

CITY OF CEDARBURG
PLAN COMMISSION
March 3, 2025

A regular meeting of the City of Cedarburg Plan Commission was held on Monday, March 3, 2025, at Cedarburg City Hall, W63N645 Washington Avenue, upper level, Council Chambers, and online via the Zoom app. Mayor Patricia Thome called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call -Mayor Patricia Thome, Council Member James Fitzpatrick, Adam Voltz, Sig Strautmanis, Jack Arnett, Sherry Bublitz, and Jon Scholz

Also Present - City Planner Mary Censky, City Administrator Mikko Hilvo, Administrative Assistant Theresa Hanaman, Cedarburg School District Superintendent Dr. Jeridon Clark, Andy Klimpel from Altius Building, Carl Miller from Dimension Design Group, Michael and Cindi Purnell

STATEMENT OF PUBLIC NOTICE

Administrative Assistant Hanaman confirmed that the agenda for the meeting had been posted and distributed in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Bublitz, seconded by Commissioner Scholz, to approve the minutes from February 3, 2025. The motion carried unanimously.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM CITIZENS – None

REGULAR BUSINESS AND POSSIBLE ACTION THEREON

A BRIEF REPORT WAS GIVEN BY THE CEDARBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT REGARDING THE RECENTLY COMPLETED “CEDARBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMUNITY GROWTH & PROJECTIONS REPORT 2024/25”.

Dr. Clark thanked the Plan Commission for the opportunity to summarize a 60-page report by Md. Roffers, commissioned by the Cedarburg School District for a population growth and enrollment study. This study analyzed anticipated growth without considering open enrollment, focusing instead on current resident students.

Dr Clark went on to explain that Md. Roffers categorized the community into 57 neighborhoods. He noted that neighborhoods around 30 years old and certain types of new home developments typically bring an influx of new/young families. The study projected future growth by engaging with city officials, developers, and surveying new home purchasers. Single-family homes typically generate about 0.76 students each, while multifamily homes yield approximately 0.05 students per unit.

Contrary to community concerns about overcrowding, the Cedarburg School District is currently under capacity, with schools like Parkview and Thorson able to accommodate an additional 100 students. Dr. Clark clarified that class sizes depend on the School Board's decisions rather than building capacity.

Projections show Thorson Elementary may exceed its capacity by 2040, with an expected 664 students versus a limit of 640. Neighborhood 49 is projected to add 140 elementary students to Thorson, prompting the School Board to consider moving this area to Parkview Elementary. They will consider this at a future meeting. Since Neighborhood 49 has no current residents, no student transfers would be needed. If approved, Parkview would accommodate 572 students and Thorson 524, keeping both schools within capacity.

Commissioner Arnett mentioned a footnote that projections might not reflect student growth during a real estate recession, similar to 2008. He was surprised that with the proposed 1,800 units, the School District would have the same number of students as today. Commissioner Arnett asked about the impact of no growth on enrollment and funding.

Dr. Clarke confirmed that projections rely on growth and new construction. Without the new units, the district would depend on home turnover, which is low (under 0.5%), indicating a potential decline in student numbers. Without 4K enrollment, the district is likely to see an overall decline, affecting funding tied to student numbers.

Mayor Thome inquired about the section northeast of Stone Wall Farms related to the Cedarburg School District. Dr. Clark explained that when the Village of Grafton acquired part of Cedarburg, some areas remained in the Cedarburg District, leading to discussions on equitable alignment. A resolution was approved to clarify school district assignments for families when those properties develop.

Mayor Thome expressed concerns about classroom sizes and their link to funding. Dr. Clark stated the district aims for 18-24 students in kindergarten and first grade, and 22-28 in grades two through five. Most classes meet these goals, though some average 26 or 27, which are manageable. Adding a new class costs roughly \$100,000. Over the last decade, class sizes have remained stable.

