



Village Hall, 262-567-2757
Fax, 262-567-4115
Highway Dept., 262-567-2422
Police Dept., 262-567-1134
Building Inspector, 262-490-4141
www.villageofsummitwi.gov

Summit Village Hall • 37100 Delafield Road • Summit, WI 53066

MINUTES

Village of Summit Plan Commission

March 19, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Siepmann called to order the Plan Commission meeting at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 19, 2026, at the Summit Village Hall, 37100 Delafield Road, Summit, WI.

ROLL CALL AND CONFIRM POSTING

Deputy Clerk/Deputy Treasurer LaValliere confirmed the meeting was noticed to the local media as required and requested and posted on the Village posting board and website.

Commissioners present were: Annette Kaja, Paul Schmitter, Matt Katz, Jim Petronovich, Sandra Murray, Jay Obenberger and Alternate Joan Gucciardi. Also present were: Chairperson Jim Siepmann, Planner Amy Barrows and Deputy Clerk/Deputy Treasurer Sarah LaValliere.

MINUTES

- October 16, 2025
- February 26, 2026

Minutes were not included they will be presented at the next meeting.

Next meeting date – proposed for Thursday, April 16, 2026, at 5:30 p.m.

REGULAR BUSINESS:

Discussion and action on request by Andy Fieber, on behalf of Nemahbin Lake Holdings LLC, for Site Development approval for building improvements, including a new roof and siding color, on property occupied by Panga, located at 34422 Delafield Road (SUMT0669017).

Planner Barrows reviewed the request for site development approval to replace the existing roof and update the exterior siding color of the building occupied by Panga.

Justin Beres spoke on behalf of the applicant regarding the design and the intent to return the structure to a more traditional appearance.

Discussion occurred regarding the color selection.

MOTION: (Petronovich, Katz) *to approve the proposed roofing and siding modifications as presented.* Carried.

Discussion and action on request by Burke Nelson, on behalf of Hope Church of Wisconsin Inc., for Site Development Plan approval to expand the parking lot and install additional lighting and landscaping located at 2431 N. Dousman Road (SUMT0637999010).

Planner Barrows presented the request for approval to expand the existing parking lot, install lighting improvements, and add landscaping.

Burke Nelson, representing Hope Church, discussed adjustments to the lighting. The majority of lights in parking lot would result in no change but they would add additional heads. There is one new pole proposed outside of the new parking lot addition. The poles will match the existing lighting in parking lot. The poles are 20' in height that do not fit with the design guidelines for the Village but the intent would be to keep lighting similar.

MOTION: (Kaja, Katz) *to approve the Site Development Plans for a parking lot expansion, lighting, and landscaping at the Hope Church property, subject to the following conditions:*

1. APPROVAL FROM ENGINEERING: *All comments of the Engineering Staff's Review Letter dated March 3, 2026 shall be complied with prior to commencing any construction activities. Wheel stops may be limited to the far west stalls.*

2. COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS:

- a. The parking lot expansion shall be constructed according to the plans prepared by TRIO with a revision date of February 16, 2026.*
- b. The landscaping shall be constructed according to the plans prepared by InSite Landscape Design on March 11, 2026.*
- c. A final Lighting Plan with revisions presented at the meeting shall be reviewed and approved by staff. The 20-ft. tall light poles are approved to match existing light poles.*

3. FIRE DEPARTMENT APPROVAL: *Prior to commencing any parking lot improvement activities, the Fire Department shall review the final plan set to ensure the Fire Department has adequate access and maneuverability.*

Carried.

Discussion and action on request by Cory Majszak, on behalf of Rogers Memorial Hospital Inc, for Site Development approval to revise a previously approved proposal for an aquatic activity building, located at 34700 Valley Road (SUMT0622977003).

Planner Barrows presented the request to revise a previously approved aquatic therapy building. The revised proposal converts the structure into a storage facility for aquatic equipment associated with Rogers Memorial Hospital programming.

The enclosed structure will be 336 square feet with an additional 480 square-foot overhang, resulting in a footprint smaller than the existing structure. Materials include James Hardie fiber cement siding (Black Ash) and a dark bronze standing seam metal roof, with stained wood under the overhang.

