



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

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

Minutes Village of Summit Plan Commission May 21, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Siepmann called to order the Plan Commission meeting at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 21, 2026, at the Summit Village Hall, 37100 Delafield Road, Summit, WI.

ROLL CALL AND CONFIRM POSTING

Deputy Clerk/Deputy Treasurer Sarah 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: Jay Obenberger, John Konopacki, Gloria Lehrer, Sandra Murray, Paul Schmitter and Lisa Mellone. Also present were: Chairperson Jim Siepmann, Planner Amy Barrows and Deputy Clerk/Deputy Treasurer Sarah LaValliere.

Commissioner Absent: Matt Katz

MINUTES

- March 19, 2026
- April 16, 2026 – Not available for approval

MOTION: (Schmitter, Obenberger) *to approve the March 19, 2026 meeting minutes as presented.* Carried

Next meeting date – proposed for Thursday, June 18, 2026, at 5:30 p.m.

PUBLIC INPUT regarding proposed amendments to the Village of Summit 2045 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map specific to Agenda Item 6.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).

Planner Amy Barrows reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Amendment to change a portion of land adjacent to Whitestone Church from Industrial Business Park to Institutional. He explained the amendment would facilitate a land transfer and future construction of a 2,600-square-foot multi-purpose building for religious and community services. Planner Barrows noted that rezoning and Certified Survey Map

approvals would be required if the amendment is approved and clarified that the existing prayer house would be included in the transfer, consolidating all church-related facilities onto a single parcel.

Chairperson Siepmann opened the meeting for Public Comment at 5:37 pm.

There was no public comment and Chairperson Siepmann closed Public Input at 5:40 pm

MOTION: (Schmitter, Murray) *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 Commissioners that unanimously carried the motion::

- Jay Obenberger
- John Konopacki
- Gloria Lehrer
- Sandra Murray
- Paul Schmitter
- Lisa Mellone

Carried

Chairperson Siepmann announced a 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.

Planner Barrows reviewed the proposed Mixed-Use Pabst Farms (MU-PF) zoning district, explaining that the district was created to accommodate the proposed Harvest at Pabst Farms development and is limited to the two Pabst Farms parcels within the Village. She noted that all development within the district would require approval of a Planned Development Overlay District, allowing the Plan Commission and Village Board to establish project-specific standards and restrictions.

Planner Barrows noted that a public hearing regarding the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Amendment is scheduled for June 11, 2026, before the Village Board.

Planner Barrows summarized revisions made since the April meeting, including limiting the district to the subject properties, prohibiting tobacco-related uses, modifying residential unit size requirements, clarifying utility and community-related uses, and adding standards for drive-through facilities, daycare centers, and accessory uses. She reviewed proposed permitted uses, residential density limits, parking requirements, setback standards, maximum building heights, signage and landscaping requirements, and design expectations intended to create a cohesive, high-quality mixed-use environment with pedestrian amenities and public gathering spaces. She emphasized that future development proposals would be subject to additional review through the Planned Development Overlay process, site plan approvals, operational plans, and design guidelines.

Chairperson Opens Public Hearing at: 6:00 pm

There were no Plan Commission comments.

Chairperson Siepmann opened the Hearing for Public Comment at: 6:05 pm

Bob Storm – 3020 Mendota Drive, Lake Country Village resident, expressed concerns regarding the proposed setback and density standards within the MU-PF zoning district. He stated that the proposed 20-foot rear setbacks and 7-foot side setbacks could reduce privacy for adjacent residential properties and result in increased visibility between the proposed development and existing homes. Mr. Storm also expressed concerns regarding the overall residential density, building heights, and potential impacts from lighting on neighboring properties. He referenced comments submitted by email and requested that the Plan Commission consider those concerns as it evaluates the proposed ordinance.

Rodger Schreiber, 35249 Walleye Drive, a resident of Lake Country Village, requested clarification regarding statements in prior meeting minutes concerning the subdivision trail system. Chairperson Siepman clarified that the trails are public trails available for public use, although they are not owned by the Village. He explained that the public trail designation was established as part of the original development agreement and associated park impact fee arrangements. Mr. Schreiber acknowledged the clarification and thanked the Commission.

