



VIRTUAL HOUSING COMMITTEE MEETING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2025, 11:00 AM

To access the meeting electronically, click:

<https://zoom.us/j/4439901723?pwd=yAVpi40M1OlqgNufcVUE8XWCUSkKaH.1&omn=97063638580>

Meeting ID: 443 990 1723 Passcode: 304078

To connect by phone: 1-301-715-8592 - Meeting ID 443 990 1723#

Deviations from agenda order may occur

For additional information visit www.sisterbaywi.gov and click on Meetings

1	Patrice Champeau - Chairperson	2	Gustavo Gallardo
3	Razvan Ciobanu	4	Lauren Aurelius
5	Lori Allen	6	Kay Smith
7	Marissa Downs	7	Louise Howson, Trustee
	<i>Julie Schmelzer – Village Administrator</i>	8	Chad Kodanko, Trustee

AGENDA

1. Call to Order & Roll Call
2. Approve Agenda
3. Approve Meeting Minutes: August 5, 2025
4. Speaker/Discussion
 - a. Tom Landgraf; Development Consultant/UW Extension
5. Set Meeting Topic(s)
6. Adjournment

Public Notice

Questions regarding the nature of the Agenda items or more detail on the items listed can be directed to Julie Schmelzer, Village Administrator, at julie.schmelzer@sisterbaywi.gov. It is possible that members of and possibly a quorum of members of other governmental bodies may attend the meeting to gather information; no action will be taken by any governmental body other than the body specifically referred to above. Upon reasonable notice, a good faith effort will be made to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals through sign language interpreters or other auxiliary aid or accommodation at no cost to the individual. Due to the difficulty in finding interpreters, requests should be made as far in advance as possible, preferably a minimum of 48 hours. For additional information or to request this service, contact the Sister Bay Village Administration Office at 854-4118, (FAX) 854-9637, or by writing to the Village Administration Building, 2383 Maple Drive, PO Box 769, Sister Bay, WI 54234. Copies of reports and other supporting documentation are available for review at the Village Administration Building during operating hours (8 a.m. to 4 p.m. Mondays – Thursdays, and 8 a.m. to noon on Fridays).

The Village of Sister Bay is an Equal Opportunity Provider and Employer.

POSTED DATE/SIGNATURE _____

VILLAGE OF SISTER BAY HOUSING COMMITTEE (VIRTUAL)
MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 05, 2025
(UNAPPROVED)

1. Call to Order & Roll Call/Introduce New Members

Chair Champeau was absent so the meeting was called to order at 11:05 AM by Interim Chair Kay Smith. Julie Schmelzer, Village Administrator, conducted roll call.

Present: Lauren Aurelius, Kay Smith, Gustavo Gallardo, Louise Howson, Chad Kodanko

Absent: Patrice Champeau, Lori Allen, Razvan Ciobanu, Marissa Downs (Downs later joined briefly)

Staff: Administrator Julie Schmelzer

Others: (None)

2. Approve Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda was made by Howson, second by Kodanko. Motion carried- All Ayes.

3. Approve Meeting Minutes: April 22, 2025

Motion to approve the minutes of April 22, 2025 was made by Smith, second by Gallardo. Motion carried- All Ayes.

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Stormwater Pond Fence Update

Schmelzer provided an update regarding the committee's previous request to have the Parks Committee install a fence around the stormwater pond behind the Shoals development. She reported that the Parks Committee had discussed the request but decided not to support putting a fence around the pond at this time.

Aurelius, who had originally raised the concern, expressed disappointment with the decision, noting that she had brought up the issue because children play around the pond. She explained that the Parks Committee's reasoning about not wanting to disrupt plants seemed misplaced when considering potential safety risks. She noted that as the on-site manager, she regularly observes children playing near the pond, and was concerned about safety.

Schmelzer added that there had been previous issues with the pond, possibly related to drainage pipes or rocks being moved. She acknowledged that if something were to happen, the village could be liable.

b. Funding Request Update

Schmelzer reported on the status of the committee's funding request to the Village Board. She explained that the committee had previously decided to pause regular meetings until they received information about how many lots could be developed, and the costs of the infrastructure, but that could only be determined by the engineer, and the committee had decided to ask the Board if and when they would be releasing funds so the work could be completed. Once engineered, the committee would know the costs of development needed for their model.

She noted this agenda item was merely an update and that the board's response to their funding request was included in the meeting packet. She also suggested the committee revisit this topic under agenda item 4e to discuss specific numbers regarding single-family lots, townhomes, and apartment lots.

Howson interpreted the board's meeting minutes and Schmelzer's explanation differently, stating that while there was full support for pursuing housing development, board members wanted more specific information about the committee's plans before releasing significant funding. She noted that the finance committee would be finalizing related matters by October or November of this year and more information would be available on potential funding.

Kodanko clarified his interpretation of the board's minutes was that the board wanted a more formal presentation with specific details, rather than the off-the-cuff discussion that had occurred. He emphasized that the board needed more comprehensive information from the entire committee before releasing substantial funds.

