

**VILLAGE OF SISTER BAY
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, MAY 26, 2026
APPROVED AS AMENDED**

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chairperson Nate Bell called the Plan Commission meeting to order on Tuesday, May 26, 2026, at 5:30 P.M., and roll call was taken.

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

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

Others: Kurt Harff, Bill Harbeck, Lisa Harbeck, Susan Caldwell, Paul H., Eric J., Garritt Bader, Skylar Witalison, S. Gullick, Katelyn Jerard, Kim Erzinger, Myles Dannhusen. VIA ZOOM: Don Peters, Louise Howson, Ellie Soderberg-Guger, MDannhusen, Jill Wiebe-LWV Observer Corp, Mary W., Michael Langer, Eric Slavin, #847-971-xxxx,

2. Approve of the Agenda

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

3. Approve Meeting Minutes

a. May 14, 2026; Special Meeting

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

4. Comments, Correspondence, and Concerns from the Public

Bill Harbeck of Sister Bluff Estates indicated he had comments regarding agenda item 5B and requested to address those concerns when that item was reached. No other public comments were received.

5. Discussion/Action Items

a. Development Agreement Amendment; Coming of Age in Sister Bay, LLC; 10615 & 10619 Sister Bluff Drive

Andrews provided background, noting this item was a follow-up to the site plan review from the May 14 Special Meeting for the second duplex development by Coming of Age in Sister Bay, LLC. The proposed amendment addressed updated driveway widths (two 18-foot driveways), approval of sunrooms, clarification of screening requirements for propane tanks, and confirmation of the existing landscaping plan.

Heidler raised the point that given the lapse of the original development agreement and the significant changes to the driveway layout and drainage, the Commission should consider executing a new consolidated development agreement rather than a second amendment. He expressed concern that the current drainage plan had not been updated to reflect the change from two retention ponds to one, and that without a revised plan on record, the Commission would be sending an incomplete package to the Village Board.

Bell acknowledged the concern but noted that requiring a fully new agreement at this stage could delay the project to a July board meeting. The applicant's representative, Garrett Bader, indicated

1 that updated drainage and site plans could be submitted within days, and that the project team had
2 been engaged for over three years and was prepared to begin construction as soon as possible.
3 After deliberation, the Commission reached consensus that a new development agreement—rather
4 than a third amendment—would be preferable to consolidate all terms in one document. The
5 Commission agreed that the new agreement would incorporate the revised driveway plan, an
6 updated drainage plan, and a landscaping plan, with the latter to be reviewed and satisfied as a
7 condition prior to issuance of occupancy permits. The Commission further agreed that the updated
8 drainage and driveway plans would be submitted and reviewed by Harff and Ahrens prior to the
9 June 16 Village Board meeting. If no objections were raised, the item would proceed to the Board
10 without requiring an additional Plan Commission meeting.

11 *Motion to recommend to the Village Board approval of a new development agreement for Coming of*
12 *Age in Sister Bay, LLC, incorporating the revised driveway plan, updated drainage plan, and*
13 *landscaping plan (the latter to be satisfied prior to issuance of occupancy permits), and conditioned*
14 *upon review of the drainage and driveway documents by Plan Commission members prior to the*
15 *Village Board meeting, was made by Bell and second by Ahrens. Motion carried – all ayes.*

16
17 **b. Development Agreement Amendment; Lunaview; 2399 Maple Drive**

18 Andrews presented a proposed amendment to the Lunaview development agreement, incorporating
19 terms discussed at the May 14 Special Meeting. The amendment addressed modifications to rooftop
20 Unit 301, revised additional parking areas as shown on the reviewed site plan, and an amendment to
21 approved building materials and colors requiring that the rooftop color be mitigated from the
22 existing white.

23 Bill Harbeck, a condominium owner at Sister Bluff Estates, addressed the Commission regarding the
24 visibility of the white roof and surrounding white structures from the bluff. He stated that he had
25 reviewed all prior development documents and found no approval for the white flat roof, which had
26 been understood to be shingled. He expressed concern that the word "mitigated" in the proposed
27 amendment was ambiguous and requested more specific language to ensure compliance, suggesting
28 earth tones consistent with neighboring rooftops such as the yacht club.

29 Heidler noted that the amendment should address not only the rooftop membrane color but also
30 the stairway enclosure and pergola walls visible from the bluff, which were also white. White
31 confirmed that the developer had previously indicated willingness to address these elements either
32 through repainting or enclosure.

33 After discussion, the Commission agreed to revise the amendment language to specify that the
34 rooftop color, stairway enclosure, and pergola walls are to be changed to a brown, tan, or gray earth
35 tone, replacing the more general language regarding "mitigation."

36 Regarding the revised parking layout, Andrews explained that two additional guest parking spaces
37 were being identified along the driveway area. Several commissioners questioned whether there
38 was adequate clearance between the proposed parking spaces and the retaining wall. It was noted
39 that the parking additions were supplemental to the already-approved spaces and did not affect
40 minimum code requirements. No changes to parking conditions were incorporated into the motion.