Paul Race, 3120 Monona Court, a resident of Interlaken Village, expressed concerns regarding pedestrian safety and connectivity across Sawyer Road. Mr. Race noted that residents, including families with children, frequently travel between neighborhoods and that future development in the area could increase pedestrian activity. Mr. Race encouraged the Village to explore options for creating a safe crossing or connection between the east and west sides of Sawyer Road and requested that the issue be considered as future development plans are reviewed.

Bill Bensman, 3051 Mineral Springs Blvd, a Lake Country Village resident, encouraged the Plan Commission to carefully consider the comments and recommendations submitted by the Lake Country Village Homeowners Association. He expressed concerns regarding the cumulative impact of existing and proposed multifamily developments in the surrounding area and questioned whether the proposed MU-PF district could contribute to increased residential density. Mr. Bensman urged the Commission to consider the long-term effects of growth and development on the Village and surrounding neighborhoods. Further stating that the HOA Board submitted an email for review.

Trudy Gerbing 2825 Yahara Drive, also addressed concerns that the proposed MU-PF zoning district and associated residential density are inconsistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan and existing low-density development patterns. Ms. Gerbing urged the Plan Commission to maintain current zoning and open space standards, preserve neighborhood character, and consider limiting residential density and unit sizes. Additional concerns were raised regarding the inclusion of taverns, microbreweries, distilleries, hotels, roof-mounted satellite equipment, trail connections to existing neighborhoods, buffering and screening requirements, and the potential fiscal impacts of the development. Ms. Gerbing encouraged the Commission to ensure that future development bears the costs associated with providing services and infrastructure.

Dan Gerbing, 2825 Yahara Drive, expressed support for preserving the rural character and identity of the Village of Summit. He stated that the community's farms, lakes, forests, parks, and small-town atmosphere are valued assets and encouraged the Plan Commission to consider maintaining those characteristics as future development is evaluated. Mr. Gerbing emphasized the importance of balancing growth with preservation of the community's natural resources, local traditions, and quality of life.

Charlene Dwyer 35184 Walleye Court, former parks and recreation commissioner expressed interest in how the proposed development would address quality-of-life amenities and align with the Village's Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan and park planning goals. The resident noted the presence of proposed green space and trails but questioned whether active recreational amenities, such as playgrounds and similar facilities, would be incorporated into the development. Following discussion, it was noted that those details had not yet been

developed, and the resident indicated an intent to provide comments during future stages of the review process when additional plans become available.

Jen McCarten 35390 Kegonsa Drive, a resident whose property is adjacent to the proposed development area, expressed concerns regarding the potential impacts of the MU-PF district on nearby neighborhoods. She requested consideration of maintaining commercial uses farther from existing residential properties and recommended additional buffering measures, including larger evergreen plantings, enhanced berming, or physical screening to protect neighborhood privacy. Ms. McCartin also expressed concerns regarding building heights, visibility into adjacent homes, traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, noise, dust, and construction-related impacts. She encouraged the Village to consider traffic improvements, construction hour limitations, and other mitigation measures to minimize impacts on surrounding residents.

Carolyn Barndt, 3147 Walleye Drive, a resident of Lake Country Village, expressed concerns regarding the cumulative residential density of existing and proposed multifamily developments in the area. She compared the number of rental units in nearby developments to the number of owner-occupied homes in surrounding neighborhoods and stated that the proposed Harvest development would significantly alter the character of the community. Ms. Barndt acknowledged that future development of the property is expected but encouraged the Plan Commission to carefully consider the long-term impacts of the proposed density on the Village and surrounding neighborhoods.