Site improvements include:

- Removal of one tree and planting of additional trees and landscaping
- Reinforcement of the lake access walkway and stairs
- Brush clearing along the walkway corridor
- Gravel drive improvements and pedestrian shoulder area
- Fire Department turnaround area

Engineering staff confirmed no stormwater modifications are required; however, an erosion control permit will be necessary.

MOTION: (Petronovich, Murray) *to approve the Site Development Plans for the aquatic activities building, site improvements, and landscaping, subject to the following conditions:*

1. APPROVAL FROM ENGINEERING: *All comments of the Engineering Staff's Review Letter dated March 2, 2026 shall be complied with prior to commencing any construction activities.*

2. COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS:

- a. *The aquatic activities building and related site improvements shall be constructed according to the plans prepared by TRIO with a revision date of March 10, 2026.*
- b. *The landscaping shall be constructed according to the plans prepared by Harwood on March 6, 2026.*
- c. *The building shall be constructed according to the plans prepared by Quorum Architects on March 10, 2026.*

3. AQUATIC EQUIPMENT: *All aquatic equipment and related activities shall be relocated from the north side of the property to the new aquatic activities building location. The pier located at the shoreline adjacent to the new building is limited to the storage/parking of one boat and the temporary storage of aquatic equipment. There shall be no overnight storage of aquatic equipment at the shore. The existing pier on the north side of the property may remain and include the storage/parking of one boat.*

4. USE OF AQUATIC ACTIVITIES BUILDING: *The use of the building and adjacent overhang are limited to aquatic equipment storage.*

5. FIRE DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

6. BUILDING PERMIT ISSUANCE

Discussion on request by Cobalt Partners, LLC for a concept plan to develop properties located in the northwest corner of I-94 and CTH P (SUMT0629998011, owned by Pabst Farms Land Company C LLC & SUMT0629998012, owned by Pabst Farms Land Company R LLC). The request includes a proposed mixed residential and commercial development known as The Harvest at Pabst Farms.

Planner Barrows provided an overview of the concept plan for the proposed Harvest at Pabst Farms mixed-use development. The proposal includes residential, commercial, and open space uses across multiple parcels within the Village of Summit and the City of Oconomowoc.

The residential component proposed within Summit includes:

- 32 single-family detached homes
- 12 owner-occupied condominium units
- Multiple garden-style apartment buildings
- One three-story apartment building with underground parking

Additional proposed uses include retail and service establishments, restaurants, offices, medical clinics, recreational facilities, and civic or institutional spaces.

Planner Barrows also reviewed elements of the Village of Summit Comprehensive Plan, including land use designations, housing considerations, transportation planning, infrastructure capacity, and economic development objectives.

The Plan Commission discussed the development and the uses of the parcel.

Commissioner Murray asked about industrial uses and size and what would be allowable on the parcel.

The plan commission discussed size and impact of industrial buildings.

PUBLIC INPUT regarding proposed amendments to the text of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan and an amendment to the Village of Summit Future Land Use Map, which is part of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan, from the Industrial/Business Park designation to the Mixed Use designation on properties located in the northwest corner of I-94 and CTH P (SUMT0629998011, owned by Pabst Farms Land Company C LLC & SUMT0629998012, owned by Pabst Farms Land Company R LLC). The amendment is proposed by Cobalt Partners, LLC to accommodate a proposed mixed residential and commercial development known as The Harvest at Pabst Farms.

Brian Porter – 37500 Stillwater Drive, Oconomowoc, asked for clarification regarding the proposed residential density included in the amendment.

Planner Barrows explained that the proposal includes a modification to the Comprehensive Plan text that would allow the subject property to be included among those permitted up to 10

residential units per acre. The amendment would also change the Future Land Use Map designation from Industrial Business Park to Mixed-Use.

Trudy Gerbing – 2825 Yahara Drive, Village of Summit, stated she had been speaking with residents in the surrounding neighborhood and presented a petition containing 76 signatures from residents in the Lake Country Village area expressing concerns about the proposed development. She indicated that many residents oppose the proposal due to the number of proposed residential units and potential impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

Ms. Gerbing expressed concern that the addition of approximately 650 residential units would significantly increase density in the immediate area and could effectively double the number of housing units adjacent to Lake Country Village. She also raised concerns regarding traffic volumes, neighborhood connectivity, and pedestrian pathways connecting existing neighborhoods to the proposed development. Ms. Gerbing noted that residents currently pay homeowners association dues within their neighborhood and expressed concerns about increased activity and access points.

