

**VILLAGE OF SISTER BAY
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 2026
APPROVED AS AMENDED**

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Denise Bhirdo called the Plan Commission meeting to order on Tuesday, January 27, 2026, at 5:30 P.M. and requested Bertges to conduct a roll call.

Present: Plan Commission Chair Denise Bhirdo, and Commission members Steve Bacsi, Nate Bell, Laurel Harff, Skip Heidler. Patrice Champeau was excused.

Staff Member(s): Village Administrator Benjamin Andrews, Administrative Assistant Sarah Bertges.

Others: Kurt Harff, Ellie Soderberg-Guger, Rick Dahlstrom, Steve Musinsky, Gary Overby, Kim Erzinger. VIA ZOOM: Jonathan Leeb, Louise Howson, "JEG", "rgazl", "iPhone"

2. Approve of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda as presented was made by Bell, second by Heidler. Motion carried -all ayes.

3. Approve Meeting Minutes: December 18, 2025

Motion to approve the minutes of December 18, 2025, was made by Heidler, second by Harff. Motion carried -all ayes.

4. Comments, Correspondence and Concerns from the Public

Gary Overby stated he was attending to observe the meeting and had questions about local properties. Andrews offered to follow up with Overby on a staff level regarding any specific questions.

5. Public Hearing

a. Ord. 2026-001; Amending the Village of Sister Bay Future Land Use Map

Bhirdo opened the public hearing at 5:33 PM. Andrews presented the staff report regarding the future land use map amendment for correcting three parcels currently shown as business for residential, which included 10283 Sunset Drive, 10705 South Spring Road, and 10569 Fieldcrest Road.

Overby asked about development near his property at 2629 South Bay Shore Drive. Andrews clarified this was not related to the current hearing but offered to follow up separately.

Jake Gazlay and his father, Ronald Gazlay, inquired about their property at 2698 South Bayshore Drive, which had been designated as R2 multifamily residential. They requested it remain R1 single family residential as that was its current and historical use. They also questioned the partial open space designation on their property. Gazlay noted their family had owned the property for 98 years and intended to maintain it as a single-family residence.

Steve Musinsky raised several questions about properties along Fieldcrest Road, including:

- The access driveway to the Glen Lane apartments shown as R1 when it should be multifamily
- A parcel marked as woodland that had been cleared for home construction
- The southwest corner of the Glen Lane apartment complex that remained wooded but wasn't designated as such

The Commission examined the maps and by consensus agreed the Glen Lane apartments driveway should be designated as multifamily residential to be consistent with the apartment complex parcel. After extensive discussion about the Gazlay property at 2698 South Bayshore Drive, the Commission determined:

- Changing the entire parcel from having a split designation (residential and open lands) to a consistent multifamily designation made the most sense
- This would maintain consistency with adjacent properties
- The R2 zoning would still permit single-family use while avoiding spot zoning concerns
- The multifamily designation would be appropriate for future planning purposes

Bhirdo closed the public hearing for item 5.a. at 6:07 PM.

Following discussion, the Commission identified two issues to address:

- The driveway at 2520 Glen Lane should be consistently designated as multifamily
- The property at 2698 South Bayshore Drive should have the open space designation removed and the entire parcel designated as R-2 multifamily

Motion to recommend to the Village Board that: 1) 2520 Glen Lane, entire lot be designated as multifamily; and 2) 2698 South Bayshore Drive have the open space designation removed and the entire parcel be designated as R2 multifamily. Motion by Bhirdo Second by Bell, Motion carried -all ayes.

The Commission also identified typos in the ordinance document that needed correction before presentation to the Village Board:

- Page 17: The ordinance needed to include the Planning Commission's recommendations
- Page 17, line 24: "map" was misspelled as "ma"
- Page 18: The effective date incorrectly showed 2025 instead of 2026

b. Ord. 2026-002; Adopting a New Zoning Map for the Village of Sister Bay

Andrews opened the public hearing for item 5.b at 6:23 P.M. and presented the item regarding aligning zoning with the comprehensive plan and incorporating changes discussed in prior meetings. Musinsky noted discrepancies in the zoning map, particularly that the Glen Lane apartment complex was shown as B1 Business in the zoning map but as R2 Multifamily in the land use map. The Commission reviewed the maps and found several inconsistencies, raising concerns about the accuracy of the maps provided in the packet.