41 *Motion to approve the amended development agreement for Lunaview at 2399 Maple Drive, with*
42 *revised language specifying that the rooftop color, stairway enclosure, and pergola walls be changed*
43 *to a brown, tan, or gray earth tone, and incorporating the revised parking layout as presented, was*
44 *made by Bell and second by White. Motion carried – all ayes.*

45
46 **c. Zoning Code Interpretation; Temporary Banner Display Request; Ben Ehlers; Chop; 2345 Mill Rd**

47 Andrews presented a zoning code interpretation request from the management of Chop restaurant,
48 which sought to display a temporary banner during daily lunch hours, removing it after service
49 concluded each day.

50 The Commission discussed whether this arrangement would qualify as a permitted temporary sign
51 under the Village's sign regulations. The consensus was that a temporary sign under the code is

1 intended for short-term, one-time promotional use—such as an upcoming event—and that a sign
2 displayed and removed on a daily recurring basis does not meet that definition. The Commission
3 further noted that the request, as submitted, did not fit the approved sign materials or permanent
4 sign standards either.

5 Andrews confirmed the Commission's interpretation that the banner display as requested is not
6 permitted as a temporary sign and does not qualify as any other approved sign category.

7 Katelyn Jerard, General Manager of Chop and Lure, acknowledged the determination and noted that
8 she would instead explore use of an open flag (consistent with the Village's flag regulations, which
9 allow up to three flags per business) and a sandwich board sign, subject to a standard permit. The
10 Commission confirmed both of those options would be allowable if compliant with applicable code
11 provisions.

12
13 **d. Site Plan Review; Lure; 10627 N Bay Shore Drive**

14 Andrews presented a site plan review for an approximately 448-square-foot patio expansion at Lure
15 restaurant, which would include a retaining wall composed of timber. The property is located in the
16 B2 Downtown District with a Historic Overlay. The proposed grading and drainage changes were
17 noted to be within the two-foot threshold that would ordinarily trigger an engineering plan
18 requirement. Andrews also noted that the expansion would intensify outdoor seating use, which
19 raised the question of whether additional parking would be required.

20 General Manager Jerard described the project, explaining that the retaining wall was initially
21 motivated by water drainage running toward the building, and that the decision was made to
22 combine that work with a patio expansion. She anticipated six tables in the new space, potentially
23 seating approximately 20 to 24 additional guests.

24 The Commission engaged in extended discussion regarding parking. Heidler noted that under the
25 current code—one space per 150 square feet of dining area or one space per four seats, whichever is
26 greater—the existing restaurant is already considerably short of required parking, with
27 approximately 16 available spaces against a much larger theoretical need. He acknowledged that the
28 situation could not be corrected retroactively, but expressed hesitation about approving additional
29 seating without addressing the parking shortfall.

30 Bell acknowledged the tension between the code requirements and the practical reality of the
31 downtown corridor, noting that the Village's code also directs the Commission to avoid excessive
32 impervious surfaces and preserve green space, and that shared parking and pedestrian traffic
33 patterns are characteristic of the B2 district. He expressed a preference for utilizing the existing fee-
34 in-lieu-of-parking mechanism rather than denying the expansion outright. He noted that the fee
35 structure as currently written is rudimentary and would benefit from future refinement as part of
36 the ongoing Zoning Code Review, but that it represents the available tool today.

37 After discussion, the Commission agreed to approve the patio expansion conditioned upon payment
38 of the fee-in-lieu-of-parking for four parking stalls, under the existing fee structure. The approval of
39 the retaining wall and screening work, including dumpster screening previously identified as
40 outstanding, was understood to proceed concurrently.

41 *Motion to approve the Lure patio expansion at 10627 N Bay Shore Drive as presented, conditioned*
42 *upon payment of the fee-in-lieu-of-parking for four stalls pursuant to the existing fee structure, was*
43 *made by Heidler and seconded by Bell. Motion carried – all ayes.*
44

45 **e. Courtesy Review; Friends of the Ice Rink; Ice Rink Reconstruction; 2155 Autumn Ct**

46 Miles Dannhausen presented on behalf of Friends of the Ice Rink, seeking courtesy review input on a
47 proposed reconstruction of the Sister Bay Sports Complex ice rink.

48 The Commission raised several points for consideration. Commissioners expressed concern about
49 the extent of tree removal that would be required to accommodate the proposed driveway access
50 and utility runs through the existing cedar windbreak. The Commission encouraged exploration of
51 combining the utility corridor and driveway access into a single cleared path to minimize tree loss,

1 and suggested replanting cedars around and behind the new structures to restore the windbreak
2 over time.