Ms. Gerbing further referenced traffic projections discussed in earlier presentations and stated that residents are concerned about the potential increase in traffic along County Highway P and surrounding roadways. She indicated that residents value the existing character of the neighborhood and expressed opposition to the proposed density of development.

Commission members requested that Ms. Gerbing provide a copy of the petition and written comments to Village staff for inclusion in the public record.

Bob Storm – 3020 Mendota Drive, Lake Country Village, stated he had not followed the proposal closely until recently but expressed concerns about maintaining the rural residential character of the Village of Summit as referenced in the Comprehensive Plan. He indicated that residents moved to the area because of its lower density and community character and questioned whether the proposed scale of development aligns with those goals.

Mr. Storm also expressed concern regarding traffic, density, and the cumulative effect of recent and proposed developments in the surrounding area.

Lyn Wright, 707 Marigold Oconomowoc, expressed concern about density and overall plan. She asked if there is a study of Lake Country Trail because it crosses Hwy P. She questioned how many people or cars and questions safety issue when changing plans.

Alan Hulliberger, 2851 Yahara Drive, Village of Summit, stated that his residence is located directly adjacent to the proposed development area, near the pickleball courts in Lake Country Village. He acknowledged that development of the property is likely and indicated he has become more open to the concept of residential development compared to the previously anticipated business park zoning that existed when he built his home.

Mr. Hulliberger emphasized the importance of maintaining the aesthetic character of the Village, recommending that any future development incorporate additional green space, berms, and

landscaping buffers to screen new development from existing neighborhoods. He noted that berms constructed around Lake Country Village effectively shield homes from view and suggested similar measures should be implemented with any new development to preserve the appearance and feel of the surrounding area.

Mr. Hulliberger also expressed the view that the Village should maintain independent decision-making authority regarding development standards within Summit, rather than mirroring development patterns in the City of Oconomowoc. He encouraged the Village to establish stronger requirements for green space, buffering, and aesthetic considerations to ensure compatibility with the character of the Village.

Kim Kyle – 35161 Castle Rock Drive, Lake Country Village, stated that she is a resident of Lake Country Village and expressed opposition to the high-density residential component of the proposed development. She noted that when she moved to the Village of Summit, she did not anticipate development of the scale presented and stated that residents chose the area because of its lower-density character compared to more urbanized communities.

Ms. Kyle raised concerns regarding traffic safety and infrastructure capacity, noting that the proposed number of housing units would likely result in a significant increase in vehicles in the area. She commented that households commonly have two vehicles, which could result in higher traffic volumes than projected.

Ms. Kyle also expressed concern about the financial impact of potential road improvements and traffic infrastructure, questioning how such improvements would be funded and whether the development would cover those costs. She referenced the relatively small number of households in the Village of Summit and indicated concern about the potential burden on taxpayers.

Additionally, Ms. Kyle stated that residents in the area have concerns regarding proposed trail connections between developments, noting that many residents do not support connecting neighborhood trails.

Bill Benjamin – 3051 Mineral Springs Boulevard, Lake Country Village, stated that he is a resident of Lake Country Village and clarified that, to his knowledge, the Lake Country Village Homeowners Association has not formally discussed or taken a position on the proposed development, and indicated that residents had been advised to contact Plan Commission members or Village trustees individually with their concerns.

Mr. Benjamin encouraged the Plan Commission to consider the entire scope of the proposed development, including both the portions located within the Village of Summit and the City of Oconomowoc, rather than evaluating only the residential units proposed on the Summit side. He suggested that Commission members review similar large-scale developments in other communities to better understand the potential magnitude and impacts of the project.

Mr. Benjamin noted concerns regarding the overall scale of the apartment units compared to the proposed retail components, referencing developments in other municipalities as examples of higher-density projects. He encouraged the Commission to carefully evaluate how the proposed

development aligns with the Village’s long-term housing composition, character, and planning goals before making decisions related to the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Laura Zielski – 35263 Yahara Road, Lake Country Village, stated that many of her concerns had already been expressed by previous speakers. She indicated that she is not in favor of the proposed high-density development and expressed concern regarding the overall scale of the project.

