

**VILLAGE OF SISTER BAY
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 2026
APPROVED**

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Nate Bell, sitting in for Chairperson Denise Bhirdo, called the Plan Commission meeting to order on Tuesday, March 31, 2026, at 5:30 P.M., and roll call was taken.

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

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

Others: Steve Musinsky, James Lohmiller, Katelyn Jerard, Erin Peddle, Abby Doobie, Paula Hedeem, Chris Schmeltz. VIA ZOOM: Barbara, Jenn, "JEG", "RGAZL".

2. Approve of Agenda

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

3. Approve Meeting Minutes: February 24, 2026

Heidler noted a grammatical correction needed on page 5, line 15 of the PDF, where the phrase "Andrews advised that he coordinate" should read "Andrews advised that he will coordinate with Bay Lakes."

Motion by Heidler, second by Champeau to approve the meeting minutes as amended. Motion carried- all ayes.

4. Comments, Correspondence, and Concerns from the Public

Musinsky noted a housekeeping correction for future reference on page 3, line 31, indicating that Don Howard's property address should reference "Fieldcrest Road" rather than "Fieldcrest Lane." No other public comments were received either in person or online.

5. Public Hearing/Action Items

5a. Ord. 2026-001; Amending the Village of Sister Bay Future Land Use Map

Andrews provided background on the proposed ordinance, explaining that changes resulted from annotations made during the February 24, 2026 Plan Commission meeting. Bay Lakes Regional Planning was consulted on various items, and a proposed future land use map was prepared on page 20 of the packet, with annotations detailed on page 26.

Bell opened the public hearing at 5:35 PM.

Steve Musinsky questioned an environmental corridor shown on the map running along what he believed should be parallel to the quarry road rather than at an angle through a swamp area. He noted there appeared to be an easement running parallel west of the quarry road.

Jake Gazlay, son of property owner Ron Gazlay at 2698 South Bay Shore Drive, addressed the Commission. He expressed appreciation for the Commission's work and acknowledged understanding the importance of contiguous zoning. Gazlay explained his family's nearly 100-year ownership of the property, which includes a memorial garden for his late sister. While accepting the R2 multifamily designation, he expressed concerns about potential development pressure and traffic

1 impacts on the Pebble Beach corridor. He requested the Commission's support in maintaining the
2 property's historic character and asked about potential variances for items like gravel driveways.
3 The public hearing was closed at 5:43 PM.

4 Discussion ensued regarding the environmental corridor issue raised by Musinsky. Heidler confirmed
5 the existence of an environmental easement on the GIS map, though noted it appeared at a
6 different angle than described. Andrews indicated this could be addressed administratively by
7 coordinating with Bay Lakes Regional Planning to correct the line work.

8 Heidler raised concerns about two properties along Highway 57 that were designated as commercial
9 on the current map but had previously been divided with business frontage and residential in the
10 rear. He noted this created an inconsistency between the future land use map and zoning map
11 discussions.

12 Andrews clarified that the intention from the last meeting was to include the remainder of those
13 parcels as commercial designation, though Heidler recalled the discussion being about maintaining a
14 commercial buffer along the highway while allowing potential subdivision of the larger properties.
15 Motion by Heidler, second by Bacsí to recommend approval of the future land use map ordinance to
16 the Village Board with amendments as discussed. Motion carried- all ayes.

17 18 **5b. Ord. 2026-002; Adopting a New Zoning Map for the Village of Sister Bay**

19 Andrews explained that similar to the future land use map, the proposed zoning map incorporated
20 annotations from the February Planning Commission meeting. Bay Lakes Regional Planning was
21 consulted on items lacking consensus, and the updated map was presented on page 20 with
22 annotations on page 26.

23 Bell opened the public hearing at 5:55 PM.

24 Musinsky identified an inconsistency on the Glen Lane apartment complex property, where the front
25 portion was correctly shown as R2 multifamily matching the future land use map, but the back
26 portion was designated as B1 general business, which did not match the future land use designation.
27 He noted that Phase 2 residential development had been proposed for that rear parcel.

28 Gazlay inquired about several properties that appeared to be spot zoned, including Pheasant Park
29 Resort, Glen Estates, and various condominium developments. He questioned why some R2
30 developments like the Cove condominiums had been changed to R1 zoning, and requested
31 consideration for his family's property to be zoned R1 rather than R2, citing potential financial
32 benefits regarding paving requirements.