In January, the School Board approves open enrollment based on class sizes, only adding seats if averages fall below minimums. Cedarburg has high demand for open enrollment, with more applications than spots. The board has a reapplication process for students transitioning from 8th to 9th grade. If the high school reaches capacity, we may limit new enrollments for 9th grade, though this has not been done before. Students who are accepted into kindergarten can remain until the end of 8th grade.

Interestingly, the school-age population dropped by about 500 from 2010 to 2020, while the 65-plus demographic increased by 1,400, raising concerns about housing for families versus seniors. Notably, new housing has minimal effect on student enrollment, averaging 0.76 students per new home.

The Cedarburg School District assessed potential projects using fairly generous projections as to future residential land uses on the undeveloped properties while collaborating with Md. Roffers and the City Planner to develop land and project growth trends through 2040.

This item was scheduled for presentation and discussion only. No action was taken.

Public Comment

Terry King, W60 N762 Sheboygan Road - He raised concerns about the open enrollment process affecting capacity and the housing density developments with the student population.

Richard Patek, N116 W5575 Lucas Court – Richard questioned the report projections for 2040 which are significantly lower than those from 2019. Is this change due to potential housing developments in Sustainable Growth Areas? What factors could contribute to this shift in five years? Can reducing development in these areas help control future school district populations?

APPLICANT/PROPERTY OWNER OZAUKEE COUNTY LASATA, IN C/O COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR JASON DZWINE, REQUESTS FOLLOW-UP PLANS REVIEW AND APPROVAL (INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE, PARKING, FLOOR AREA RATIO, AND EXTERIOR LIGHTING) IN SUPPORT OF THEIR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) TO ADD A NEW 16,034 SQ. FT./19-UNIT CBRF BUILDING/WING ONTO THEIR EXISTING 22.59-ACRE RCAC BUILDINGS/CAMPUS LOCATED AT W79 N673 N. WAUWATOSA ROAD. THIS PROPERTY IS ZONED I-1 INSTITUTIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE DISTRICT.

On January 6, 2025, the Plan Commission reviewed this Conditional Use Permit (CUP) use request, along with the related building, site, landscaping, lighting, access/parking, and other related subordinate plans/details. The CUP was approved at that time, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Applicant to commission a professional lighting analysis and plan, for review and approval by the Plan Commission prior to occupancy, which plan depicts full compliance with industry standards for safety as to lighting the new building and related drive/parking/entry areas. Any new lighting required under an approved lighting plan must be placed and operational prior to the start of occupancy.
- 2) Applicant to provide survey-based confirmation that the sum total of the floor area of the principal building and all accessory buildings, included with this proposed new addition, will not exceed 40 percent of the lot area.
- 3) Applicant to satisfy the requirements of the Fire, Building Inspections, Engineering, Light & Water, and Public Works Departments as to the new site and building plans.
- 4) Plan Commission review and approval of a revised architectural design for the building taking into account, the guidance of the architect specialists to the Plan Commission.
- 5) If a living roof is proposed, the details and proposed timeline should be made a part of the plan submittal.
- 6) Full execution and recording of the CUG documents prior to start of occupancy.
- 7) Any new signs which may be proposed are subject to prior review, approval, and permit

issuance in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Building Code – Regulation of Signs prior to placement at the site.

7) Applicant to maintain the required licensure for CBRF use in this building at all times. No other occupancy type is permitted without prior review and approval by the Plan Commission.

8) Fully detailed plans as to stall sizes, curb-stopping, and setbacks from lot lines, shall be provided by the applicant for review and approval by the Plan Commission.

At the discretion of the Plan Commission, conditions 1), 2), 4), & 8) above may be satisfied by the revised plan set.

The applicant continues to work with the various applicable City staff to satisfy condition number 3) above. These departments will be asked to sign off as ‘satisfied’ prior to issuance of a building and/or early start footings/foundation permit.

Condition 5) above is no longer applicable. There will not be a flat or living roof in the project.

