

**VILLAGE OF SISTER BAY
SPECIAL PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2026
APPROVED**

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Nate Bell called the Special Plan Commission meeting to order on Thursday, MAY 14, 2026, at 4:00 P.M., and roll call was taken.

Present: Commission members: Chair Nate Bell, Laurel Harff, Skip Heidler, Brigid White. Jerry Ahrens was excused.

Staff Member(s): Village Administrator Benjamin Andrews, Administrative Assistant Sarah Bertges, and Dave Lienau Marina Manager.

Others: Kurt Harff, Allen Gokey, Garritt Bader, Paula Hedeem, Pam Heyrman, John Heyrman, Dan Mortier, Katelyn Jerard VIA ZOOM: Dr. Jennifer Hall, Lori Pollatz, Mary W, Jake Gazlay, Chris Schmeltz.

2. Approve the Agenda

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

3. Approve Meeting Minutes

a) March 31, 2026; Regular Meeting

b) April 20, 2026; Special Meeting

Both sets of meeting minutes were presented together. No corrections were identified.

Motion to approve the minutes for both the March 31, 2026 Regular Meeting and the April 20, 2026 Special Meeting was made by Heidler and second by Harff. Motion carried -all ayes.

4. Comments, Correspondence, and Concerns from the Public

-Bell noted that a letter from a prior period had been included in the meeting packet and had been resubmitted. Andrews confirmed that he and Bell had subsequently met with the relevant parties approximately two weeks prior. White inquired whether the matter would appear on a future agenda, and Bell confirmed it would be addressed at an upcoming regular meeting.

-Paula Hedeem, a property owner, addressed the Commission regarding her concerns about the rezoning of her property. Ms. Hedeem stated that she had submitted an email to both Bell and Andrews seeking information about why her property was rezoned and what the applicable dimensional standards were for the commercial and R-2 residential districts, as she had a prospective buyer for the property. She indicated that she had not received a response to her inquiry and expressed frustration about a perceived lack of communication. She further noted that she had missed the meeting at which the rezoning was finalized due to a notification error, and that she was subsequently informed she had missed a 30-day appeal window.

Bell acknowledged Ms. Hedeem's concerns, apologized for any perceived lack of communication, and confirmed that a meeting had been attempted to be scheduled. He reiterated that the public comment period is not a question-and-answer session, but that her concerns were heard and a response would be forthcoming.

5. Discussion/Action Items

a) Courtesy Review; Marina Building; 10733 Bay Shore Drive

1 Andrews introduced the item, noting that the design for the new marina building at 10733 N Bay
2 Shore Drive is substantially complete. The Marina Manager, Dave Lienau, and White were present to
3 receive feedback from the Commission. The purpose of the courtesy review was to assess
4 consistency with the zoning code and the village's architectural guidelines. No significant site plan
5 issues related to setbacks or green space were identified. White noted that the specific materials
6 called out in the plans were placeholders, and that final material selections would be confirmed by
7 the marina committee prior to permit application.

8 Discussion touched on several topics. Bell raised the matter of solar panels, stating his strong
9 preference that the village investigate the financial payback of a solar installation given the building's
10 favorable sun exposure and the marina's peak energy usage in summer months. Heidler
11 acknowledged the merit of researching it but noted that aesthetics would need to be factored in, as
12 panels would be most visible on the public-facing side of the building. Lienau confirmed that the
13 architecture firm's green energy specialist had been contacted and would provide an updated
14 analysis.

15 Heidler also suggested exploring dark-sky compliant lighting where feasible, and raised a question
16 about the existing storage shed to the rear of the building. Lienau explained that the shed is used for
17 storing petroleum products, grills, and other outdoor equipment unsuitable for interior storage, and
18 that it sits on DNR-permitted property. The Commission discussed adding vegetative screening
19 around the shed to reduce its visual impact once surrounding trees are removed during
20 construction. Lienau confirmed that civil engineering work, including pavement layout and bollard
21 placement, remains to be completed.

22 The Commission also briefly discussed the construction timeline relative to the village's development
23 agreement restrictions on exterior work. White and Bell noted that the restrictions are embedded in
24 the standard development agreement rather than in ordinance, and that the Commission would be
25 receptive to a request for flexibility if it were accompanied by a clear timeline justification. No formal
26 action was taken; the item was a courtesy review for Commission feedback.

27
28 **b) Site Plan Review; Coming of Age in Sister Bay, LLC; 10615 & 10619 Sister Bluff Drive**

29 Andrews introduced the site plan review for the second building of a previously approved multi-
30 building development. He noted that the proposal is largely consistent with the original 2024
31 approval, with two modifications: the addition of a sunroom on the rear of the building, and a
32 request for two driveways in lieu of the single driveway approved under the original site plan. Village
33 code permits a second driveway with Plan Commission approval.

