



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](http://www.villageofsummitwi.gov)

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

## AGENDA

### Village of Summit Plan Commission

Thursday, May 21, 2026, 5:30 p.m.

At the Summit Village Hall, 37100 Delafield Road

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL AND CONFIRM POSTING
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. MINUTES
  - March 19, 2026
  - April 16, 2026
5. Next meeting date – proposed for Thursday, June 18, 2026, at 5:30 p.m.
6. **PUBLIC INPUT** regarding proposed amendments to the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use Map specific to Agenda Item 6.A.
  - A. Discussion and action on request of Ryan Buck, Executive Pastor of White Stone Community Church, to 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 Institutional designation on a portion of adjacent lands to the church property to accommodate a new building used for religious and community related purposes. The property is part of Lot 2 of CSM #11983, located in the SE ¼ of Section 16, T7N, R17E (SUMT0637999009).
7. **PUBLIC HEARING** to receive comments and discuss a request from Cobalt Partners, LLC on behalf of Pabst Farms Land Co C LLC and Pabst Farms Land Co R LLC, property owners of land in the Pabst Farms Development identified as SUMT0629998011 & SUMT0629998012, to amend the text of the Village of Summit Zoning and Shoreland Protection Ordinance by repealing and recreating Section 111-353 to create a new Mixed Use Zoning District.
8. **REGULAR BUSINESS:**
  - A. Discussion and action on request of Cobalt Partners, LLC on behalf of Pabst Farms Land Co C LLC and Pabst Farms Land Co R LLC, property owners of land in the Pabst Farms Development identified as SUMT0629998011 & SUMT0629998012, to amend the text of the Village of Summit Zoning and Shoreland Protection Ordinance by repealing and recreating Section 111-353 to create a new Mixed Use Zoning District.
9. **ADJOURN** Plan Commission meeting

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Barrows  
Village Planner

**Next meeting date: June 18, 2026**

**Posted: May 15, 2026**

\*\*\*\*\* Please note that, upon reasonable notice, efforts will be made to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals through appropriate aids and services. For additional information or to request this service contact the Village Hall at 567-2757.

\*\*\*\*\* It is possible that members of and possibly a quorum of members of other governmental bodies of the municipality may be in attendance at the above-stated meeting to gather information; no action will be taken by any other governmental body except by the Village of Summit Plan Commission noticed above.



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](http://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**

**Sarah LaValliere**

---

**From:** breinders  
**Sent:** Monday, May 11, 2026 7:57 PM  
**To:** Sarah LaValliere  
**Subject:** Public Comment re May 21 plan comm public hearing

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

DEAR Plan Commission,

RE changing the text and regulations around Mixed Use in the Village of Summit. It is my humble opinion that the density and amount of dense retail requested by the developer is not appropriate in the Village. The standing Mixed Use code was determined and well thought out by past village board members and laid a vision of what Summit was allowed to have and not have as Mixed Use areas. Im sure past members painstakingly defined Mixed Use as what they deemed an appropriate well-received and appealing atmosphere for the Village. I understand it currently allows 6 Units/Acre as an historically acceptable density here in the Village. One current board or group of members presently presiding temporarily should not be swayed by ONE developer who desperately seeks a certain revenue goal. The Village was content with 6 Units all these years and one current board should not be swayed by one Developer "passing thru town" to perhaps mistakenly forever change the future look, atmosphere, greenspace, traffic patterns, quality of lfe, peace and quiet, crime level, and allow this type of density both residential and retail to go on in perpituity by any and every developer on any piece of land anywhere in the Village going Forward. Any new code verbage will have to be accepted and not able to be denied anywhere in the Village by any Developer who applies. For Example, all along DR, along P Sawyer Rd to the South, in the Area of Panga, the Vacant farm land on the NW Corner of Valley & Sawyer. This new verbage will be deemed acceptable anywhere in Summit from Now On.....So dear Commission please consider what you are doing to the future of Summit because of this One Developer and his demands. PLEASE compromise and Allow 7 or 8 units max. Ten per acre is clearly not well-received and Summit will be destroyed by this and all future Developers who are allowed that everywhere else. Please dont allow him to be the voice of the future of our Village. Seven units/ac is plenty for his project and all those that may come in the upcoming years.

Please note, the above opinion applies to RETAIL as well. Once you change this wording, it will apply across the Village wherever and whenever any future Developers apply.

Thank you

Barbara Reinders  
3095 Walleye Dr  
Summit, WI 53066

**Sarah LaValliere**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2026 12:44 PM  
**To:** Sarah LaValliere  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Proposed Cobalt Development

Dear Village of Summit Plan Commission Members:

I am writing to you to raise several concerns I have with the proposed "Cobalt" development.

We reside in Lake Country Village, moving to Summit in 2020. We truly enjoy the Village, its location, and the amenities found within our subdivision. We are not opposed to development, in general.

You are aware that the website for Summit includes the following language: "The Village offers the benefits of a quiet, rural and lake country setting near urban amenities.... The Village includes a variety of quality housing developments and excellent school districts, with many shopping and dining opportunities within a short drive. Through well-planned and controlled development, Summit is a growing, thriving community where residents find opportunities to live, work and play."

I believe our subdivision reflects the description set forth on the Summit website. An aerial view of our subdivision, and the adjacent subdivision in Oconomowoc, shows well laid out streets, spaces between residences, and green space for residents and green space and amenities for youngsters to enjoy. Our subdivision's building requirements and necessary approvals insure that each residence will be built so as not to impose or overtly "overlook" a neighboring property, so all can enjoy some level of privacy, such as can be provided in a residential community.

The Cobalt proposal indicates that there will be parking lot parking for the apartment buildings. That type of parking will require outdoor lighting. Such lighting is often placed on high poles and it shines over a broad area. While the lighting does not appear to be necessary directly adjacent to our subdivision, the needed height for the poles would likely cause ambient lighting from these poles to reach the subdivision. This would be intrusive to the residences immediately north of the proposed development.

As you know there is a berm between the southern boundary of the Lake Country Village residences and the area proposed to be developed by Cobalt. The proposed development would place densely placed, multi story homes immediately against the southern slope of the berm. These homes would be close to and look out upon the existing Lake Country Village properties in a manner and with a close proximity to existing residences, that, I believe, would greatly intrude on the privacy of the existing Lake Country Village residences.

In addition, the three story building proposed by Cobalt, while not directly adjacent to the berm described above, would be of a height that would again provide the occupants with a direct sight line across the berm.

I am aware that other communities that approve developments often require developers to take into account privacy concerns of neighboring property owners. I ask that this board do the same: require the

developer to place trees, fencing or a combination of the same on the development's northern border (or with the permission and approval of Lake Country Village on the berm) to preserve the privacy of the existing residential properties. I would note that Oconomowoc has used a similar concept in its landscaping around the new well which provides a visual barrier for the residents of East Lake so that those residents do not directly view a commercial building.

A review of an aerial of Lake Country Village will clearly show that our developer, perhaps in consultation with this Board prior to development, included green space and amenities for use by youngsters in the development. I note that the Cobalt proposal contains no amenities for youngsters. Since Cobalt has indicated it is proposing single family homes, it is logical that these homes (especially in light of the multi story images presented) will be occupied by families and not by, for example, retirees. The green space presented in Cobalt's proposal appears more likely to be a narrow space provided for aesthetic purposes and not for much actual use. The lack of amenities for use by families and youth in a dense residential are as is being proposed (i.e., a total of 600+ living units for the total development) would present a potentially dangerous situation where youth either have to cross Sawyer Road to get to the limited recreational facilities directly East of the intersection leading into Cobalt's proposed development, or cross over into Lake Country Village to use the facilities which are privately paid for and maintained by Lake Country Village. I would hope the Board would understand the need for facilities which would be used by, and convenient to, the individuals buying into Cobalt's single family development as well as the families that would be renting the planned apartments. For comparison, note that the Hackney House has only 302 units and has quite extensive recreational facilities for its residents. Also note that while at the "zoning approval" meeting your committee pointed out that the paths of Lake Country Village are "open" to the public, there is no path leaving Lake Country Village to the Cobalt planned development and I understand that our HOA would not agree to the addition of a new path to the proposed development.