Schmelzer responded that if the board wants a formal presentation, the committee can certainly provide one, but the committee's request was to determine if money was even available to complete their model. Further discussion occurred under item 4.e.

c. R-4 Zoning Update

Schmelzer reported that the Plan Commission and Village Board had adopted the committee's recommendations regarding R-4 zoning changes. These changes included allowing smaller one-bedroom homes (700 square feet) and enlarging the minimum lot sizes to ensure homes could meet setback requirements. She noted that these changes would mean fewer lots could be developed on the Wiltse property than originally anticipated, but the homes would now properly fit on the lots while meeting setback requirements. She referred the group to a diagram on page 9 of the packet showing how the Wiltse property was zoned, with approximately 36 acres available for development (shown in yellow) and other areas that cannot be served by sewer and water (shown in green).

d. Review Housing Proposal: Multi-Family at Northwoods and Ava Hope

Schmelzer presented the proposal from Tim Halbrook for developing multi-family housing at the corner of Ava Hope and Northwoods. She reminded the committee that they had previously recommended that at least 20% of units in this development be restricted to households not exceeding 80% of the county median income.

She explained that after issuing an RFP, numerous developers had inquired but most did not submit proposals because they couldn't work within the Plan Commission's two-story height restriction or other limitations. Tim Halbrook was the only developer to submit a proposal. The proposal included three 9-unit buildings (27 units total), consisting of 21 two-bedroom units, 3 three-bedroom units, 3 one-bedroom units, and 1 handicap-accessible unit. The rent ranges proposed were \$1,350 to \$1,650, with 20% of units meeting the 80% county median income requirement. Smith expressed concern that the proposal was not truly "low-income housing" as Halbrook had labeled it, noting that the average hourly wage in Door County was \$14.34. She questioned whether the committee was truly meeting its goals with only 20% of units being affordable.

Aurelius noted that the current 80% affordable units at the Shoals charge \$1,380 for two-bedroom, one-bath apartments. She expressed concerns about the limited number of one-bedroom units in the proposal and the insufficient number of handicap-accessible units, noting that only one out of 27 units being handicap-accessible was inadequate given the demographics of the area.

Kodanko pointed out that while not perfect, the proposal represented progress because the developer was willing to include price-controlled units, which was better than having no development at all or having all units at market rate with no affordability requirements.

After discussion, the committee agreed to support the proposal while requesting:

- 1 ● More one-bedroom units
- 2 ● More handicap-accessible units
- 3 ● A review of the pricing to confirm it aligns with 80% of county median income
- 4 ● If possible, an increase in the percentage of affordable units beyond the minimum 20%

5

6 Schmelzer indicated she would convey these requests to the developer, while acknowledging that

7 the proposal did meet the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP. She explained the proposal

8 would now be forwarded to the Parks Committee for input on the park design.

9

10 **e. Discuss Request to Confirm Funding**

11 The committee discussed how to proceed with their request for funding to develop the Wiltse

12 property. Schmelzer referred to information in the packet showing projected housing needs from

13 the housing study, including the need for 56 single-family homes, 24 townhomes, and various rental

14 units. She noted that these projections might need adjustment since a private developer was now

15 planning approximately 60 housing units elsewhere in the village, which would affect the demand

16 calculations.

17

18 Kodanko expressed concern about the conceptual layout shown in the plan, suggesting that

19 segregating different housing types (ranches, townhomes, etc.) into distinct areas might not be the

20 best approach for long-term development. He emphasized the need for a mixed development

21 approach. Schmelzer clarified that the diagram was merely to demonstrate that the projected units

22 could fit on the property, not to suggest an actual development pattern and that the actual

23 conceptual plat still needed to be developed, when the committee had access to funding.

24

25 The committee debated the next steps. Smith suggested bringing in a developer experienced with

26 mixed-use developments to get input on what would be needed to proceed. Kodanko explained he

27 wasn't aware of where the committee 'was at' but recommended consulting with Tom Landgraf,

28 who has expertise in housing development, and helped the original committee that worked on the

29 proposed development of the Wiltse property.

30

31 Gallardo expressed concern that if they couldn't develop truly affordable homes (under \$200,000),

32 they would be wasting their time. Schmelzer acknowledged this concern, noting that the previous

33 model involving mass production of homes with donated land and infrastructure was designed to

34 keep costs lower. She reminded the group, however, that was based on the developer's

35 recommendation the village be the developer to keep costs down.

36

37 After discussion, the committee reached consensus to: Invite Tom Landgraf to a future meeting to

38 provide expertise on mixed-use development approaches; postpone any formal presentation to the

39 Village Board until after consulting with Landgraf; schedule the next meeting in September due to

40 staff capacity limitations in August.

41

42 Schmelzer said she would send Kodanko the previous minutes of the committee as well as the

43 housing study that had been presented to the Board in 2024.

44 ●

45 **5. Set Meeting Topic(s)**

46 The committee agreed that the next meeting would focus on hearing from Tom Landgraf. Smith

47 volunteered to contact him through her connections with the Housing Attainability Committee to

48 arrange his appearance.

49

50 **6. Adjournment**

51 *Motion to adjourn was made and second. Motion carried- All Ayes*

- 1 The meeting was adjourned at 12:34 PM.
- 2
- 3 Minutes by Sarah Bertges, Administrative Assistant