33 The public hearing was closed at 6:02 PM.

34 The Commission discussed Gazlay's spot zoning observations. Andrews explained that most parcels
35 in question, such as those around the former Bay Ridge golf course area, were appropriately zoned
36 R2, with only the "countryside" parcel being different due to its larger size meeting different criteria.
37 Regarding Pheasant Park Resort, Heidler noted that due to its conference center business model, the
38 E1 designation was appropriate for the main facility while surrounding condos remained R2.

39 Heidler confirmed the Glen Lane property issue raised by Musinsky, noting that the rear parcel
40 should be R2 multifamily to match both the future land use map and previous Commission
41 discussions.

42 Heidler also identified issues with two Bayshore Drive properties (2629 and 2649) where Bay Lakes
43 Regional Planning appeared to misunderstand the Commission's intent. The discussion was about
44 changing residential zoning classes based on property size, not changing from business to
45 residential. Property 2629 at 1.1 acres should be R1, while property 2649 at 5.2 acres should be R3,
46 as neither meets the countryside zoning criteria.

47 Bell expressed continued concerns about the Woodland overlay district methodology but
48 acknowledged the need to move forward with the process rather than make fundamental changes.

49 *Motion by Heidler, second by Harff to recommend approval of the zoning map ordinance to the*
50 *Village Board with amendments as discussed. Motion carried – all ayes.*

51 52 **6. Discussion/Action Items**

6a. Standard Zoning Application; Chop Restaurant; 2345 Mill Rd

Andrews presented the application from Chop Restaurant to install an outdoor cooler at the rear of the building. The cooler would replace the current dumpster location and be positioned against but not attached to the building. The application required exterior modification site plan review and architectural review. The B3 zoning district permits the accessory structure, and garbage service would continue to be shared with the Dorr Hotel.

Chris Schmeltz, representing the applicant, was present to answer questions and provided material samples of the cooler.

Bacsi questioned why screening was required when current dumpster screening was poor, but acknowledged the proposed improvement's aesthetic value. He praised the trellising and landscaping design as a significant improvement.

Heidler raised several detailed questions about the current cedar fence, dumpster arrangements, and screening materials. He expressed concern that the proposed metal cooler facade would not meet code requirements, as the village code prohibits exposed metal siding. Heidler advocated for screening the structure with siding materials similar to the building rather than relying solely on landscaping.

The Commission debated whether the proposed trellis and vegetation would constitute adequate screening. Heidler emphasized the importance of adhering strictly to code requirements to avoid setting precedent for other businesses.

Discussion centered on the need to screen the metal facade with materials matching the building's exterior. Schmeltz expressed willingness to work with various solutions but noted practical challenges with different approaches.

The Commission reached consensus that while the cooler structure itself was acceptable, proper screening matching the building's materials was required rather than relying primarily on landscaping.

Schmeltz agreed to return with screening options that would meet code requirements, including an 8-foot fence with materials and design similar to the building's siding.

6b. Courtesy Review; Parking Requirement Review; Spa at the Dorr Hotel; 2335 Mill Road

Andrews presented a courtesy review for a proposed 2,500 square foot spa facility expected to accommodate up to 20 patrons. The facility would be located in the B3 downtown district as a permitted use. The review addressed parking methodology and potential shared parking arrangements with the Dorr Hotel.

Schmeltz provided background on the complex parking arrangements within the Sister Bay marketplace, explaining that 73 total spaces exist with 20 allocated to Chop and 52 to the Dorr Hotel through development agreements.

The Commission discussed whether the spa should be classified under retail/customer service (requiring 8 spaces) or business/recreational use (requiring 5 spaces). There was consensus that business/recreational classification was more appropriate.

Bell noted the significant overlap between spa customers and hotel guests, with most non-hotel customers likely using the facility during different peak hours than hotel parking demand.

Heidler questioned the three-space credit availability, given the shared operations, but the Commission determined that as a separate use on a separate lot, the spa would be eligible for the downtown credit.

The Commission provided guidance that the parking requirement would be based on business recreational use (5 spaces), with 3 spaces credited and 2 additional spaces met through shared parking with the Dorr Hotel, along with identification of required loading space.

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

No items were identified for future agendas.

1 **8. Next Meeting**

2 The next regular monthly meeting is scheduled for April 28, 2026, at 5:30 PM in the Large Meeting
3 Room at the Sister Bay-Liberty Grove Fire Station.

4
5 **9. Adjournment**

6 *Motion to adjourn at 6:56 PM.*

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

8
9 Respectfully submitted by Sarah Bertges, Administrative Assistant