Wendy Williams 1544 N Breezeland Drive, expressed concerns regarding the proposed density and scale of development, including the introduction of three-story buildings. She acknowledged that growth and development are likely to occur but encouraged the Plan Commission to consider designs that maintain the character of the Village while preserving green space and recreational opportunities. Ms. Williams also raised concerns regarding traffic congestion, lighting impacts, and the effect of development on local wildlife habitat. She encouraged consideration of reduced density, additional open space, and preservation measures to help mitigate impacts on surrounding neighborhoods and natural resources.

Plan Commission Comments:

Commissioner Schmitter questioned how potential conflicts between the proposed MU-PF zoning ordinance and future design guidelines would be addressed, particularly with respect to signage standards. He noted that design guidelines are still being developed and sought clarification on how inconsistencies between ordinance requirements and future design standards would be resolved during the review process.

Planner Barrows explained that the ordinance establishes minimum development standards, while additional requirements may be incorporated through the Planned Development Overlay District. She stated that design guidelines would become part of the Planned Development Overlay approval process and would be required to be established by the Plan Commission and adopted by the Village Board. Planner Barrows further noted that future design guidelines may address topics such as signage and digital signage standards, which could supplement or modify ordinance provisions through the Planned Development Overlay process.

Planner Barrows further explained that the proposed single-family homes along the northern edge of the development adjacent to Lake Country Village would be subject to the same 35-foot height limitation that applies elsewhere in the Village.

Commissioner Lehrer sought clarification regarding the proposed building height standards, specifically the measurement of residential structures to the "highest eave." She questioned how the term would be interpreted and whether the measurement would be taken from the roof overhang, fascia board, or another architectural

feature, noting that eave designs can vary and may affect the overall building height. She also requested clarification on the definition of “Garden Style” home.

Commissioner Murray expressed concerns regarding the ordinance provision allowing incidental tobacco product sales within certain retail establishments. She noted that the previously discussed 10 percent floor area limitation could be difficult to interpret and enforce. Applicant representative Scott Yauck explained that the intent was not to permit tobacco or vape shops, but rather to allow limited incidental sales within establishments such as grocery stores or pharmacies.

Commissioner Murray also questioned the inclusion of drive-through facilities within the proposed district, noting that prior discussions had focused on sit-down and fast-casual restaurant uses. Planner Barrows explained that the provision was added following legal review to address potential future drive-through uses and establish standards related to vehicle stacking and operational impacts.

Scott Yauck President, CEO Cobalt Partners, noted that many modern fast-casual restaurants incorporate drive-through or pickup lanes and that the provision was intended to accommodate those evolving business models while remaining subject to Plan Commission review.

Commissioners discussed whether drive-through facilities should be permitted within the proposed Mixed-Use District. Concerns were raised regarding the compatibility of drive-through restaurants with adjacent residential neighborhoods, particularly uses with extended operating hours.

The applicant indicated that drive-through facilities were not a primary component of the proposed development but acknowledged that certain commercial users may request them. Planner Amy Barrows noted that specific limitations regarding the number and location of drive-through facilities could be addressed through the Planned Development Overlay District review process.

Following discussion, the Commission expressed support for allowing the Planned Development Overlay District to regulate the number and placement of any future drive-through facilities rather than establishing specific limits within the zoning district text amendment. The Commission considered revising the provision to limit tobacco-related sales to the lesser of 10 percent of the tenant space or 50 square feet.

Commissioners discussed whether operating hours and certain recreational uses should be addressed within the Mixed-Use District zoning text. Staff advised that detailed operational standards, including hours of operation, employee counts, noise impacts, and site-specific use restrictions, are typically reviewed through the Site Development Review and Business Plan of Operation processes rather than within the zoning district regulations. Staff further cautioned that overly specific restrictions in the zoning code could unintentionally imply that other unlisted uses are permitted.

Discussion also occurred regarding the potential location of microbreweries, distilleries, drive-through facilities, and outdoor recreational uses. The applicant indicated a willingness to address such matters through the Planned Development Overlay District review process.