After discussion, the Commission determined that the maps appeared to contain errors and needed verification with Bay Lake, the firm that had prepared them. Public hearing for item 5.b. was closed at 6:35 P.M.

Motion to postpone agenda item 5.b. until the maps can be confirmed with Bay Lake and the Commission can feel confident in having another public hearing on this item.

Motion by Bhirdo, Second by Bacsí. Motion carried -all ayes.

c. Ord. 2026-003; Amending Ch. 66 of the Municipal Code, Zoning

Bhirdo opened the public hearing for item 5.c at 6:37 P.M. Andrews presented the proposed text amendments to Chapter 66 of the village's zoning code. The updates included:

- Aligning non-conforming uses and structure provisions with state statutes
- Removing conflicts with state building codes
- Revising substandard lot regulations to comply with Wisconsin statutes
- Adding regulations for the Woodland overlay district
- Updating definitions and provisions for community living arrangements and family daycare homes
- Miscellaneous amendments for lighting standards, site plan review exemptions, and CS1 district clarification

Musinsky raised several questions and concerns:

- Regarding non-conforming uses and structures, particularly about mother-in-law suites and the 50% rule for non-conforming structures
- Regarding the Woodland Overlay District, suggesting a forestry policy was needed to truly protect the tree canopy
- About the wording related to disease prevention in the woodland provisions, suggesting an arborist should be specified rather than landscape engineers/architects
- Regarding solar collectors, noting that the code seemed to restrict them to principal structures when there were good reasons to place them on accessory structures

Bhirdo closed the public hearing for item 5.c. at 6:52 P.M.

The Commission noted several typographical errors that needed correction:

- Page 37, line 19: Missing the letter "a" (should read "a different number of children")
- Page 23, line 30: Issue with the R1 district header being crossed out
- Page 37, line 5: "who do not require care" had incorrect punctuation

Bhirdo raised a question about outdoor lighting regulations, noting concerns about residential properties with excessive outdoor lighting that affects neighbors. The Commission briefly discussed the challenges of enforcement but agreed this could be a topic for future discussion.

Motion to recommend the proposed ordinance to the Village Board with the corrections identified during the meeting.

Motion by Heidler, second by Harff. Motion carried 4-1- with Bell opposed.

6. Discussion/Action Items

a. Standard Zoning Permit Application; Review/Approve Modifications to Existing Tower; 2530 S Bay Shore Drive

Andrews presented an application from Jonathan Leeb of Terra Consulting Group for a class 2 co-location for an existing mobile service tower facility at 2530 South Bayshore Drive.

Andrews explained that while initially the application appeared to meet the village's requirements for administrative approval, additional information received indicated the antenna size would exceed the dimensions allowed under the village ordinance, which would trigger public hearing requirements.

The applicants, Leeb and Shaw, contended that state statutes would supersede the village ordinance and that their application should be considered a permitted use rather than requiring conditional use approval.

Bell expressed concern about accepting legal interpretations from the applicants rather than getting guidance from the village's attorney. The Commission agreed that legal clarification was needed before proceeding.

Motion to postpone this item until the Commission receives an opinion from the village attorney.

Motion by Bell second by Bacsi. Motion carried -all ayes.

The Commission also discussed concerns about the timing of the application submission, noting it had come in after the standard deadline and additional information was received the day of the Plan Commission meeting (1/27/2026).

7. Matters to be Placed on a Future Agenda or Referred to a Committee, Official or Employee

The Commission identified two items for follow-up:

- Andrews would consult with the village attorney regarding the tower modification application and state statutes that may supersede local ordinances
- Andrews would contact Bay Lake regarding the discrepancies in the zoning maps

8. Next Meeting

The next regular monthly meeting was confirmed for February 24, 2026, at 5:30 P.M. in the Large Meeting Room, Sister Bay-Liberty Grove Fire Station.

1

2 **9. Adjournment**

3 *Motion to adjourn at 7:15 PM.*

4 *Motion by Heidler second by Harff. Motion carried -all ayes.*

5

6 Respectfully submitted by Sarah Bertges, Administrative Assistant