Finally, I have been watching the development of the five or more multi story apartments to the West of the Cobalt proposed development. Those are huge buildings that clearly stand out against the skyline of the existing residential properties North of the apartment development. I do not believe more of such three story apartments fit the existing appearance and plan of our community.

Thank you. Robert Storm

Sarah LaValliere

---

**From:** Trudy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2026 5:34 PM  
**To:** Sarah LaValliere  
**Subject:** Public Hearing May 21

Amy,

I do plan on coming to the meeting so not sure if this letter is necessary but if you pass to planning great.

Thank you for all you do. Trudy

[deputyclerk@villageofsummitwi.gov](mailto:deputyclerk@villageofsummitwi.gov)

We disagree with the MU-1 district intentions of "The Harvest" development which is not in agreement with the 2045 Comprehensive Plan 9.7.4 mixed -use which states that **residential density shall not exceed a net four (4) units per acre**. We as many residents have moved into Summit, WI with the promise of the low-**density ratios. A person's home is their sanctuary.**

We would appreciate the board and planning commission to uphold their 2045 Comprehensive plan, summit zoning section 111-359 C-5 (a) For exclusively residential development where the "ratio of preserved lands" is

Defined to includes at least 40 percent of the project area and keep this new development at the 4 units per acre. **Which would give Cobalt a total of available units on the village side of 143.2 units for the 35.8 acres he is purchasing.**

Under the Principal permitted uses of which Cobalt states only to create high end uses, we disagree with the

Following permitted uses, we **would not** like to have:

- (2) Taverns
- (6) Microbrewery or distillery
- (13) Hotel

We would not like these items in our backyard or Lot 2? of the Certified plan. Whichever is the other side of our berm.

**Therefore, we do not want a vertically integrated mix-use buildings opposite our berm do to traffic, crime and hurting our future property values.**

The minimum floor area per dwelling should be kept in order with the other apartment complexes in the

Area – Hackney, Locklyn, and Norden in order to **keep Cobalt's promise of high-end development.**

Thus we propose:

1. NO Junior
2. 1-bedroom should be 700 sq. feet (which is Locklyn smallest unit)
3. 2-bedroom should be 1100 sq feet (which is Hackney smallest unit)

4. 3-bedroom should be 1350 sq feet (which is Locklyn smallest unit)

**Cobalt has promised high end let us not build low end cheap rentals.**

Cobalt is also asking for roof-mounted satellite fixtures, provided they are screened from view.

(Whose view the roads then again, our subdivision has to see this eyesore- in 2026 this is unnecessary

Option for renters.)

He is asking that lots or parcels within PD Overlay be served by public streets. We hope that Cobalt is like

any developer paying for these public streets to exist.

**Again, no connecting walkways to our subdivision,** and we would like to have Cobalt plant at the onset of his develop at least 150 additional evergreens to protect our neighborhood from this upcoming development on the berms adjacent and also on either side of Sawyer Road.

Another thought I have because he is already going after city of Oconomowoc for TIFFS. Of course, we are totally against this TIFF program but I would also point out to this development that with his current adding of 332 apartment units that he also be asset at onset of development for the fire dept services at least same rate as us per household which would be yearly  $332 \times \$560$  ++ unit \$185,920.00 for fire service. And Pabst farm stormwater  $332 \times 41.11 = \$13,645.20$ . **Again, we do not want any TIFFS given. Therefore, being responsible for the property taxes yearly at the net value assessed rate.**

**We did not hire Cobalt because the area needed development. He is the one wanting to develop our quiet rural area please let him do it all on his own dime.**

Thank you for hearing our comments and we appreciate your consideration.

Kind regards,

Dan and Trudy Gerbing

**Sarah LaValliere**

---

**From:** duwayne schumacher  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 14, 2026 3:32 PM  
**To:** Sarah LaValliere  
**Subject:** Proposed new mixed use zoning district- lots 2and 3csm#11510

I am in the LCV development and would like to comment to this proposed development.

1. Should have no more then 6 units per acre.
2. The units should have a larger square feet per unit, the units are too small and no more than 2 stories.
- 3 no opening to egress into LCV trails from end of development.
4. Less street parking for minimum parking requirements.

Thank you for reading and including my comments in the public hearing since I will be out of town for the hearing.

DuWayne Schumacher

2921 Winnebago Dr.

Summit

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone



## VILLAGE OF SUMMIT PLAN COMMISSION ZONING REPORT

TO: Village of Summit Plan Commission

FROM: Amy Barrows, Village Planner  
*Planning & Zoning LLC*

MEETING DATE: **May 21, 2026**  
April 16, 2026

RE: **White Stone Community Church Future Land Use Map Amendment**  
Part of SUMT0637999009

---

The following report is provided for cursory review prior to action. Specifics relating to the submitted documents of this application may be referenced in the Meeting Packet.

---

**Property Owner:** White Stone Community Church  
**Applicant:** Ryan Buck, Executive Director  
**Existing Zoning:** A-1 Agricultural  
**Existing Land Use Plan:** Industrial/Business Park

**POSSIBLE MOTION (May 21, 2026):** *Motion to adopt the enclosed resolution recommending that Village Board approve the proposed amendment to the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map category from the Industrial/Business Park category to the Institutional category on a portion of the subject property more specifically described in Exhibit A, subject to Village Attorney review.*

**PLAN COMMISSION MOTION FROM APRIL 16, 2026:** *Direct staff to draft a resolution for potential consideration by the Plan Commission at the May meeting to amend the Future Land Use Map of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan from the Industrial/Business Park category to the Institutional category on a portion of the subject property, more specifically described in Exhibit A.*

**CURRENT REQUEST:**

- Amend the Future Land Use Map from Industrial/Business Park to Institutional

**FUTURE REQUESTS:**

- Amend the zoning district from the A-1 Agricultural District to the Institutional District.
- Certified Survey Map to combine the acreage identified in Exhibit A with the adjacent property known as Lot 1 CSM # 11983, also owned by White Stone Community Church.
- Review Site Development and Operational Plans.

**PROJECT SUMMARY:**

The applicant is proposing to transfer the lands described in Exhibit A to the adjacent property to the east and north of the subject parcel described as Lot 1 CSM # 11983 to expand church operations. The applicant would like to construct a 2,600 sq. ft. multi-purpose building for religious and community services. A summary of uses is included in the packet. Site Development plans will be presented at a future meeting. The planned location is outside of the church’s existing property that is already planned and zoned for institutional purposes. Therefore, the applicant is required to amend the Future Land Use Category and Zoning District for the lands that will need to be combined with the church property to accommodate the building. The applicant is also proposing to amend the land use designation for a portion of the property to accommodate an additional land transfer so that a proposed parking lot on the church property will comply with the setback requirements to the south and so that an existing prayer house located further west than the proposed multi-purpose building will be located on the church property and comply with all setback requirements.

The proposed land use amendment to accommodate the land transfer that will enlarge the church property is a minor request and does not appear to impact the goals and objectives of the land use plan. The remnant parcel will still be economically viable for Industrial/Business Park purposes.