34 Applicant Garritt Bader explained that the original single-driveway configuration would require
35 clearing nearly all trees between the garages and Sister Bluff Drive to accommodate the stormwater
36 retention pond layout. By reconfiguring the stormwater pond and introducing two narrower
37 individual driveways—one per building—the significant majority of the existing trees along the street
38 frontage could be preserved, and total impervious surface would be reduced.

39 The Commission discussed the appropriate width for each driveway. Bell proposed 18 feet as a
40 reasonable width, noting it would accommodate two passing vehicles at low speed. The applicant
41 and Harff expressed agreement. Harff noted that the two-driveway layout made logical sense given
42 the building configuration and the green space proposed between the structures. The Commission
43 also discussed the need for propane tank screening and confirmed that replanting of trees along the
44 street frontage—including in the area disturbed by the current construction access—would be
45 required and should be confirmed in the development agreement.

46 Andrews clarified that a draft development agreement had been prepared and would return to the
47 Commission at the next regular meeting for formal action. The Commission requested that building
48 height be confirmed and included in the materials at that time. The Commission indicated general
49 support for the sunroom addition, noting that impervious surface limits were not exceeded.

50 No formal motion was made at this meeting; the item will return with the development agreement
51 for recommendation to the Village Board.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

c) Standard Zoning Application; Chop Restaurant; 2345 Mill Rd

Andrews presented this item as a follow-up to a prior meeting at which the Commission had directed Chop Restaurant to provide screening for its mechanical accessory structure in the form of an 8-foot wood fence with materials consistent with the building's siding. The applicant resubmitted plans reflecting an 8-foot cedar fence consistent with that direction.

Heidler commended the applicant for responding to the Commission's feedback. Discussion confirmed that the fence should be painted to match the red siding of the building, with white trim consistent with the building's exterior trim, rather than the black trim depicted in the submitted rendering. White concurred, noting that the color should simply match the building.

Motion to approve the standard zoning permit application for Chop Restaurant, with the condition that the fence color and trim match the building's existing exterior siding and trim colors, was made by Heidler and second by Harff. Motion carried -all ayes.

d) Revised Site Plan/Plat Submission; Luna View Development; 2399 Maple Drive

Andrews summarized the proposed revisions to the previously approved site plan for Luna View Development, originally approved by the Plan Commission on October 25, 2022. The modifications consist of two components: reassigning the rooftop deck area of Unit 301 from common space to private ownership under that unit, and minor adjustments to the guest parking layout.

Applicant Allen Gokey explained that the rooftop deck change is driven by insurance liability considerations. As common space, the association's insurance costs increased substantially; assigning the deck to Unit 301—which Gokey will own—transfers the liability to him personally, reducing costs for the association. He confirmed that the physical footprint and square footage of the deck are unchanged.

Andrews noted that correspondence had been received from a neighboring property owner raising questions about the rooftop area and certain discrepancies in what had been depicted in renderings versus what was approved. He acknowledged the development agreement language had been ambiguous on this point, and suggested the amendment could provide an opportunity to clarify.

Discussion also arose regarding the visual impact of the building's white rubber roof, which several Commission members and neighboring residents had noted as visually prominent. Gokey acknowledged the concern and indicated that enclosing the mechanical area—adding doors and wood trim consistent with the rest of the building—was feasible. The Commission indicated its preference that the rooftop area be modified to reduce the visual impact of the white roof and better integrate with the building's earth-tone palette, and that this condition be reflected in the amended development agreement.

Motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of the revised site plan for Luna View Development, including the Unit 301 rooftop designation change, the revised guest parking layout, and a condition requiring mitigation of the rooftop color/visual impact to be reflected in the amended development agreement, was made by Bell and second by Harff. Motion carried -all ayes .

e) Setback Review in P-1 Zoning District; Peninsula Kayak Company; Accessory Structure

Andrews introduced the item, which had been referred from the Parks, Property, and Streets Committee. The Committee sought Plan Commission input on the placement of a small accessory storage shed for a park vendor providing e-bike services at Waterfront Park. Two potential locations had been identified—one marked in red and one in yellow on the provided map. The P-1 zoning district requires 50-foot front and rear setbacks, with side setbacks to be determined by the Plan Commission.

Heidler raised a question about whether the side setback might be further constrained by the more restrictive abutting R-2 planned unit development district under the applicable code provisions.

Andrews indicated this would require review of the original PUD file, which predates current records. Bell suggested this level of analysis may not be necessary given the modest nature of the

1 structure—approximately 5 feet wide by 5 feet tall by 6 feet deep, of wood construction on a non-
2 permanent base.