Conditions 6) & 7) will carry forward and remain applicable to the original CUP approval.

Architecture. The architect specialists to the Plan Commission met and worked with the applicant to refine the original building plans. The resulting, revised plans appear to be significantly improved considering the contextual style of the surrounding buildings, materials, use of windows, primary entrance...and so on. The architect specialists still have a couple of comments/recommendations, such as:

- Sheet A2.2: the retaining wall is 5+ feet tall at the highest point. It would be nice to see that softened up a bit, if possible.
- Sheet A5.1: shows new storefront with an anodized finish. The model appears to show a finish on the storefront that matches the fiberglass windows, which feels appropriate. I'd recommend a powder coat finish to match the storefront.

The architect specialists on the Plan Commission can expound on the status of the current (revised) design details.

Floor Area Ratio. The applicant has provided the required calculation, and the proposed Floor Area Ratio (with the new building included) is 31.2% where up to 40% is permitted.

Parking. The narrative submittal identifies a net increase in parking of 13 stalls. The details as to location of these parking stalls are clearly called out in the revised plans as to stall sizes, curb-stopping, and apparent setbacks from lot lines. One of the new parking areas is on the southwest corner of the plan along the main drive. These stalls will have vehicles pulling in forward with headlights shining toward homes to the west. It's a distance of approximately 300 feet from the stalls to the homes, and there appears to be adequate existing vegetation between them to mitigate any light trespass on the neighbors. The parking stalls are specified as 9' wide x 18' deep typical (i.e., 162 square feet). Section 13-1-82(c) of the City Code states that the "Size of each parking space shall be not less than 180 square feet, exclusive of the space required for ingress and egress". The Code does not appear to give the Plan Commission the authority to waive or modify this

standard.

Lighting. The building and site lighting fixture types are detailed in the revised submittal. All the proposed fixtures are designed for downcast lighting and are not expected to create glare or trespass issues on the neighbors.

Planner Censky recommends the following conditions be considered for attachment to any approval the Planning Commission may be inclined to grant in this matter:

- 1) The proposed new lighting as presented under these revised plans must be placed and operational prior to the start of occupancy.
- 2) The proposed new landscaping as presented under these revised plans must be installed no later than 3 months after initial occupancy or, if seasonal weather conditions prevent this, no later than the next July 1.
- 3) In the event nuisance light trespass would occur as a result of vehicles parking in the new spaces being added in the southwest corner of the site, the City may request that Lasata design and install, after-the-fact, a suitable screening solution to mitigate the trespass.
- 4) All new and revised parking stalls shall be modified to meet the minimum standard 180 sq. ft. in area.
- 5) Applicant to satisfy the requirements of the Fire, Building Inspections, Engineering, Light & Water, and Public Works Departments as to the new site and building plans, prior to their sign off and issuance of a building and/or early start footings/foundation permit, including, for instance, but not necessarily limited to these comments most recently received from engineering, public works and light/water departments:
 - a. After plans have been approved by the plan commission, a stormwater management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City Engineer.
 - b. Long-term maintenance agreements will be needed for the ponds.
 - c. Stormwater is being directed from the West pond to the East pond, can the East pond handle this?
 - d. Easements will be needed for all public sanitary sewer and water main on the entire Lasata site.
 - e. Developers' agreement will be needed for public sanitary sewer and water main.
 - f. Installation of public sanitary sewer and water main will require on-site inspection and as-builts.
- 6) Full execution and recording of the CUG documents prior to start of occupancy.
- 7) Any new signs which may be proposed are subject to prior review, approval, and permit issuance in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Building Code – Regulation of Signs prior to placement at the site.
- 8) Applicant to maintain the required licensure for CBRF use in this building at all times. No other occupancy type is permitted without prior review and approval by the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Voltz reviewed the updated architecture plans, stating the revised proposals better reflect existing architectural features immediately surrounding this new building with design elements like gable forms, clapboard siding, and double-hung windows. He also reiterated the finish on the store front should match the white double hung residential windows. As far as the

concern about height of the retaining wall, the applicant noted that they intend to landscape thoroughly along that wall with perennial grasses to soften the appearance.