**Adjacent Land Uses:**

North	North of I-94 is residential, Existing White Stone Church property is north of a portion of the lands and is designated as Institutional.
West	Agricultural (Planned Industrial/Business Park)
East	City of Oconomowoc Business Park
South	Hope Church (Institutional), Residential/Agricultural (Planned Industrial/Business Park)

**IF THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDS ADVANCING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS, THE FOLLOWING CONDITION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED:**

- 1) The Future Land Use Map Amendment is not effective until such time the subject property is rezoned to Institutional and a Certified Survey Map is reviewed and approved and recorded that combines the subject lands identified in Exhibit A with the adjacent property owned by the White Stone Community Church (Lot 1 CSM # 11983).

PLAN COMMISSION OF THE  
VILLAGE OF SUMMIT, WISCONSIN

RESOLUTION NO. 26-000

---



---

**RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING AN AMENDMENT TO  
THE VILLAGE OF SUMMIT 2045 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
APPENDIX A: THE 2045 FUTURE LAND USE MAP  
PURSUANT TO WISCONSIN STATUTES SECTION 66.1001**

---



---

WHEREAS, Section 61.35 of Wisconsin Statutes applies the standards and requirements of Section 62.23 - City Planning - on Villages in the State of Wisconsin; and

WHEREAS, Section 62.23 (2), and (3) of Wisconsin Statutes provides that it shall be the function and duty of the Plan Commission to make and adopt a Master Plan, herein referred to as “Plan”, for the physical development of the Village of Summit and environs, which, together with the accompanying maps, plats, charts, and descriptive and explanatory matter, shall show the Plan Commission’s recommendations for such physical development; and

WHEREAS, Section 62.23(3)(a) of the Wisconsin Statutes provides that the Plan shall be made “with the general purpose of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the municipality which will, in accordance with existing and future needs, best promote public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or the general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development”; and

WHEREAS, in 1999, the Wisconsin Legislature enacted a comprehensive planning law, which is set forth in Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes, that requires that master plans (which are referred to under Section 66.1001 as “comprehensive” plans; referred to herein as “comprehensive master plan”) be completed and adopted by local governing bodies in order for a town, county, city, or village to enforce its zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Summit prepared such a plan in June, 2001, as one of the first comprehensive master plans approved under Section 66.1001 of Wisconsin Statutes, with the recommendation that the Plan be reviewed and updated at the end of ten years; and

WHEREAS, Section 66.1001(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes sets forth specific requirements affecting the contents and procedures for adoption of a comprehensive master plan; and

WHEREAS, as of January 1, 2010, Sections 62.23(3)(b) and 66.1001(3) of the Wisconsin Statutes require, in part, that Villages engaging in any of the following actions to take such actions in accordance with their comprehensive master plan:

- Official mapping established or amended under Section 62.23(6) of the Wisconsin Statutes;
- Local subdivision regulation under Section 236.45 or 236.46 of the Wisconsin Statutes;
- Zoning ordinances and shoreland zoning ordinances enacted or amended under Section 61.35, 62.23(7) and 61.351 of the Wisconsin Statutes and other laws; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Summit was incorporated into the Village of Summit on July 29, 2010, taking on the responsibilities and authorities of the previous Town of Summit; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board, at the recommendation of the Village of Summit Plan Commission approved the Village of Summit Master Plan 2020 on November 3, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board, at the recommendation of the Village of Summit Plan Commission have approved amendments to the Village of Summit Master Plan 2020; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board, at the recommendation of the Village of Summit Plan Commission approved a comprehensive update to the Plan that was published and posted on September 8, 2023, titled “Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan”; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board, at the recommendation of the Village of Summit Plan Commission have approved amendments to the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Summit has received a request from a petitioner to amend the Future Land Use Map of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan to amend the designation of approximately 4.72 acres of land, identified as part of Lot 2, Certified Survey Map No. 11983 (the “subject property”) from the Industrial/Business Park category to the Institutional category, more specifically described and illustrated on Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the subject property owner and the owners of all properties within 500 feet of the subject property were notified of the May 21, 2026 plan commission meeting and will be notified of the public hearing concerning the proposed amendment that will take place at a future Village Board meeting, in accordance with the adopted Public Participation Plan that is part of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Summit Plan Commission finds that the proposed amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan are consistent with the purpose and intent of the comprehensive master plan and are compatible with surrounding properties; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Summit Plan Commission recommends the Village Board adopt the amended Future Land Use Map of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes Section 66.1001; and

WHEREAS, the Village Clerk is directed to send the adopted resolution, proposed amendment and map(s) to all entities listed in Wisconsin Statutes Section 66.1001(4)(b).

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Village Plan Commission of the Village of Summit, Wisconsin that the amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan from the Industrial/Business Park category to the Institutional category on approximately 4.72 acres of land, identified as part of Lot 2, Certified Survey Map No. 11983 (the “subject property”), more specifically described and illustrated on Exhibit A, is hereby recommended for adoption per Wisconsin Statutes Section 66.1001(4)(b) by a majority vote of the entire Plan Commission provided the following condition is met:

- 1) The Future Land Use Map Amendment is not effective until such time the subject property is rezoned to Institutional and a Certified Survey Map is reviewed and approved and recorded that combines the subject lands identified on Exhibit A with the adjacent property owned by White Stone Community Church (Lot 1 CSM # 11983).

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that action taken by the Village of Summit Plan Commission is recorded by the identifying signature of the Village Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer.

Adopted and approved this 21<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2026.

**VILLAGE OF SUMMIT PLAN COMMISSION**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
James Siepmann, Commission Chairman

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Debra Michael, Village Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer

This resolution was approved on a motion by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_, and as voted on as set forth below, with the affirmation of votes of not less than a majority of all the members of the Village of Summit Plan Commission being required for adoption:

Jim Siepmann	_____	Gloria Lehrer	_____
John Konopacki	_____	Jay Obenberger	_____
Paul Schmitter	_____	Lisa Mellone	_____
Matt Katz	_____	Alternate Sandra Murray	_____

# Exhibit A (1 of 2)

Description for Additional Area to be added to Lot 1.

All that part of Lot 2, Certified Survey Map No. 11983, recorded on March 10, 2020 as Document No. 4458728, in Volume 121 of Certified Survey Maps, Waukesha County Register of Deeds, on pages 294 thru 297 bounded and described as follows:  
Commencing at an 1" iron pipe being the Northeast Corner of Lot 2 and the Northeast Corner of Lot 1 of said CSM, thence S 00d13'44" W along the west line of said Lot 2, 794.82 feet to a 1" iron pipe found; thence S 89d39'13" E along the North line of Lot 2 and the South line of Lot 1, 550.37 feet to a 1" iron pipe being on the West right of way line of Dousman Road; thence S00d20'47" W, 15.00 feet to a point; thence N 89d39'13" W, 794.61 feet to a point; thence N 00d13'44" E, 805.78 feet to a point on the North line of said Lot 2; thence N 89d23'54" E, along said North line, 244.30 feet to the point of beginning. Said Lands containing 205579.89 square feet or 4.72 Acres of Land.



White Stone Community Church would like to construct a small, multi-purpose building just to the southwest of its parking lot. The planned location of this building is outside the church's 10-acre footprint that is zoned Institutional. The church would like to move its west lot line approximately 200 feet further west, into church-owned land currently zoned Agricultural. The expanded footprint would include both an existing prayer cottage and the planned 40' X 65' building. The church would also like to move its south lot line approximately 10' further south to bring its parking lot expansion project into compliance with the village's setback requirements.

The planned building will be owned by the church, but will be the home of the Oconomowoc Men's Shed...a community service organization. The Men's Shed's primary purpose is to help the people in the surrounding area (especially widows and single moms) with home repair and other projects. This building will also provide a Christian environment for men to interact, work on projects together and learn from each other. The building will also be used for weekly food distribution to needy families.