Commissioners expressed concerns regarding the overall residential density proposed within the development, noting that the Village's Comprehensive Plan emphasizes maintaining Summit's rural character. Concerns were raised that the proposed density, three-story buildings, and reduced open space may not be consistent with the Village's long-standing vision as a quiet rural community. Additional discussion focused on the need for substantial buffering and berming adjacent to existing residential properties.

Scott Yauck, Cobalt Partners, responded that the proposal includes significant open space and noted that the development's residential-to-commercial ratio remains below that of comparable mixed-use developments. The applicant also stated that development would occur over multiple phases extending several years rather than being constructed all at once.

The applicant noted that the current by-right use for the property includes industrial and business park development, which could result in larger buildings, truck traffic, and other impacts. Commissioners acknowledged this point but noted that well-designed screening, landscaping, and buffering would be critical regardless of the final use.

Staff reminded the Commission that the current land use designation allows industrial and business park uses, including buildings up to 50 feet in height and a variety of commercial, storage, recreational, restaurant, utility, and related uses. Staff also noted that the Commission had previously recommended approval of the land use plan amendment allowing up to 10 dwelling units per acre for the northern 35.8 acres of the proposed development.

Commissioners discussed the proposed minimum dwelling unit sizes and whether the standards adequately reflect housing characteristics within the Lake Country area. Concerns were raised that the proposed minimum floor areas may be smaller than comparable apartment developments in the surrounding community.

Mr. Yauck, applicant, responded that the proposed standards are intended to reflect market expectations for higher-end residential products and noted that the ordinance establishes minimum unit sizes, with many units anticipated to exceed those requirements.

Additional discussion focused on the long-term implications of the proposed development standards and the importance of ensuring that the zoning district remains appropriate regardless of future ownership or development changes. Questions were raised regarding the proposed residential rear yard setback requirements and whether the standards would remain appropriate if development plans were modified in the future.

Mr. Yauck, noted that the northern portion of the development is planned and restricted for single-family residential use. Mr. Yauck stated that they are in line with average higher end products.

Planner Barrows further explained that the zoning district establishes separate setback requirements for residential and commercial development and is structured to accommodate the intended land use pattern.

The Commission discussed proposed setback and parking requirements within the Mixed-Use District. Staff explained that the proposed minimum dwelling unit sizes were originally derived from the Village's existing MF-2 Multifamily Residential District standards, which permit up to 10 dwelling units per acre. Staff noted that while the proposed minimum unit sizes largely mirror the MF-2 standards, the setback requirements in the proposed district are generally smaller than those required in the MF-2 District.

Staff reviewed comparable setback requirements from existing Village regulations and nearby developments, noting that the proposed district includes reduced rear and side yard setbacks. The applicant indicated that the proposed setback standards were not driven by specific development needs and expressed a willingness to increase setback requirements to align more closely with existing Village standards. Several Commissioners voiced support for increasing setbacks to be consistent with the MF-2 District.

The Commission also discussed residential parking requirements. Concerns were raised that the proposed parking ratios may be insufficient compared to neighboring communities. Staff noted that parking requirements

in planned developments are often adjusted during the site plan review process and that approved developments may utilize modified parking ratios based on the specific characteristics of the project.

At the Commission's request, Commissioner Paul Schmitter provided an overview of multifamily parking considerations. He explained that appropriate parking ratios vary based on the location, housing type, unit size, and expected resident demographics. He noted that developments consisting of larger units, townhomes, and direct-entry residences generally require more parking due to larger household sizes and increased visitor activity, while smaller apartment units may require fewer parking spaces.

The Commission continued discussion regarding residential parking requirements and the balance between providing adequate parking and minimizing impervious surface coverage. Commissioner Schmitter explained that parking ratios vary based on housing type, unit size, location, and expected resident demographics. He noted that larger units and direct-entry townhomes generally require additional parking due to larger household sizes and visitor demand, while smaller one-bedroom and efficiency units typically require fewer spaces.

Mr. Yauck, stated that the proposed parking ratios are intended to reflect the anticipated unit mix and noted that market demand generally drives parking supply, as adequate parking is necessary to attract and retain residents. The applicant further indicated that public street parking is not being relied upon to satisfy parking requirements and expressed support for clarifying that parking calculations exclude public street parking if desired.