Plan Commissioners discussed with representatives from Lasata, Carl Miller, and Andy Klimpel regarding the recommendations from the City Planner and the proposed 162 sq. ft. stalls vs the existing standard of 180 sq. ft. The Plan Commission would support a code change to reflect the more typical 9' x 18' stall size (162 sq. ft.), vs our current minimum standard 180 sq. ft. in area.

Action: The motion was made by Council Member Fitzpatrick, seconded by Commission Scholz to approve the Ozaukee County Lasata plan review in support of their Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and to add a new CBRF building/wing onto their existing campus subject to the Planner's recommended conditions and subject to the parking stalls being brought into compliance with the current code, and with the recommendation that the color of the storefront frames be consistent with the double-hung window color. The motion carried unanimously.

REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMON COUNCIL FOR REZONING (MAP CORRECTION) OF THE TWO PROPERTIES LOCATED AT W61 N506-510 WASHINGTON AVENUE, FROM EXISTING I-1 INSTITUTIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE DISTRICT WITH HPD HISTORIC PRESERVATION DISTRICT OVERLAY, TO B-3 CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT WITH HPD OVERLAY. THIS ITEM IS CITY INITIATED AS IT APPEARS TO BE AN ERROR IN THE MAPPING.

Planner Censky relayed a recent inquiry about the zoning district classification of one of these parcels and someone had requested a list of the permitted uses within that district. On close review of the Zoning Map (current and past editions), it was discovered that, despite these properties having been treated as B-3 Central Business District w/ HPD Historic Preservation District Overlay in past Plan Commission matters, these properties are mapped in the I-1 Institutional and Public Service District. It doesn't appear that either of these buildings was associated with the historic, adjoining I-1 use, Immanuel Lutheran Church. There is no record of these properties ever having been rezoned from I-1 to another district. The City's current Land Use Plan/Map classifies these properties as Commercial.

The Planner supports favorable recommendation of this rezoning to the Common Council as a matter of map correction. Doing so will comport with the Land Use Plan/Map classification of the properties. Further, it will correctly convey to current and prospective future owners of the properties – what are the permitted uses and related spatial/bulk restrictions.

Action: The motion was made by Council Member Fitzpatrick, seconded by Commission Arnett to recommend to the Common Council for rezoning of two properties located at W61 N506-510 Washington Avenue from existing I-1 Institutional and Public Service District with HPD Historic Preservation District Overlay, to B-3 Central Business District with HPD Overlay. The motion carried unanimously.

APPLICANT CRAIG CALIENDO, OWNER/DEVELOPER AND BUILDER OF THE STONE LAKE CONDOMINIUM PROJECT, REQUESTS APPROVAL FOR NON-SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE PUD REGARDING BUILDING SETBACKS FROM THE PUBLIC ROAD, AND THE ADDITION OF ONE MORE DOUBLE-FRONT-FACING-GARAGE TWIN HOME PLAN. APPLICANT IS ALSO SEEKING CLARIFICATION ON THE EXTENT DEVELOPER FLEXIBILITY AS TO THINGS LIKE BUILDING FOOTPRINT LOCATIONS, GARAGE STALL ADDITIONS, DECKS, AND PATIOS.

The Stone Lake Condominium project was approved with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay Zoning classification. Within this PUD, the specific plans and terms of approval, including some exceptions from the base zoning district (i.e., Rd-1 Two-Family Residential District) standards, are memorialized. [Section 13-1-69\(o\)\(3\) of the Code](#) states that “Any subsequent change or addition to the plans or uses shall first be submitted for approval to the city plan commission and if in the opinion of the city plan commission such change or addition constitutes a substantial alteration of the original plan, a public hearing before the city common council shall be required...”

