconded to adjourn at 8:47 PM; all ayes. Motion carried.

Recorded by Kim Roberts – Deputy Clerk