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](http://www.villageofsummitwi.gov)

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

**VILLAGE OF SUMMIT 2045 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT  
ON A PORTION OF PROPERTY DESCRIBED AS LOT 2 OF CSM #11983, LOCATED IN THE SE ¼ OF SECTION 16, T7N,  
R17E (SUMT0637999009)**

May 12, 2026

TO: Property owners directly impacted and within 500 ft. of the property subject to a 2045 Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use Map amendment request

RE: Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment for a portion of property described as Lot 2 of CSM #11983, located in the SE ¼ of Section 16, T7N, R17E (SUMT0637999009)

To Whom It May Concern:

White Stone Community Church is requesting an amendment to the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use Map on a portion of the property located directly west and south of the church property to accommodate a new building used for religious and community related purposes. The property is part of Lot 2 of CSM #11983, located in the SE ¼ of Section 16, T7N, R17E (SUMT0637999009). The request includes modifying the future land use designation from the Industrial/Business Park designation to the Institutional designation.

The Village of Summit Plan Commission will be considering the adoption of a resolution on **May 21, 2026 at their regularly scheduled meeting which starts at 5:30 pm**. The Plan Commission would like to receive public input regarding the requested land use map amendment before adopting a resolution for consideration by the Village Board. The requested map amendment will require a public hearing at the July 9, 2026 Village Board meeting before final action is taken. Action may be taken on the same day following the July 9<sup>th</sup> public hearing.

We encourage your attendance at the May meeting if you have any concerns or comments related to the proposed land use map amendment to the 2045 Comprehensive Plan. If you have any questions in the meantime, feel free to reach out to me at (262) 567-2757. I am in the office on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays 12:00 pm-3 pm.

Respectfully,

*Amy Barrows*

Amy Barrows  
Village Planner

cc: Village Plan Commission Members  
Village Board Members  
Village Administrator



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](http://www.villageofsummitwi.gov)

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

---

**PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE**  
**VILLAGE OF SUMMIT, WISCONSIN**

*Thursday, May 21, 2026*

Please be advised that the Village of Summit Plan Commission will hold a public hearing on **Thursday, May 21, 2026, at 5:30 p.m.**, at the Summit Village Hall located at 37100 Delafield Road, Summit, Wisconsin. The purpose of the hearing is to receive comments and discuss a request from Cobalt Partners, LLC on behalf of Pabst Farms Land Co C LLC and Pabst Farms Land Co R LLC, property owners of land in the Pabst Farms Development identified as SUMT0629998011 & SUMT0629998012, to amend the text of the Village of Summit Zoning and Shoreland Protection Ordinance by repealing and recreating Section 111-353 to create a new Mixed Use Zoning District.

Information regarding this application is available for review at the Village of Summit Village Hall, 37100 Delafield Road, during regular business hours. Citizens may email written comments regarding this public hearing to the Village Deputy Clerk at [deputyclerk@villageofsummitwi.gov](mailto:deputyclerk@villageofsummitwi.gov) or by using this link: <https://villageofsummitwi.gov/contact-comment/> and submitted comments will be included in the meeting packet. The deadline to receive written comments is noon on Thursday, May 14, 2026. Verbal comments may be provided at the meeting. For more information regarding this public hearing, please contact Amy Barrows, Village Planner, at the Summit Village Hall (262) 567-2757.

All interested parties will be heard.

VILLAGE OF SUMMIT

Amy Barrows, Village Planner

Published: May 7 and May 14, 2026  
Posted: May 7, 2026



## VILLAGE OF SUMMIT PLAN COMMISSION ZONING REPORT

TO: Village of Summit Plan Commission

FROM: Amy Barrows, Village Planner  
*Planning & Zoning LLC*

MEETING DATE: May 21, 2026

RE: **Text Amendment to create a Mixed-Use Zoning District as part of the Zoning and Shoreland Protection Ordinance**

---

The following report is provided for cursory review prior to action. Specifics relating to the submitted documents of this application may be referenced in the Meeting Packet.

---

**Applicant:** Cobalt Partners, LLC on behalf of Pabst Farms Land Co C LLC and Pabst Farms Land Co R LLC, property owners of land in the Pabst Farms Development identified as SUMT0629998011 & SUMT0629998012

***POSSIBLE MOTION (May 21, 2026): Motion to recommend that Village Board approve the proposed text amendments to the Village of Summit Zoning and Shoreland Protection Ordinance to create the MU-PF Mixed Use – Pabst Farms District subject to staff preparing an ordinance for consideration by Village Board and subject to Village Attorney review.***

***PLAN COMMISSION MOTION FROM APRIL 16, 2026: Direct staff to finalize mixed use zoning district and hold public hearing at May meeting.***

### **PROJECT SUMMARY:**

The applicant is proposing to create a new zoning district that will accommodate a mixed-use development, specifically to support development of The Harvest at Pabst Farms. Information related to the proposed development can be found in the meeting packet from the April Plan Commission meeting: [https://files.heygov.com/summitvillage.org/meetings/me\\_01knwegvefc1nvs350zdjca4g5/41626-pc-epacket.pdf](https://files.heygov.com/summitvillage.org/meetings/me_01knwegvefc1nvs350zdjca4g5/41626-pc-epacket.pdf). The development is subject to the review of several separate approval processes, including a land use plan text and map amendment, rezone, planned development overlay district, site plan and business plan of operation approvals, and possible land divisions. The development review process is still pending.

Plan Commission considered a previous version of the text amendments at the April meeting and had the following comments:

- The zoning district should be limited to the two Summit properties in the Pabst Farms Development that are subject to the proposed Harvest at Pabst Farms development.
- Tobacco-related uses should be prohibited.
- Clarification regarding civic, community, and utility-related uses, is needed.
- The minimum size of a junior one-bedroom should be increased from 400 sq. ft. to 500 sq. ft.

*Text Amendments MU-PF*

- Parking requirements were discussed and the applicant was asked to return with a detailed parking analysis to ensure adequacy and functionality. A table is included in the meeting packet that provides examples of parking requirements for multi-family uses in other communities.
- Signage should be reviewed carefully to ensure there are restrictions in the ordinance related to digital signage. Section 23-10 of the Sign Ordinance that regulates design, construction, and maintenance standards is included for reference. Additional digital signage provisions will be presented by the planner at the meeting.

Following the Plan Commission meeting, Plan Staff discussed that hotels are not an appropriate use. The developer would like to discuss allowing hotels on the south side of Pabst Farms Boulevard.

## MU-PF Mixed Use – Pabst Farms (revised on May 14, 2026)

### (a) Location and intent

The MU-PF District is intended to provide for the orderly and attractive grouping of diverse office, retail, customer service, single-family residential, multi-family residential, and park and open space uses where the appearance of such mixed uses is enhanced by pleasing building architecture and generously landscaped sites free of outside storage and outside display of products. The MU-PF District may allow for single-use or multi-use projects. The district is intended to be located in highly visible locations adjacent to arterial highways, and should be buffered by means of landscaping and berms from residential uses. More specifically, properties zoned MU-PF shall be limited to lands within the Pabst Farms development described as Lot 2 and Lot 3 of Certified Survey Map #11510.

### (b) Development criteria

Development within the MU-PF District will require a heightened level of site design. All developments shall be considered as a Planned Development Overlay District in accordance with Section 111-359 of this Ordinance. The Planned Development may include a single property or several neighboring properties. Individual buildings shall be arranged in a unified fashion to be complementary and harmonious to each other. The Planned Development provides design flexibility and is the mechanism that establishes dimensional, area, parking, and other site standards unique to each development to achieve economic, aesthetic and quality of life benefits while maintaining orderly and efficient land use. Each development shall have elements that benefit the public, such as pedestrian facilities, public gathering spaces, and dynamic places that are attractive for people to live, work and enjoy within.