Commissioners discussed concerns regarding potential on-street parking and overnight vehicle storage.

Planner Amy Barrows explained that any proposed private street parking would require engineering review and approval and could result in additional impervious surface requirements.

Commissioner also acknowledged receipt of correspondence from the Lake Country Villages Board regarding issues such as berming, maintenance, lighting standards, and trail access. Staff and Commissioners recognized the concerns raised in the letter and noted that those topics would be addressed during future phases of the development review process rather than as part of the current zoning text amendment discussion.

Additional discussion occurred regarding the potential impacts of automatic teller machines and other uses that could generate late-night activity. Commissioners expressed concerns about noise and traffic associated with 24-hour access features and suggested that operational restrictions may be appropriate for consideration during future development and site plan reviews.

The Commission continued discussing operational impacts associated with future commercial uses within the proposed Mixed-Use District. Concerns were raised regarding late-night activity associated with uses such as drive-through facilities, automatic teller machines, and other commercial operations located near residential areas. Staff noted that operational details, including hours of operation, are reviewed through the Site Development Review and Business Plan of Operation process. Following discussion, there was general consensus that language could be added to the review criteria to ensure hours of operation are evaluated for compatibility with surrounding residential uses and the character of the development.

The Commission also discussed the potential inclusion of hotels as a permitted use within the district. Concerns were expressed regarding the potential demand on police, fire, and emergency medical services, as well as possible impacts on nearby residential neighborhoods and public spaces. One Commissioner questioned whether a hotel use would be appropriate given the Village's size and existing lodging options in the surrounding area.

The applicant responded that hotels are currently permitted under existing industrial and business park zoning classifications and noted that hotel accommodations were identified as a potential component of the mixed-use development based on market analysis. The applicant referenced other mixed-use developments developed by the project team that include hotels and stated that those facilities have operated successfully without the types of issues described. The applicant further indicated that a hotel could serve as an amenity supporting the broader mixed-use development and suggested that additional standards or operational requirements could be considered during future phases of the development review process.

Chairperson Siepman asked for an informal vote on hotels.

- Sandra Murray – No
- Lisa Mellone – No Does not want hotel.
- Gloria Lehrer – Difficult but fine
- Jay Obenberger – OK
- John Konopacki - OK
- Paul Schmitter – OK
- Jim Siepman – initially was not opposed could live with hotel in Pabst farms – maybe not as the front door of Summit

Second round of Public Comment:

Robert Storm 3020 Mendota Drive, commented on the proposed setback standards and emphasized the importance of maintaining adequate separation between residential properties. He noted that while homes within Lake Country Villages may have relatively modest setbacks, the development was designed with substantial open space between homes, resulting in greater overall separation and privacy. He expressed concern that the proposed development could place homes in closer proximity to existing residences, potentially resulting in views into neighboring properties and impacts associated with higher density development.

Mr. Storm also voiced support for increasing setback requirements and reducing density within the proposed development. Additionally, he expressed concerns regarding the potential inclusion of a hotel within the project, particularly due to its proximity to the neighborhood park and the possibility of increased pedestrian activity crossing roadways to access park facilities. He encouraged the Commission to carefully consider these issues as the development review process continues.

Paul Race 3120 Mendota Court, expressed concerns regarding the overall direction and potential impacts of the proposed development. He stated that, after hearing the discussion, he had become increasingly concerned that the project may not adequately reflect the interests and vision of the Village. Mr. Race encouraged the Plan Commission and Village leadership to remain actively engaged in shaping the development and to carefully evaluate future proposals to ensure they align with community values and long-term goals. He emphasized the importance of continued vigilance and public involvement as the review process moves forward.

John McCarten, 39350 Kegonsa Drive, encouraged the Commission to reconsider the proposed mixed-use designation and instead consider a more limited commercial land use approach. He expressed concern about how future development could occur beyond the currently proposed phases and urged the Commission to prioritize preserving the Village's small-community character.