Ms. Zielski also noted concerns related to traffic along County Highway P, stating that the roadway already experiences periods of heavy traffic. She reiterated her opposition to the size and density of the proposed development.

Aubrey Gerard – 35343 Kegonsa Drive, Lake Country Village, stated that her family is opposed to the proposed high-density residential development. She expressed concerns related to safety and the overall number of housing units being proposed in the area.

Ms. Gerard commented that some existing apartment developments in the region appear to have vacancies, and questioned whether additional high-density housing is necessary. She also expressed concern that increased residential development could result in additional population growth, which may place further strain on local schools and community resources.

Ms. Gerard noted that school districts in the area are already addressing capacity challenges, and she questioned how additional development could impact school enrollment and facilities moving forward.

Karen Rasmussen – 35146 Castle Rock Drive, Lake Country Village, stated that she understands traffic and roadway issues related to the proposed development are currently being studied. She expressed concern about the potential environmental and health impacts associated with increased traffic, including vehicle emissions and exhaust.

Ms. Rasmussen also questioned the need for additional retail development, noting that she has observed vacant retail spaces in nearby commercial areas and expressed concern that new retail buildings could remain unoccupied if demand is insufficient.

Additionally, Ms. Rasmussen stated that she is not in favor of the proposed high-density residential development, particularly the inclusion of a three-story residential building. She indicated that while she has lived in more urban environments previously, she did not expect that level of density in the Village of Summit.

Closed public input at 6:35 pm

REGULAR BUSINESS CONTINUED

Discussion and action on request of Cobalt Partners, LLC to amend the text of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan and amend the Village of Summit Future Land Use Map, which is part of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan, from the Industrial/Business

Park designation to the Mixed Use designation on properties located in the northwest corner of I-94 and CTH P (SUMT0629998011, owned by Pabst Farms Land Company C LLC & SUMT0629998012, owned by Pabst Farms Land Company R LLC). The amendment is proposed by the developer, Cobalt Partners, LLC, to accommodate a proposed mixed residential and commercial development known as The Harvest at Pabst Farms.

Planner Barrows explained that if the Plan Commission wished to move forward with consideration of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, they could direct staff to draft a resolution for potential consideration at the April meeting. The resolution would include amendments to the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan text and Future Land Use Map, changing the designation of the subject parcels from Industrial Business Park to Mixed-Use.

Planner Barrows reviewed several potential conditions that could be incorporated into the resolution, including:

1. The Comprehensive Plan text and map amendments would not become effective until the subject property is rezoned to an appropriate zoning district that accommodates mixed-use development and includes a Planned Development Overlay District in accordance with the Village zoning ordinance.
2. The overlay district would establish specific design requirements addressing building location and scale, architectural and site design, community and public spaces, lighting, signage, and landscaping to ensure cohesive development.
3. Residential density would not exceed 10 units per acre of the area proposed for residential development.
4. The development would include commercial uses along Pabst Farms Boulevard.
5. The developer would be required to obtain the necessary approvals to operate as a mixed-use development within one year of the land use map amendment being approved by the Village Board.

Planner Barrows explained that the Plan Commission serves as a recommending body, and any resolution adopted by the Plan Commission would then proceed to the Village Board for consideration, including a required public hearing and notice period. She also noted that the Plan Commission could choose to take no action, request revisions, or postpone action if additional information or changes were desired.

Chairperson Siepman stated that this was the first opportunity for the Plan Commission to review the proposal together, and he did not expect that a recommendation would be forwarded to the Village Board at that meeting. He indicated that the Commission should discuss and review the proposal in detail, allowing members time to digest the information before determining next steps.

Chairperson Siepman suggested the Commission consider the proposal as two separate components: the commercial development proposed for the southern portion of the site and the residential development proposed for the northern portion.

Commercial Development Discussion

Chairperson Siepmann noted that relatively few public comments were made regarding the commercial component of the proposal and stated that commercial uses near the I-94 corridor may align with ongoing development activity in the area.

Commissioner Murray commented that commercial uses are already permitted under the existing land use designation and zoning framework. She noted that uses such as hotels or other commercial facilities could already occur on the property under current regulations.

Chairperson Siepmann added that the property could potentially accommodate large-scale commercial or industrial-style buildings under the current designation, including structures with loading docks or truck activity.