### (c) Principal permitted uses:

- (1) General retail, excluding adult-oriented establishments and tobacco shops that include the sale of cigarettes, vaping, cartridges, and/or cigars and the sale of related paraphernalia, except for sales incidental to grocery stores, pharmacies, and other specialty stores where the sales area dedicated to such items does not exceed 10% of the floor area of the occupied tenant space.
- (2) Restaurant (sit-down or fast casual), tavern, coffee shop, bakery, and café. For a drive-through, the Plan Commission must find that the vehicle stacking and noise from its operation will not adversely impact surrounding properties or any public roadway.
- (3) Grocery and specialty food
- (4) Cultural uses, including art studio or gallery
- (5) Day-care facility, provided that any outside play area is surrounded by fencing; that no day care center is located within 300 feet of a gasoline service station, underground gasoline storage tanks, or any other storage of explosive material.
- (6) Microbrewery or distillery
- (7) Personal or professional service and sales, excluding automotive and boat service and sales and gas stations
- (8) Health clubs

(9) Bank or financial institution. For a drive-through, the Plan Commission must find that the vehicle stacking and noise from its operation will not adversely impact surrounding properties or any public roadway.

(10) Offices

(11) Medical or dental clinic

(12) Veterinary clinic or animal grooming

(13) Hotel

(14) Private and/or public commercial indoor and outdoor recreational facilities

(15) Civic and community center

(16) Private and/or public park and green spaces, including community gardens

(17) Private and/or public utility installations

(18) Residential uses, including single-family and multi-family dwellings, may be permitted as part of an integrated mixed-use Planned Development Overlay District provided a commercial use is also present within the development area of the Planned Development Overlay District and subject to the following standards:

a. The density of dwelling units shall not exceed ten (10) units per acre of the area designated for residential development within the approved Planned Development Overlay District.

b. Residential unit mix, size, design, and parking requirements shall be established in the adopting Planned Development Overlay District ordinance and approved site, building, and operational plans.

c. The minimum floor area per dwelling unit shall comply with the following:

1. Junior (partial) one-bedroom: 500 square feet.

2. One-bedroom: 650 square feet.

3. Two-bedroom: 800 square feet.

4. Three-bedroom or greater: 1,000 square feet.

d. There shall be at least one parking stall per one-bedroom residential dwelling unit and a minimum of two parking stalls for residential dwelling units with more than one bedroom. Visitor parking shall be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

e. As part of a site, building, and operational plan of approval in accordance with Article X, the plan commission may be more restrictive than subsections a through f above and any other provisions of the Village code as to the location, number, size, and design of the dwelling units and parking spaces to ensure the use is compatible with and complementary to the commercial uses on the property and surrounding neighborhood.

(d) Accessory Permitted Uses:

(1) Off-street parking and loading areas.

(2) Roof-mounted satellite fixtures, provided they are screened from view.

(3) Automated teller machine and Individual/Interactive teller machine. For a drive-through, the Plan Commission must find that the vehicle stacking and noise from its operation will not adversely impact surrounding properties or any public roadway.

(4) Catering establishment for off-site food service.

(5) Accessory structures for the personal storage of vehicles, equipment, and materials in conjunction with a principal residential use.

(e) Conditional uses: None.

(f) Bulk regulations. Bulk and dimensional standards, including lot size, lot width, setback, area, height, and impervious surface requirements, shall be established in the adopting Planned Development Overlay District process, except that all development shall comply with the following:

(1) Maximum impervious coverage: 75 %, consideration may be given to combined lots if specified in the Planned Development Overlay District.

(2) Minimum setbacks for structures containing a commercial use:

a. Front/street setback: 20 feet from the base setback line.

b. Side yard setback: 20 feet.

c. Rear yard setback: 20 feet.

d. Pavement setback: none.

(3) Minimum setbacks for structures containing a residential use:

a. Front/street setback: 20 feet from the base setback line.

b. Side yard setback: 7 feet.

c. Rear yard setback: 20 feet.

d. Pavement setback: 3 feet.

(4) Maximum structure height.

a. Principal commercial structure: 50 ft. from the lowest exposed point to the highest ridge line, no more than three stories above grade.

b. Principal residential structure (single-family and garden-style): 35 ft. from the lowest exposed point to the highest eave.

c. Principal residential structure (multi-family apartment and townhome condominium): 54 ft. from the lowest exposed point to the highest ridge line, excluding subterranean parking access, and no more than three stories above grade.

(g) Commercial Parking and Access.

(1) Shared parking facilities, including shared parking agreements, cross-access easements, private drives, and coordinated internal circulation systems may satisfy parking and access requirements if approved as part of the adopting

Planned Development Overlay District and recorded in forms acceptable to the Village.

- (2) Lots or parcels within an approved Planned Development Overlay District may be served by public streets, or, if approved as part of the Planned Development Overlay District process, private streets or recorded access easements, consistent with Section 111-68 and the approved land division and site plan documents.
- (h) Signage. Signage in the MU-PF District is subject to the same regulations that apply to the NC Neighborhood Commercial District. As part of the Planned Development Overlay District, the Plan Commission may modify the signage provisions if it is determined that the signage would be compatible with the general area, and that the impact of such a sign will not adversely impact any nearby residential areas.
- (i) Landscaping. The Plan Commission may modify the requirements for landscaping found in Article X, as well as the landscape requirements of Section 111-157 Parking requirements, provided landscape treatments improve the appearance of the development, enhance architectural features, screen parking areas, minimize the impact of structures, and enhance the streetscape.
- (j) Erosion Control. As described in the Village of Summit Erosion Control Ordinance when applicable.
- (k) Plans and specifications to be submitted to the Plan Commission in accordance with Article X of this chapter.
  - (1) Development shall be designed as a coordinated, walkable, high-quality mixed-use environment with cohesive architecture, integrated open space, connected streets and paths, screened service areas, and coordinated signage, lighting, and landscaping
  - (2) To encourage a commercial environment that is compatible with the character of the Village, and as contemplated in subsection j(1) above, building permits for permitted uses in the MU-PF District shall not be issued without review and approval of the plan commission.
  - (3) This review and approval shall be concerned with general layout, building plans, ingress and egress, loading and unloading, landscaping and open space use. The process used to review a development in the MU-PF District is set forth in Section 111-359 of this chapter.
  - (4) Development shall be subject to Design Guidelines that must be established by the Plan Commission and adopted by the Village Board.

#### Proposed Definitions:

Fast Casual means a restaurant that combines elements of fast-food service such as counter ordering without full table service, with other elements, such as made-to-order food, that are typical of a full-service restaurant.

Interactive/Individual teller machine (ITM) means a banking kiosk, similar to an automated teller machine, but with service from a live teller via video.



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

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

Date Filed: 03/30/2026

\$100.00 Application Fee Paid 100

## Zoning Text Amendment Application Packet

Based on Chapter 111, Section 386 of the Code of the Village of Summit

Please read and complete this application carefully. All applications must be signed and dated.

1. APPLICANT OR AGENT

Cobalt Partners, LLC

400 N Broadway, Ste 100

Milwaukee, WI 53202

Phone # \_\_\_\_\_

e-mail \_\_\_\_\_

2. PROPERTY OWNER

Pabst Farms Land Co *C+R*

3412 Commercial Ave

Northbrook, IL 60062

Phone # \_\_\_\_\_

e-mail # \_\_\_\_\_

5. What Zoning Ordinance Section is proposed for amendment? Section 111 - 353

6. What is the PROPOSED Zoning Language Change? (Please include current language with underlined type for new language and strike-out type for removed language.)