3 The Commission generally agreed that the yellow location was preferable to the red location from a
4 neighbor impact standpoint, and noted that the vendor had expressed willingness to place the shed
5 wherever was acceptable to both the village and adjacent property owners. The Commission
6 directed that the vendor coordinate directly with the adjacent condominium association (Sister Bay
7 Yacht Club) to identify a mutually agreeable location, and that Andrews be authorized to approve
8 the final placement once that consensus is reached, without requiring the matter to return to the
9 full Commission.

10 *No formal motion was required, as this was a courtesy referral from the Parks Committee. The*
11 *Commission noted its direction by consensus.*

12
13 **f) Standard Zoning Permit; Door County Housing Partnership, Inc.; 2407 Ava Hope Trail**

14 Andrews presented a zoning permit application from Tim Halbrook on behalf of Door County
15 Housing Partnership, Inc. for a single-family residential development in an R-2 district. All
16 compliance standards were met. However, the R-2 district requires one tree to be planted for every
17 40 feet of street frontage, with the tree species subject to Plan Commission approval.

18 Discussion centered on appropriate species selection for the location. Heidler, drawing on his
19 familiarity with local conditions, advised against monocultures and noted that visually prominent
20 conifers would be inappropriate near corner sight lines. He recommended species from the birch
21 and maple families, noting that ornamental varieties tend to remain at a more manageable size than
22 native hardwoods such as oak or sugar maple, and are better suited to roadside conditions including
23 salt and pollution exposure.

24 *The Commission agreed to direct the applicant toward species from the birch and maple families,*
25 *with no conifers to be planted in corner-adjacent locations. Andrews confirmed this direction was*
26 *sufficient to issue the permit with the appropriate condition.*

27
28 **g) Discussion on Zoning Code Revisions and Related Items**

29 Bell initiated a broader discussion on the state of the village's zoning code, characterizing it as
30 organically grown over many years and difficult to read and interpret. He noted that the code does
31 not always align with the village's current vision for land use. White agreed, noting that relevant
32 regulations for a given district are often scattered across multiple sections of the code in ways that
33 are not intuitive to the reader. Harff similarly noted difficulty locating specific provisions.

34 Bell expressed a preference for engaging an outside consultant rather than conducting a purely in-
35 house review, citing both the volume of work involved and the recommendation of the village
36 attorney, Randy Nesbitt, that an external resource is preferable for such an undertaking. Andrews
37 noted that a previous contact, Jeff Sanders, had indicated he was not currently accepting new clients
38 for strategic planning work, though he may be available in a later timeframe or in a different
39 capacity. The Commission agreed that other sole proprietors or planning firms offering similar
40 services should be considered.

41 Heidler suggested that as a first step, the Commission conduct a section-by-section review to
42 identify the scale and nature of changes needed before engaging a consultant. Bell acknowledged
43 this approach but indicated the Commission had gone through that process previously without
44 achieving the desired results, and reiterated his preference for outside expertise. The Commission
45 agreed to pursue both tracks—gathering a preliminary list of desired changes from each member
46 while simultaneously exploring consultant options.

47 Specific areas identified for near-term review included: permitted uses across zoning districts (which
48 were noted as having been developed ad hoc around specific businesses over time), accessory
49 dwelling units (ADUs) with provisions to prevent their conversion to short-term rentals, parking
50 standards in the B-3 district, and the sign permit process. Bell noted that text amendments could be
51 bundled into a single public hearing to maximize efficiency.

1 Andrews also raised the matter of standardizing the format of zoning permit applications to improve
2 the Commission's ability to verify calculations—including square footage, green space, and lot
3 dimensions—before materials are presented for review. The Commission directed that a more
4 consistent calculation format be developed and included in future permit submissions.

5
6 **6. Matters to be Placed on a Future Agenda or Referred to a Committee, Official or Employee**

7 The Commission identified the following items for future agendas:

- 8 ● The Savard/auto repair use matter will be incorporated into the broader zoning code revision
9 process, with a target timeline of fall 2026.
10 ● A monthly permit log will be distributed to Plan Commissioners by staff; a standing discussion
11 item will be placed on future agendas for any permit-related questions or concerns.
12 ● The development agreement for Coming of Age in Sister Bay, LLC (Item 5b) will return at the
13 May 26, 2026 regular meeting.

14
15 **7. Next Meeting**

16 The next regular monthly meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 26, 2026, at 5:30 P.M., in the Large
17 Meeting Room, Sister Bay-Liberty Grove Fire Station.

18
19 **8. Adjournment**

20 Motion to adjourn was made by Bell and second by Harff. The motion carried -all ayes.

21 The meeting was adjourned.

22 *Motion to adjourn at 5:40 PM.*

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

24
25
26 Respectfully submitted by Sarah Bertges, Administrative Assistant