Mr. McCarten stated that many residents chose to live in the Village because of its rural atmosphere and expressed opposition to the potential inclusion of a hotel within the development. He also raised concerns regarding the impacts associated with larger commercial uses, including increased parking areas, lighting, and potential encroachment on nearby residential neighborhoods. Additionally, he noted concerns that future development could negatively affect the character of the area and potentially impact surrounding property values.

Mr. Storm reiterated concerns regarding privacy impacts associated with the proposed residential development. He noted that screening and buffering adjacent to industrial or commercial buildings differs from residential development, where homes may have windows overlooking neighboring properties. Mr. Storm expressed concern that the proposed building orientation and proximity of future homes could result in reduced privacy for adjacent residents and emphasized the importance of considering these impacts when evaluating density, setbacks, and buffering requirements.

Roger Schreiber, 35249 Walleye Drive, Lake Country Village inquired about a previously referenced mixed-use development in Menomonee Falls that includes hotel accommodations and other commercial amenities. Specifically, he asked whether the development is adjacent to existing residential neighborhoods similar to the conditions surrounding the proposed development in Summit.

In response, the applicant stated that portions of the Menomonee Falls development are adjacent to single-family residential areas, with approximately 40 percent of the project's perimeter bordering residential uses. The applicant further noted that the hotels within that development are located along a frontage road near the interstate, which differs from some aspects of the proposed Summit development.

Wendy Williams, 1334 N. Breezeland Road, commented on the proposed Mixed-Use District and questioned whether hotel uses should remain a permitted use within the new zoning district. She noted that while hotels may be allowed under the property's current industrial/business park designation, the Village is considering a new zoning framework and therefore has the opportunity to reconsider whether such a use aligns with the community's vision.

Ms. Williams expressed concerns regarding the potential impacts of a hotel, including increased density, lighting, noise, and overall intensity of development. She suggested that additional study and evaluation may be warranted before permitting hotel uses within the district. Ms. Williams also stated that many residents may not yet fully understand the scope of the proposed development and encouraged continued public outreach and communication to ensure residents are informed about the long-term implications of the project.

Karen Rasmussen, 35146 Castle Rock, expressed support for comments previously made regarding the potential inclusion of a hotel within the proposed development. She stated that, regardless of whether a hotel is ultimately included in the project, she did not believe such a use would be appropriate within the Summit portion of the development, particularly in areas adjacent to existing residential neighborhoods.

Kim Khail 35161 Castle Rock Drive, encouraged the Plan Commission to make decisions based on what is in the best interest of the Village of Summit and its residents. She emphasized the importance of maintaining the Village's unique identity and character and stated that the Commission and Village Board have the authority and responsibility to evaluate proposals independently. Ms. Khail expressed appreciation for the service of the Commission members and Village officials and conveyed her trust in their ability to make decisions that reflect the interests and values of the community.

John/ Jen McCarten, 35390 Kegonsa Drive raised concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on local schools and related services. He questioned whether the school district has sufficient capacity and resources to accommodate additional students that may result from future residential growth. Mr. McCarten also encouraged consideration of potential impacts on transportation services, including school busing, pedestrian safety, and crosswalk infrastructure.

Commissioner Schmitter asked whether the proposed zoning district could include an expiration date or sunset provision if the contemplated development does not proceed. Staff explained that expiration provisions are generally not associated with the creation of a zoning district itself, as zoning classifications remain in effect

until amended. Staff noted, however, that deadlines or triggering events can often be incorporated into zoning approvals, rezoning actions, or Planned Development Overlay District approvals.

Commissioner Murray explained her concern that future economic conditions or ownership changes could result in a project being completed by different developers with varying design standards, potentially affecting the overall quality and consistency of the development. Staff indicated that the question would require further legal review and consultation with Village counsel.

The applicant noted that a similar approach had been utilized in the City of Oconomowoc, where certain approvals do not become effective until specified development activities occur.