3 Ahrens raised the question of whether the chiller system's noise output had been assessed relative
4 to the Village's noise standards at the lot line (75 dBA). Dannhausen noted the system was described
5 as comparably quiet to rooftop HVAC equipment and agreed to follow up with noise documentation.
6 The Commission discussed the aesthetic character of the proposed garage structure. The consensus
7 was that the building should be utilitarian and durable, and that it should use a mixture of materials
8 that blend with the park setting. The Parks Maintenance Facility aesthetic was mentioned as a
9 possible reference, though commissioners noted it has a more industrial character. Dannhausen
10 agreed to return with more detailed plans, including a lighting plan if dark-sky-compliant lighting
11 upgrades are to be included in the current phase.

12 No action was required on this courtesy review item. The Commission's feedback was noted for
13 incorporation into the detailed plans to be presented at a future meeting.

14
15 **f. Courtesy Review; Adam and Bridgid White; Sister Bay General Store; 10674 North Bay Shore**
16 **Drive**

17 White recused herself from the dais to present this item as an applicant, noting the coincidental
18 timing of her Planning Commission membership and the project's development, and that the two
19 were unrelated.

20 The proposal involves construction of a new general store with an ice cream parlor on an irregularly
21 shaped parcel in the B3 Downtown District extending to Spring Road. Brigid White, Adam White's co-
22 applicant, presented the project with architect Eric Slavin (participating remotely) and engineer
23 Skyler Witalison of Stantec Engineering.

24 The applicants described a two-story building in a folk Victorian architectural style, designed to
25 evoke a historic commercial building that could have been constructed in the area 100 years ago.
26 The building would front North Bay Shore Drive, with parking access from Spring Road at the rear of
27 the property. The applicants noted that the lot contains numerous mature cedar trees toward the
28 rear, and expressed a preference for preserving as many as possible.

29 Ahrens raised questions regarding wetland delineation and setback requirements. Witalison
30 explained that a new wetland delineation had been completed, with the delineated line falling very
31 close to a prior survey from 2021. Andrews noted that the Village's wetland overlay district is based
32 on a 1990s conceptual map, and that the current delineation governs the actual building envelope.
33 The DNR wetland classification and any applicable state setbacks were still being confirmed by the
34 delineator, though the expectation was that the category would be among the more lenient
35 classifications.

36 The Commission discussed parking. Bell noted that the code directs the Commission to avoid
37 unnecessary parking that would sacrifice green space and reduce impervious surface. The
38 Commission suggested that when formal plans are submitted, the applicants provide two parking
39 layout options—one maximizing spaces and one preserving trees—so the Commission can weigh the
40 trade-offs directly.

41 Bell also suggested exploring a pedestrian connection from the street frontage to the rear parking
42 area and noted that bike parking provisions and transit stop proximity could contribute to parking
43 reduction considerations under the code.

44 On architectural and design questions, Heidler noted some visual inconsistencies in the window
45 treatment shown on the preliminary elevation and a sense of busyness on certain elevations. Slavin
46 acknowledged the comments, noting that some window adjustments had already been identified,
47 and confirmed that the front exterior staircase shown in the submitted packet had since been
48 removed from the design in favor of an internal egress stair, which would allow those openings to
49 become windows.

1 On signage, the Commission confirmed that a construction sign is permitted without a permit during
2 the construction period under the code, not to exceed one sign of 18 square feet, and must be
3 removed upon issuance of the occupancy permit.

4 On outdoor lighting, the applicants asked about the permissibility of traditional lantern-style wall
5 fixtures in keeping with the building's historic character. The Commission discussed the relevant
6 code provision, which requires that light sources be shielded to prevent direct upward light and
7 minimize spillover onto adjacent properties. Heidler noted the code's purpose is to prevent light
8 trespass and sky glow, not to prohibit decorative fixtures. Ahrens noted that the dark sky standard of
9 3,000 Kelvin would apply. Slavin indicated that cut sheets for proposed fixtures, including wattage
10 and opaque/transparent component identification, would be submitted with the formal application
11 for Commission review.

12 No action was required on this courtesy review item. The applicants indicated they anticipated
13 returning for formal submission in July.

14 15 **6. Permit Activity Log**

16 Andrews noted the permit activity log had been distributed the day of the meeting. The Commission
17 requested that future permit logs be distributed with the regular meeting packet. No further
18 discussion was recorded.

19 20 **7. Matters to be Placed on a Future Agenda or Referred to a Committee, Official or Employee**

21 -Zoning Code Review

22 -Bell noted that accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and a refined fee-in-lieu-of-parking framework
23 remained outstanding items for inclusion in the Zoning Code Review agenda.

24 -Commissioners were invited to submit additional topics to Andrews for scheduling.

25 -Andrews confirmed a zoning administrator report would be added to future agendas.

26 27 **8. Next Meeting**

28 The next regular monthly meeting of the Sister Bay Plan Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, June
29 23, 2026, at 5:30 PM, in the Large Meeting Room of the Sister Bay-Liberty Grove Fire Station.

30 31 **9. Adjournment**

32 *Motion to adjourn at 8:29 PM.*

33 *Motion by Heidler second by Ahrens. Motion carried -all ayes.*

34
35 Respectfully submitted by Sarah Bertges, Administrative Assistant