Please see attached narrative

- 7. Describe why the text change is needed, including a description of the proposed impact under the new zoning language, including new uses available & the creation of any non-conforming uses and or structures.

Text change is required to support development of The Harvest at Pabst Farms. See prior related information submitted in connection with requested amendment to comprehensive land use plan.

- 8. Please initial the following statements after you have read them.

  x   I understand that the Village is under no obligation to change the current Ordinance language.

  x   I understand that the Village staff, Plan Commission and/or Village Board may request additional information to properly evaluate this request, and failure to provide such information may in itself be sufficient cause to deny the request.

  x   I am aware that this text amendment shall go into effect immediately upon approval of the Summit Village Board and posting and/or publication of the approved changes.

**9. SIGNATURES**

**NOTE: ALL APPLICATIONS/PETITIONS MUST BE SIGNED BY THE RESPONSIBLE PARTY**

DocuSigned by:  
Scott Yauck 3/30/2026  
 Applicant/Agent date

Signed by:  
Brian Bell 3/30/2026  
 Property Owner (Responsible Party) date

\* Submitted for public hearing as \*  
part of application  
- new version available

**Proposed New Mixed Use Zoning District – Specific to Lots 2 and 3 CSM # 11510**

**MU-1 Mixed Use**

(a) Location and intent

The MU-1 Mixed Use District is available to limited properties designated as Mixed Use on the Village of Summit Future Land Use Map. More specifically, properties zoned MU-1 shall be limited to lands within the Pabst Farms Development located in the northwest corner of I-94 and CTH P (Sawyer Road), also described as Lot 2 and Lot 3 of Certified Survey Map # 11510.

The district allows a mixture of commercial, office, residential, institutional or park and open space uses and may also allow for single use projects. The MU-1 District is intended to accommodate compact, higher intensity development, within the interstate corridor where urban services are available and urban development is appropriate and will contribute to the vitality of the community.

(b) Development criteria

Development within the MU-1 District will require a heightened level of site design. All developments shall be considered as a Planned Development Overlay District in accordance with Section 111-359 of this Ordinance. The Planned Development may include a single property or several neighboring properties. Individual buildings shall be arranged in a unified fashion to be complementary and harmonious to each other. The Planned Development provides design flexibility and is the mechanism that establishes dimensional, area, and parking standards unique to each development to achieve economic, aesthetic and quality of life benefits while maintaining orderly and efficient land use. Each development shall have elements that benefit the public, such as pedestrian facilities, public gathering spaces, and dynamic places that are attractive for people to live, work and enjoy within.

(c) Principal permitted uses:

As part of the creation of the Planned Development Overlay District, the Village Board, following a recommendation from Plan Commission, may limit the permitted uses on a property by permitting a specific list of uses that are more restrictive than the uses listed in this section if it is determined that certain permitted uses are not suitable for the overall development or surrounding neighborhood. The following uses may be permitted:

- (1) General retail, excluding adult-oriented establishments and tobacco shops
- (2) Restaurant (sit-down or fast casual), catering establishment for off-site food service, tavern, coffee shop, bakery, cafe
- (3) Grocery and specialty food
- (4) Cultural uses, including art studio or gallery

- (5) Childcare or daycare facility
- (6) Microbrewery or distillery
- (7) Personal or professional service and sales, excluding automotive and boat service and sales and gas stations
- (8) Health club or fitness
- (9) Bank or financial institution
- (10) Professional office
- (11) Medical or dental clinic
- (12) Veterinary clinic or animal grooming
- (13) Hotel
- (14) Indoor and outdoor recreational facilities
- (15) Civic and community center
- (16) Private and public park and green spaces, including community gardens
- (17) Private and public utility installations.
- (18) Other permitted uses. Other substantially similar uses as specifically approved by the Village Board, following a recommendation from the plan commission.
- (19) Residential uses, including single-family and multi-family dwellings, may be permitted as part of an integrated mixed-use Planned Development Overlay District provided a commercial use is also present on the property and subject to the following standards:
  - a. Residential uses may be:
    1. Vertically integrated within mixed-use buildings; or
    2. Developed in separate but coordinated areas within the overall planned development
  - b. The density of dwelling units shall not exceed ten (10) units per acre of the area designated for residential development within the approved Planned Development Overlay District.
  - c. Residential unit mix, size, design, and parking requirements shall be established in the adopting Planned Development Overlay District ordinance and approved site, building, and operational plans.
  - d. The minimum floor area per dwelling unit shall comply with the following:
    1. Junior (partial) one-bedroom: 500 square feet.
    2. One-bedroom: 650 square feet.
    3. Two-bedroom: 800 square feet.
    4. Three-bedroom or greater: 1,000 square feet.
  - e. There shall be at least one parking stall per one-bedroom residential dwelling unit and a minimum of two parking stalls for residential dwelling units with more than one bedroom. Visitor parking shall be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

- f. As part of a site, building, and operational plan of approval, the plan commission may be more restrictive than subsections a through e above and any other provisions of the Village code as to the location, number, size, and design of the dwelling units and parking spaces to ensure the use is compatible with, and complementary to, the commercial uses on the property and surrounding neighborhood.

(d) Accessory Permitted Uses:

- (1) Off-street parking and loading areas
- (2) Roof-mounted satellite fixtures, provided they are screened from view
- (3) Automated teller machine

(e) Conditional uses: None, all uses must be specified in the adopting Planned Development Overlay District.

(f) Bulk regulations. Bulk and dimensional standards, including setback, area, height, and impervious surface requirements, shall be established as part of the adopting Planned Development Overlay District process.

(g) Commercial Parking and Access.

- a. Shared parking facilities, including shared parking agreements, cross-access easements, private drives, and coordinated internal circulation systems may satisfy parking and access requirements if approved as part of the adopting Planned Development Overlay District and recorded in forms acceptable to the Village.
- b. Lots or parcels within an approved Planned Development Overlay District may be served by public streets, or, if approved as part of the Planned Development Overlay District process, private streets or recorded access easements, consistent with Section 111-68 and the approved land division and site plan documents.

(h) Signage. Signage in the MU-1 District is subject to the same regulations that apply to the NC Neighborhood Commercial District. As part of the Planned Development Overlay District, the Plan Commission may modify the signage provisions if it is determined that the signage would be compatible with the general area, and that the impact of such a sign will not visually impact any nearby residential areas.

(i) Erosion Control. As described in the Village of Summit Erosion Control Ordinance when applicable.

(j) Plans and specifications to be submitted to the Plan Commission in accordance with Article X of this chapter.

- (1) Development shall be designed as a coordinated, walkable, high-quality mixed-use environment with cohesive architecture, integrated open space, connected streets and paths, screened service areas, and coordinated signage, lighting, and landscaping.
- (2) To encourage a commercial environment that is compatible with the character of the Village, and as contemplated in subsection j(1) above, building permits for

permitted uses in the MU-1 District shall not be issued without review and approval of the plan commission.

- (3) This review and approval shall be concerned with general layout, building plans, ingress and egress, loading and unloading, landscaping and open space use. The process used to review a development in the MU-1 District is set forth in Article X of this chapter.