Discussion continued regarding the proposed expansion of allowable uses to include retail uses. Commissioner Murray stated she was not comfortable with open-ended retail uses and indicated that the currently permitted uses could still be compatible with adjacent development without expanding the range of retail options.

Alternate Commissioner Gucciardi expressed similar concerns, noting uncertainty about the types of retail uses that could ultimately be introduced and potential traffic impacts.

Commissioner Katz indicated he was comfortable with the proposed commercial component as presented.

Commissioner Kaja stated she was not supportive of expanding retail uses, and aligned with Commissioner Murray's concerns.

Chairperson Siepmann stated that he was generally comfortable with the direction of the commercial development, but acknowledged that the specific list of permitted uses would require further review by the Commission.

Chairperson Siepmann then transitioned the discussion to the residential component of the proposed development, noting that this portion of the proposal generated the majority of public comment and concern during the meeting.

Chairperson Siepmann explained that effective land use planning typically involves layering densities, beginning with lower-density development near existing single-family neighborhoods and transitioning to higher-density uses closer to commercial areas. He noted that the proposal includes single-family homes along the northern edge of the development adjacent to Lake Country Village, followed by progressively higher-density residential uses moving south toward the commercial area. He commented that this approach reflects a typical planning strategy used to protect adjacent single-family neighborhoods while allowing development to occur.

Chairperson Siepmann also referenced the development history of Lake Country Village, noting that the subdivision itself was originally proposed with fewer lots but was later revised to include a greater number of homes to make the project economically viable. He stated that the

subdivision ultimately included smaller lot sizes than had previously been allowed in the Village, along with open space and trails as part of the development plan.

Chairperson Siepmann clarified that the trail system within Lake Country Village consists of public trails owned by the Village, although the subdivision maintains them. He indicated that the Village would continue to evaluate the trail system as part of future planning discussions.

Chairperson Siepmann further noted that the Village's Comprehensive Plan identifies areas near I-94 and major transportation corridors as appropriate locations for higher-density development, particularly where sewer and water service are available through the City of Oconomowoc. He explained that the subject property was previously designated as Industrial Business Park and that the Village had not reevaluated that designation during the most recent comprehensive planning process because the property owner already had approved land use rights under the existing plan.

Chairperson Siepmann stated that the current proposal represents a request to change that land use designation, which is a process any property owner may pursue. He indicated that the Commission must evaluate the request and determine whether the proposed land use change provides long-term value to the Village while also protecting nearby neighborhoods.

During discussion of multifamily housing, Chairperson Siepmann commented that the visual scale of multifamily buildings can make it difficult to determine the number of units contained within a development, as multiple buildings may appear similar regardless of whether they contain a smaller or larger number of units.

Commissioner Schmitter noted that the largest building proposed within the development, particularly the three-story structure with parking below, appeared significantly larger than the other residential buildings. He stated that this building stood out as different from the surrounding structures and may warrant further review.

Chairperson Siepmann acknowledged that the scale of the larger residential building may require additional discussion, but reiterated that the overall development concept demonstrates a planned transition of densities from single-family homes to multifamily housing and ultimately to commercial uses, which he described as a typical planning approach.

Chairperson Siepmann concluded that while the general concept reflects standard planning practices, the overall residential density and building scale remain subject to further discussion and deliberation by the Commission.

Chairperson Siepmann noted that the portion of the proposed development within the City of Oconomowoc had already received approvals, including zoning and planned development approvals for approximately 390 residential units. He stated that the Plan Commission must determine what level of density and development is appropriate for the Village of Summit portion of the project.

Chairperson Siepmann commented that the developer's proposal attempts to transition densities, placing lower-density housing adjacent to Lake Country Village and gradually increasing density closer to the commercial areas. He indicated that this approach was intended to protect existing residential areas while allowing development to occur.

Commissioner Murray stated that the Commission also has a responsibility to consider residents located east of the proposed development. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan had historically identified the area as Business Park, which would serve as a buffer between residential neighborhoods. Commissioner Murray expressed concern that the number of residential units proposed could significantly exceed the Village's long-term housing projections and alter the intended rural character of the community.

Commissioner Katz noted that the City of Oconomowoc's approvals would likely result in additional traffic and density impacts regardless of the Village's decision, and questioned how the proposed memorandum of understanding between the communities would affect the Village's authority over land use decisions.