The various component plans for this project were approved over the course of several meetings.

Architecture. In 2023, the architectural plans (and plan locations) for the various buildings that would be constructed in this condominium were reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission (see documents attached). The Castillion Model Double-Forward/Double-Front-Facing garage plan was limited to use only on buildings 9, 25, and 32 of the site plan. At this time, the applicant is requesting permission to use a Castillion Model Double-Forward/Double-Front-Facing garage plan for building 15 of the original site plan as well. This building was originally approved for a double-front-facing (not double-forward) Breton model.

Building Setbacks. On January 30, 2023 the Common Council approved reduction of the standard setback (i.e., 25’) for this development to 20’, “from the right-of-way of all streets”. Staff are planning to use the edge of pavement as synonymous with edge of right-of-way as to the private street. Along the public street, the applicant is requesting approval to use 25-foot setback from the back-of-curb which translates into a building setback of 12.5-feet from the back of the sidewalk. Staff would suggest that, if the Plan Commission favors this reduction in setback for the buildings along the public street, the buildings must be arranged in a manner that ensures there is adequate outdoor space (i.e., not less than 9-feet wide and 20-feet in length per vehicle) available to each unit to park at least two vehicles between the garage door and the street without encroaching upon the sidewalk.

Clarifications. The applicant (and Staff) also request clarification from the Plan Commission as to the extent of flexibility the developer has when it comes to final spatial location of the building footprints, the addition of extra garage stalls, decks, patios, sunrooms... and similar.

If the Plan Commission feels that the architectural plan changes for the building identified as 15 on the original site plan, together with the setback modification from the public street are

considered ‘non-substantial alterations’ to the approved plans, then a motion to approve or deny these requests would be appropriate at this time. If they are considered ‘substantial’ alterations to the approved plans, then a motion to recommend action to the Common Council would be appropriate at this time.

The Planner recommends the following conditions be considered for attachment to any approval(s) the Planning Commission may be inclined to make in this matter:

- 1) If the Plan Commission favors the proposed reduction in setback for the buildings along the public street (to 25-feet back from curb), the adjacent buildings must be arranged in a manner that ensures there is adequate outdoor space (i.e., not less than 9-feet wide and 20-feet in length per vehicle) available to each unit to park at least two vehicles between the garage door and the street without encroaching upon the sidewalk.

Planner Censky requested Plan Commission guidance as to staff review of the latest documents (building permit applications) coming through on this project. How much flexibility does the developer have in terms of building plans changes and building location adjustments. Planner Censky referred to the Condominium plat and past approvals, noting the specific house plans for each lot were proposed and approved and the building footprint locations were shown on the approved plat. Staff doesn’t know whether this is the exact outcome the Plan Commission was expecting or whether there is flexibility for the developer to adjust these things on a case-by-case basis as he submits for building permits.

Developer Craig Caliendo says he will provide a package with the site plan and current building plans for each unit as they go. He noted that they sell many of these units before construction, so the final configurations at specific sites will depend on pre-sales, while still adhering to the approved floor and site plans.

Commissioners felt the current plan differed significantly from the initially approved plan, expressing concern about unexpected changes. Commissioners emphasized the need for clear alignment on changes to the approved plans and plat. The Plan Commission wants to focus on final designs, especially garage placements, to avoid unexpected changes after lots are platted. Commissioners also expressed concerns regarding the increased size of some buildings and the reduction of green space.

The Plan Commission expressed significant concerns regarding multiple double front facing, garage-forward designs. Commissioners stipulated that garages doors should not dominate the street view. They had originally limited double front-facing, garage forward plans to just three units in the original plan: sites 9, 25, and 32. Now they also want permission to do this on site 15 (per the original site plan numbering). The applicant also requests approval for a 25-foot setback from the edge of pavement on the public road which he feels will better align with the 20-foot setback from the edge of pavement on the private road.