---

## Sec. 111-359. Planned Development Overlay District (PDO).

- (a) *Intent.*
- (1) Planned Development Overlay District (PDO) regulations are intended to permit greater flexibility and, consequently, more creative and imaginative design for the development of a site than is possible under conventional zoning regulations. It is further intended to promote more economical and efficient use of the land while providing a harmonious variety of housing choices, a higher level of amenities, and preservation of the natural qualities of open spaces.
  - (2) The planned development procedure requires a high degree of cooperation between the developer and the village. Because of this coordination, property within a proposed planned development overlay district must be single ownership or control at the time of application for rezoning. The procedure described herein is designed to give the developer general development plan approval before completing all the detailed design work while providing the village with assurances that the project will retain the character envisioned at the time of approval.
- (b) *Criteria for approval.* The approval of a planned development proposal shall be based upon determination as to compliance with the criteria listed below.
- (1) The proposed development is consistent with the spirit and intent of these regulations and with the development goals set forth in section 111-129(3), has been prepared with competent professional advice and guidance, and produces significant benefits to the village in terms of improved environmental design and in contributing to the aforesaid development goals to justify the application of the planned development concept.
  - (2) The site development plan reflects sensitive consideration of the physical nature of the site with particular concern for conservation of natural features, preservation of open space, and careful shaping of terrain to minimize scarring, insure proper drainage and preservation of natural terrain wherever appropriate.
  - (3) The general character and intensity of use of the development produces an attractive environment appropriate to the uses proposed and which is compatible with existing development in the surrounding area and with the adopted village plan and village policies.
  - (4) The development can be provided with appropriate municipal services and would not conflict with or cause overload on such facilities as schools, highway, police, fire or utility services.
  - (5) Proposed design standards provide adequately for practical functioning and maintenance, based on actual functional need, in terms of circulation, parking, emergency services, delivery services, and snow plowing.
  - (6) Adequate provision has been made to ensure proper maintenance and preservation of any preserved lands as described and regulated under section 111-129(2), provided for the recreational and aesthetic enhancement of the development, for the preservation of the rural environmental character or the area, for preservation of agricultural lands, or for the preservation or protection of natural ecological resources. Such provisions may be made by dedication to the public or by retention in private ownership with appropriate covenants.
- (c) *General provisions.* The plan commission may recommend and the village board may, upon the request of the owners, establish planned development overlay districts which will, over a period of time tend to promote the maximum benefit from coordinated area site planning by permitting the diversified location of structures and mixed dwelling types and mixed compatible uses.

- 
- (1) *Permitted and accessory uses.* Permitted and accessory uses in the planned development overlay district shall be the same as those permitted in the underlying existing zoning district in which the PDO is located. If a developer desires uses different than those permitted by the existing zoning, the developer must simultaneously petition for rezoning of the underlying existing zoning to a zoning district that allows the desired uses.
  - (2) *Mixed uses.* A mix of different uses within a planned development overlay district may be permitted if the plan commission and village board determine that the mix of uses is compatible and necessary to achieve the objectives of the PDO.
  - (3) *Temporary uses.* The planned development district may allow real estate field offices or shelters for materials and equipment being used in the construction of a permanent structure as temporary uses.
  - (4) *Number of principal buildings on a lot.* The planned development district may allow more than one principal building on a lot.
  - (5) *Density.* The allowable residential density for a planned development overlay district shall be established by using the underlying existing zoning district or districts, subject to the following:
    - a. For exclusively residential development, where the ratio of preserved lands (as defined in section 111-431) is at least 50 percent, the density factor may be reduced at the sole discretion of the plan commission, provided that the resultant density factor for the developable area (as defined in section 111-431) is not greater than 1.5 times the underlying standard subdivision density.
    - b. For development in the mixed use district, density may be transferred from one portion of the subject site to another and permits the clustering of dwelling units in one or more locations within the total site. However, the overall density shall not exceed the density permitted in the underlying existing zoning district.
  - (6) *Minimum area for a planned development overlay district.* Planned development overlay districts are intended to provide flexibility to encourage more creative design for all sizes of sites than would be allowed under conventional zoning. To achieve this goal, there is no minimum area for a PDO.
- (d) *Application procedure and required information.* The procedure for zoning to a planned development district shall be as required for any other zoning amendment, except that a petition for zoning to a planned development overlay district may be considered only in conjunction with a general development plan as described in subsection (D)(2) of this section, and shall be subject to the following additional requirements.
- (1) *Preliminary consultation.* An applicant shall meet with the plan commission and appropriate village staff members for a preliminary consultation prior to formally submitting a rezoning petition for a planned development overlay district. The purpose of this preliminary consultation is to discuss the proposed request and review the local regulations and policies applicable to the project, to discuss the land use implications of the proposal and to insure proper compliance with the requirements for processing.
  - (2) *Rezoning petition and general development plan.* The applicant shall submit a rezoning petition in accordance with the application procedure described in section 111-386. In addition to the required information noted in section 111-386, a general development plan shall be submitted to the plan commission 30 business days prior to any rezoning hearing. The general development plan shall provide the following information in sufficient detail to make possible the evaluation of the criteria for approval.
    - a. The pattern of proposed land uses including general size, shape, and arrangement of lots and specific use areas; proposed density of residential development; proposed building square footage for commercial or industrial development; general environmental character common

---

open spaces, parking and drive areas, recreation facilities, principal landscaping features, floodplain and/or wetlands and other major components of the proposed project.

- b. The basic street pattern.
  - c. The basic storm drainage pattern.
  - d. The general location, size and character of recreational and open space areas, including the designation of any such areas to be classified as preserved lands.
  - e. Documents or related information or plans showing the architectural designs of buildings.
  - f. Appropriate statistical data relative to the development.
  - g. General outline of intended organizational structure related to property owner's association, deed restrictions, etc.
  - h. Any other information deemed appropriate and necessary by the plan commission.
- (3) *Public inspection.* The conceptual development plan and related information shall be available for public inspection prior to any rezoning hearing on the proposed project.
- (4) *Referral and hearing.* As set forth in section 111-387.
- (e) *Conditions and restrictions.*
- (1) The plan commission may recommend, and the village board may adopt, by ordinance, conditions and restrictions for planned developments that specify permitted use, set bulk regulations and standards for lot coverage and dwelling unit size and distribution and yard setbacks.
  - (2) Conditions and restrictions adopted to govern any planned development may include nonstandard or non-uniform requirements, regulations and provisions recommended by the plan commission and approved by the village board. Such nonstandard requirements, regulations and provisions shall be designed to insure proper development and appropriate operation and maintenance of specific developments on specific sites.
  - (3) Developers shall agree, by a developer's agreement, with the village to comply with all applicable laws and regulations, including any conditions and restrictions adopted to regulate a specific planned development.
- (f) *Precise implementation plan.* After planned development overlay district zoning has been granted and the general development plan, together with conditions imposed, has been approved, detailed site plans and information covering that portion of the total project that is intended for construction shall be submitted to the plan commission for approval prior to the issuance of building permits. The detailed plans and information shall conform substantially to the general development plan and to the resolution of conditions and restrictions that were approved at the time of rezoning. Precise implementation plans shall include the following information:
- (1) An accurate identification of the area of the precise implementation plan as it relates to the general development plan.
  - (2) The specific designation of proposed land use including the pattern of public and private roads, driveways, walkways and parking facilities; detailed lot layout and the arrangement of building groups, including single-family homes if applicable; and the specific treatment of any preserved lands to be kept as common open space or amenities.
  - (3) Specific landscape plans for all common open space, amenities, or housing groups including private single-family homes.
  - (4) Detailed storm drainage, sanitary sewage disposal and water system plans.

