

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM PLAN COMMITTEE
WORKING SESSION MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2026 - 12:00 PM
9996 WATER STREET**



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

Absent: Monique McClean.

Staff: Brent Bristol - Village Administrator.

Guests: John Cox.

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

K. Nelson opened the session by explaining that the purpose of the working session was to conduct a final review of the PW Ordinance before its formal approval at the 7:00 p.m. Plan Committee meeting that evening. He noted that, upon approval, the ordinance would be officially forwarded to the Village Board, which would then set it for a public hearing in two weeks. K. Nelson indicated that he had received written comments from Village Board Trustee Carly Mulliken, and invited any final thoughts from Plan Committee members before addressing her comments.

K. Nelson proceeded to read through the written comments submitted by Trustee Carly, which concerned the use of the term "footprint" throughout the ordinance, and addressed each in turn.

Regarding section 8(a)(i)(a.): *"Footprints of finished interior space (see definition in §17.09) in the PW District can be modified so long as there is no increase in the width, as measured parallel to STH 42, of the residence or accessory buildings, and no increase in the total footprint"*; Mulliken suggested that the final use of the word "footprint" in this section be replaced with "square foot," stating she felt that phrasing made more sense. K. Nelson directed the Committee's attention to the definition of "footprint" in Section 17.09, which defines footprint as "the area of a single horizontal plane bounded by the exterior walls of the building expressed in square feet." K. Nelson noted that the definition itself already incorporates square feet because footprint is measured in square feet. Bartelt expressed concern that substituting "square foot" for "footprint" would introduce unnecessary confusion, as the two terms convey the same concept. Thorp agreed, stating that "footprint" is intentional ordinance terminology that is well-defined within the document. Held concurred, noting her hesitation to remove the established term. Hoyerman further emphasized that "footprint" is a term of art specific to this ordinance, and that replacing it risked confusing readers into thinking it referred to the total square footage of the entire structure. The Committee reached consensus that the language should remain as written.

Regarding section 8(a)(i)(b.): *"Footprints of attached garages can be modified so long as there is no increase in the width, as measured parallel to STH 42, and no increase in the total footprint. No upper level will be allowed over the reclaimed square footage of the attached garage"*; Mulliken again suggested replacing the final use of "footprint" with "square footage." The Committee agreed this raised the same issue as the comment for Section 8(a)(i)(a.) and that the same rationale applied. Thorp noted that where the ordinance already uses the phrase "no upper level will be allowed over the reclaimed square footage," the use of "square footage" is appropriate in that context because it refers to something distinct from the footprint itself. Bartelt concurred that this sentence referred to upper-level square footage rather than the footprint. The Committee agreed no change was warranted in response to this comment.

Regarding section 8(a)(i)(c.): *"Footprints in the PW District cannot be increased with the following exception: Consideration given to principal building footprint increases when existing accessory buildings are to be removed. The footprint of the accessory building may be reclaimed and combined with the principal building, provided there is no increase in the width of the footprint, as measured parallel to STH 42, of the principal building. No upper level will be allowed over the reclaimed square footage of the accessory building."*; Mulliken suggested that the references to "footprint" and "square foot" be reconciled in the subsection addressing conditions under which footprint increases may be considered when accessory buildings are removed. She also

suggested an alternative opening for the section framed around "an overall increase in finished interior square footage." K. Nelson again directed the Committee back to the existing definition, stating the use of "footprint" was consistent and that any change would be redundant.

Bartelt noted a separate concern with the language in Section 8(a)(i)(c.), "*Consideration given to principal building footprint increases*," observing that it read as an incomplete and awkward construction. He acknowledged it was a minor stylistic concern but suggested that the sentence would read more clearly if it began with the subject of the exception and used "may be given" rather than simply "given," so as to preserve the Committee's discretionary authority without making a binding commitment. Held and Thorp agreed that retaining "consideration" language was preferable, as it preserved flexibility. After brief discussion of alternative phrasings, the Committee reached agreement that the most practical correction was to amend the phrase to read "*Consideration **may be** given to principal building footprint increases*," with all members affirming the change.

Regarding Mulliken's broader suggestion to reframe the section around "finished interior square footage," Held noted that the existing structure, stating that the footprint cannot be increased, subject to one exception already conveyed clearly within the ordinance, and no further change was deemed necessary.

K. Nelson thanked the Committee members for their sustained effort over the preceding two and a half months, noting that the ordinance would provide owners, developers, and architects with a substantially clearer framework. He referenced a one-page summary document he had prepared for the Village Board, highlighting what had become more or less restrictive under the revised ordinance, and suggested Committee members use it as a reference tool when fielding public questions.

K. Nelson noted that he would not be present at the September Village Board meeting and asked Hoyerman to carry the lead for the Plan Committee at that session. He explained that the September board meeting would serve to set the ordinance for a formal public hearing, with the Board's final decision expected at the October meeting.

K. Nelson confirmed signs were the next priority item on the Plan Committee's agenda, referencing concerns about "sail-style" signs and businesses using multiple signs.

Bristol advised that he intended to send a letter to all commercial property owners in the near term, informing them of the existing sign ordinance requirements and notifying them that the Plan Committee would begin formal discussion of the topic at its October meeting. The letter would invite participation by the businesses in the discussion process. Bristol also noted that he had met with Kelsey Stone of the Ephraim Business Council (EBC). EBC is preparing a draft business survey in connection with the upcoming quarterly meeting with the EBC and Ephraim Historical Foundation, which Bristol indicated he would review for alignment with the Committee's objectives before it was distributed.

The Committee agreed that no noon working sessions would be held in September, and that the next working session would be scheduled for October.

Hoyerman moved, Held seconded, to adjourn at 12:25 PM.

Recorded by Kim Roberts – Deputy Clerk