Planner Barrows explained that the memorandum of understanding discussed during prior joint meetings primarily addressed coordination between the developer, the City of Oconomowoc, and the Village of Summit regarding information sharing and timing of review processes. She stated that the memorandum does not approve any development and does not control the Village's decision regarding the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Planner Barrows also explained that if the property remains zoned Business Park, permitted uses could include office, light industrial, or other commercial activities with significant impervious surfaces, lighting, parking areas, and truck traffic. She noted that a planned development overlay associated with a mixed-use district could allow the Village to establish more specific design and development standards, including limitations on uses, building design, and site features.

Commissioner Katz indicated he may support lower residential density as part of a compromise between residential and business park uses.

Commissioner Schmitter reiterated concerns about the largest residential building proposed, noting that the three-story structure with parking below could result in very long building corridors. He suggested that the building could potentially be divided into multiple smaller structures.

Commissioner Gucciardi commented that while she generally prefers business park development, the property has remained undeveloped for many years and the City of Oconomowoc's approvals have altered the context of the site. She stated that the proposal appears to be a well-designed plan overall, and that the area is one of the few locations within the Village served by municipal sewer and water, which can support higher-density development.

Commissioner Petronovich stated that although he would have preferred the property remain agricultural or open space historically, development in the area has already occurred and will likely continue. He commented that the proposed mixed-use development may be more

compatible with the surrounding Pabst Farms development than an isolated business park surrounded by residential uses.

Members of the Commission expressed concern that the proposed development could exceed the population projections outlined in the Village's Comprehensive Plan and noted that the Village may have limited options given approvals already granted by the City of Oconomowoc, and also raised concerns regarding the overall residential density, the scale of the largest residential building, and certain commercial elements near the intersection, suggesting potential modifications such as reducing the size of the largest building and incorporating additional condominium-style development.

Chairperson Siepmann stated that if the property remained Business Park, it could potentially be developed with light industrial or commercial buildings, which could generate truck traffic, loading activity, and noise early in the morning or late at night. He suggested that the Commission should consider whether residential buffering and mixed-use development may ultimately have fewer impacts than a traditional business park development adjacent to existing homes.

Chairperson Siepmann summarized that the Commission had heard several areas of concern, including:

- Overall residential density
- The size and design of the largest residential building
- The commercial activity proposed near the roundabout
- Trail connections and open space considerations

Chairperson Siepmann suggested that the Commission take additional time to consider the proposal before making a final recommendation.

MOTION: (Katz, Schmitter) *to direct staff to draft a resolution for potential consideration by the Plan Commission at the April meeting to amend the text of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan and to amend the Future Land Use Map category from Industrial/Business Park to Mixed Use on the subject parcels.*

Subject to conditions Planner Barrows outlined in staff report and listed below with additional condition regarding uses recommended by Planner Barrows.

1. *The text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map are not effective until such time the subject property is rezoned to an appropriate Zoning District category that accommodates Mixed Use Development and subject to a Planned Development Overlay District in accordance with Section 111-359 of the Zoning and Shoreland Ordinance. The Planned Development Overlay District shall provide specific design requirements to encourage uniform and harmonious development, such as location and scale of buildings, architectural and site design, community public and green spaces, lighting, signage and landscaping.*

2. *Residential density shall not exceed 10 units per acre of the area proposed to be developed as residential. The development shall include commercial uses along Pabst Farms Boulevard on both properties.*
3. *The property shall have all necessary permits to operate as a Mixed-Use Development within one year of the Land Use Plan Amendment being approved by Village Board, including the approval of a Rezone and Planned Development Overlay District. This requirement does not include specific Site Plan Development approvals for individual buildings and site improvements, or possible future land divisions.*

Carried

Murray opposed

Chairperson Siepmann recommended the developer address the following:

- Density
- 110-unit building can it be broken down versus one large one
- Corner at the roundabout with Harvest signage.
- Trails and accessibility

ADJOURN Plan Commission meeting

MOTION: (Schmitter, Katz) *to adjourn the plan commission meeting at 7:15 p.m.* Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah LaValliere
Deputy Clerk/ Deputy Treasurer

Next meeting date: April 16, 2026