- 
- (5) Proposed engineering standards for all roads, parking areas and walkways.
  - (6) Agreements, bylaws, covenants and other documents providing for permanent preservation and maintenance of any preserved lands, common open areas and amenities.
  - (g) *Architectural plan review.* Building plans shall also be submitted to the plan commission for its review and approval prior to the issuance of any building permits.
  - (h) *Commencement of the project.*
    - (1) After the plan commission has approved the detailed site plans, construction of private and public improvements may commence in accordance with section 111-278(d).
    - (2) No building permit shall be issued until all applicable fees and assessments have been paid and either:
      - a. All public and private improvements have been completed and approved; or
      - b. A developer's agreement and letter of credit has been approved and signed by the village board. For phased development such developer's agreements shall provide for the construction of improvements and the maintenance and use of common areas outside of the subject phase.
    - (3) After the plan commission has approved the plans, the project shall be commenced within one year unless the time is extended in writing by the plan commission. In the event the project is not so timely commenced, the approval of the plan commission shall be deemed to be automatically revoked.
  - (i) *Maintenance of project.*
    - (1) Should the owner of a planned development fail to properly operate or maintain the business or premises to the extent that a nuisance is caused to occupants or neighbors, or constitutes a nuisance to nearby properties, the plan commission may refuse to approve subsequent stages of development until such time as they determine that the situation and/or method of operation has been corrected.
    - (2) Should the owner of a planned development fail to adequately perform maintenance functions such as snow and ice removal, weed cutting or trash disposal, the village shall have the right to perform such functions or to contract for their accomplishment at the property owner's expense.
  - (j) *Changes or revisions.*
    - (1) All proposed changes, revisions and additions to any aspect of an approved planned development project shall be submitted to the plan commission for its review. The plan commission shall determine if the change, revision or addition is minor or if it materially affects the intended design of the project and the impact of the project on neighboring uses.
    - (2) If the change is determined to be minor, plan commission shall review the request and forward its findings to the village board, which may approve the change without a public hearing. The plan commission's decision on minor changes shall be rendered at a meeting subsequent to the meeting at which the requested change was initially presented to the plan commission.
    - (3) If the requested change is determined by the plan commission to be substantial because of its effect on the intended design of the project or on neighboring uses, a public hearing shall be held by the plan commission to review and forward its findings to the village board for final approval.
  - (k) *Application of this chapter on division and platting of lands.* To the extent applicable, any planned development shall be subject to the procedures and regulations of this chapter on division and platting of lands. However, the design standards and required improvements established in that ordinance may be modified or waived upon recommendation of the village engineer and plan commission and approval by the village board where strict compliance would result in not achieving the design flexibility necessary to achieve the objectives of the planned development.

---

(Ord. No. 31-2015, § 12.14, 10-1-2015)

---

(Supp. No. 10)

Created: 2026-02-13 08:25:54 [EST]

## Community Parking Examples for Multi-Family Residential

Community	Ordinance Provision	Notes
City of Oconomowoc	<p>1.5/du for one-bedroom units 2/du for all other units All projects shall provide 0.25 guest spaces per unit</p> <p>Properties zoned MC mixed commercial are exempt from off-street parking requirements.</p>	<p>Several PUD's identify modified parking requirements unique to development</p> <p>PUD for "The Harvest" allows parking exemptions, including # of stalls, access isles, and parking ratios, which will be granted after review and approval and determined on a case-by-case basis upon review of the site plans for outlots and individual building sites. Determined prior to site plan and development plan approval.</p>
Village of Sussex	<p>two (2) spaces per dwelling unit plus one (1) guest parking space per five (5) dwelling units (10 percent guest parking). All parking except guest parking shall be provided in enclosed garages. Attached garages or underground parking is preferred.</p> <p>Housing for the elderly—one (1) space per dwelling unit.</p>	
Village of Dousman	<p>2 spaces per unit. Garage space can be used to satisfy this requirement.</p>	
Village of Pewaukee	<p>RM multi-family: Minimum required enclosed parking spaces in the RM district shall be: (1)One bedroom units: 1.75 parking spaces per unit. (2)Two bedroom units: 2.00 parking spaces per unit. (3)Three bedroom units: 2.00 parking spaces per unit.</p>	

<p>City of Pewaukee</p>	<p>Rm-2 multi-family (9 units/acre): There shall be a minimum of 2 1/2 two-hundred-square-foot off-street parking spaces provided for each residential unit, of which at least two must be located in a garage as defined in § <b>340-16.2</b>.</p> <p>Rm-3 multi-family (12 units/acre): Suggested minimum parking. One and one-half off-street parking spaces provided for each efficiency, one-bedroom, or two-bedroom unit and 2 1/2 off-street parking spaces provided for each three or more bedroom unit or as determined practical by the Plan Commission.</p>	
<p>City of Delafield</p>	<p>Multi-family 2 spaces per dwelling unit.</p> <p>Elderly multi-family 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit.</p> <p>Exception for elderly housing. Where in the opinion of the plan commission, an elderly housing development may need less than 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit due to the nature of the facility or the fact that many of the residents will not own or drive automobiles, the plan commission may grant an exception to the required 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit.</p>	

Waukesha County	Developments containing more than four (4) dwelling units shall provide a minimum of two (2) spaces per dwelling unit. Parking may be reduced to a ratio of 1.75 spaces per dwelling unit if a minimum of twenty percent (20%) of the dwelling units are one bedroom or efficiency units. Visitor parking shall be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	
-----------------	--	--

**Sec. 23-10. Design, construction and maintenance standards.**

- (a) *General.* Signs shall be constructed in such a manner that they will not be a hazard to neighboring properties and will withstand the forces of severe weather. Signs shall be maintained in a clean and sanitary manner, shall be repainted or repaired when necessary and all accessory features of signs (such as lighting) shall be maintained in an operable condition. Signs shall not be permitted to become aesthetically offensive in appearance. Signs shall be secured to buildings, poles, and posts and shall not be placed in a manner which interferes with the provision of public services such as electrical service, telephone service, natural gas service and fire protection.
- (b) *Facing.* No sign except those permitted in sections 23-3 shall be permitted to face a residence within 100 feet of such residence.
- (c) *Lighting and color.*
  - (1) *Interference with official signs.* Signs shall not resemble, imitate, or approximate the shape, size, form, or color of railroad or traffic signs, signals, or devices. Signs shall not obstruct or interfere with the effectiveness of railroad or traffic signs, signals, or devices.
  - (2) *Interference with public safety.* Signs shall not be erected, relocated, or maintained so as to prevent free ingress to or egress from any door, window, or fire escape and no sign shall be attached to a standpipe or fire escape. Signs shall not be placed so as to obstruct or interfere with traffic visibility, nor be lighted in such a way as to cause glare or impair driver visibility upon public ways.
  - (3) *Lighting.* Signs may be illuminated, but such illumination shall comply with the standards of ANSI/IES RP-39-19 or its successor publication. Signs in residential districts shall not be illuminated except for monument signs as listed in section 23-05(1).
  - (4) *Monument signs* are required to be externally lit unless a finding is made by the plan commission that allowing internal illumination would be compatible with the general area, and that the impact of such a sign will not visually impact any nearby residential areas.
- (d) *Animation.* Signs shall not revolve, flash, scroll, blink, chase, or otherwise be animated in nature. Flashing signs are those that change characters or blink more than once every three seconds. Electronic message signs may fade over not less than three seconds nor more than five seconds to allow for the changing of messages, pictures, characters, etc. may be part of an electronic message, but all images on an electronic message sign shall not be animated.
- (5) *Color and material.* Signs shall be designed to complement the architecture of the structure(s) they represent. Wherever possible, signs on multi-tenant buildings should be guided by an approved sign plan for the development with regards to size, font and color. Signs should have uniform letter coloring, size, and shape unless the plan commission finds that alternate color schemes appropriately complement the architecture and use of the structure. Monument and ground signs shall be constructed of brick, dimensional building stone, larger wood beams or other decorative building materials, and often feature landscaped element(s) within the sign design. The sign cabinet for ground and monument signs may be of a metal or quality plastic material if the appearance is found to be consistent with the quality of the rest of the sign and the architecture of the development.

(Ord. No. 80-2020, § 2, 3-12-2020)