Planner Barrows responded that while such provisions may be possible for future zoning and planned development approvals, they may be more difficult to apply to the creation of a zoning district itself.

Commissioner Lehrer requested clarification regarding the term "garden-style housing." The applicant explained that garden-style housing generally consists of multi-unit residential buildings designed to resemble townhomes, often featuring individual entrances, attached garages, and vertically stacked residential units with separate upper and lower living spaces.

Planner Barrows agreed to ask Attorney Macy about deadline requirements related to the effect of the ordinance.

Planner Barrows reviewed the steps of the process for the audience and what we are talking about tonight is just the Mixed-Use zoning district.

Following completion of public comment and discussion, the Commission acknowledged that numerous questions and potential revisions had been identified during the hearing process. The Chair suggested continuing the public hearing to a future meeting to allow staff and the applicant time to review the comments, evaluate potential ordinance modifications, and prepare responses to issues raised by the Commission and the public. Staff concurred with the recommendation, and the Commission expressed support for continuing the public hearing to a future meeting date rather than closing the hearing at that time.

Prior to adjourning the public hearing, Planner Barrows reviewed the comments and potential ordinance revisions identified during the discussion to ensure the Commission's direction was accurately captured for future consideration.

Planner Barrows noted there appeared to be consensus on the proposed location and intent development criteria and the previously discussed restrictions related to tobacco sales. Staff also summarized discussion regarding drive-through facilities, noting a potential provision allowing the Planned Development Overlay District review process to regulate or restrict the number and location of drive-through facilities. Commissioners indicated that additional discussion regarding the applicability of such restrictions to restaurants and banking uses would occur at a future meeting.

Planner Barrows further identified several topics requiring additional review, including possible restrictions related to microbreweries and distilleries, legal questions regarding expiration or triggering provisions for future approvals, and the appropriateness of hotel uses within the district.

The Commission also discussed outdoor dining associated with restaurants. Commissioners generally expressed support for allowing outdoor dining opportunities, while recognizing that specific operational standards and conditions could be addressed through future development review processes.

Additional discussion occurred regarding minimum dwelling unit floor areas. Commissioners requested additional information regarding comparable developments and unit sizes before considering any modifications to the proposed standards. Staff was directed to verify information presented during the public hearing and work with the applicant to provide additional detail for future review.

The Commission also revisited parking standards for multifamily development. Staff reviewed parking requirements from neighboring communities and noted that many ordinances require between 1.5 and 2.0 parking spaces per dwelling unit, depending on unit size and bedroom count. After discussion, the Commission expressed preliminary support for requiring 1.75 parking spaces for studio and one-bedroom units, with the possibility of reducing the requirement to 1.5 spaces through the Planned Development Overlay review process if justified by the proposed development plan. Commissioners acknowledged that parking needs are influenced by unit mix, market demand, and site design and agreed that additional project-specific information would be beneficial before finalizing standards.

Discussion also occurred regarding signage standards. Staff noted that future design guidelines being developed for the project could address signage design, placement, and digital signage standards. Commissioners agreed that signage regulations may be more appropriately addressed through the Planned Development Overlay District and accompanying design guidelines rather than through the base zoning district text.

After confirming there were no additional comments or ordinance revisions for staff to consider, the Commission discussed continuing the public hearing to allow staff and the applicant time to review comments, prepare potential revisions, and provide additional information.

MOTION: (Schmitter, Obenberger) *to adjourn the public hearing at:* Carried

Chairperson Siepmann clarified for those in attendance that no approvals had been granted and encouraged residents to continue reviewing the proposed ordinance and provide comments focused on the ordinance language at the continued hearing.

REGULAR BUSINESS:

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.

No action was taken on this agenda item. The public hearing was adjourned until the next plan commission meeting.

ADJOURN Plan Commission meeting

MOTION: (Schmitter, Obenberger) *to adjourn the Plan Commission meeting at 7:39p.m. –* Carried

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah LaValliere
Deputy Clerk/ Deputy Treasurer