Action: The motion was made by Commissioner Strautmanis, seconded by Council Member Fitzpatrick, to approve the request for one additional double front facing, garage forward building to be constructed in the development on site 15 (per the original site plan numbering) and to

approve the limited flexibility as to final building footprint locations, building features (such as decks, porch, sunroom, extra garage stalls) as each building permit is applied for, subject to staff review and approval that the overall site still works as to eventual, cumulative building spacing, setbacks from roads and quarry, mass grading, utilities and to approve the request for 25-foot building setback from the back of curb of the public road provided such buildings are arranged in a manner that ensures there is adequate outdoor space (i.e., not less than 9-feet wide and 20-feet in length per vehicle) available to each unit to park at least two vehicles between the garage door and the street without encroaching upon the sidewalk. These changes are considered a non-substantial amendment to the PUD. The motion carried unanimously.

Council Member Fitzpatrick mentioned the units may need to have side entrance garages to provide this parking space.

REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION/RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMON COUNCIL TO AMEND TITLE 15, CHAPTER 5, SEC. 15-5-11(H) OF THE SIGN CODE AS MIGHT ALLOW PAINTING OF WALL SIGNS DIRECTLY UPON THE SURFACE OF A BUILDING IN THE B-3 CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT AND/OR THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY DISTRICT. THIS MATTER IS CITY INITIATED.

Presently, City Code Section 15-5-11(h) of the [Sign Code](#) lists “Painted wall signs which are painted directly on the surface of the building.” among the sign types that are prohibited City-wide.

The question was recently asked, should this prohibition continue to be applied quite so strictly within the City’s Central Business District and/or Washington Avenue Historic Preservation District, where such signs are thought to have been at least somewhat common in the past. On inquiry, the Plan Commission did, on February 3, 2025, consider and refer this matter to the Landmarks Commission for consideration and possible recommendation back to the Plan Commission.

On February 27, 2025, the Landmarks Commission considered the matter in concept. There was general support for this change provided, among other things, that no sign painting could be applied to masonry surfaces. At that meeting, Staff was requested to return with a draft of language that would enact this change.

On February 13, 2025, the Landmarks Commission reviewed a draft of proposed Code changes to effectuate this change and favorably recommended it to the Plan Commission. The DRAFT of changes is provided below:

City of Cedarburg Code of Ordinances Title 15, Chapter 5
Sec. 15-5-11 - Prohibited signs.

The following signs shall be prohibited within all zoning districts in the City of Cedarburg:

- (a)** Abandoned signs. See section 15-5-10.
- (b)** Flashing, alternating, rotating or swinging signs. Flashing, alternating, rotating or swinging

signs or devices, whether illuminated or not, visible from the public right-of-way.

...

(h) Painted wall signs*. Painted wall signs which are painted directly on the surface of the building.

***In the B-3 and/or Historic Preservation Overlay Zoning District, the Landmarks Commission may consider and approve signs painted directly on the surface of the building provided:**

- 1) Such signs (and any related lighting) shall be determined by the Landmarks Commission to be complimentary to the architectural style and character of the building, and suitable in the context of its surroundings, or they shall not be approved. Specific findings in support of any approval or denial shall be made by the Commission.**
- 2) Colors (including depth/richness of the color tone, and finish) and manner of application to the building surface are first reviewed and approved by the Landmarks Commission.**
- 3) Such signs shall attempt to emulate the local historic practice and style of painting sign content directly on the surface of a building.**
- 4) No sign shall be painted, in whole or part, directly upon any masonry building surface.**
- 5) Signs painted directly on the surface of a building shall be counted toward the cumulative maximum quantity and square footage of wall signs permitted on any given building or property.**
- 6) The area of a sign painted on the surface of a building shall be calculated as the smallest regular polygon that can be drawn around all lettering, wording and accompanying designs or symbols, together with any background of a different color than the natural color or finish material of the building.**
- 7) For signs painted directly on the surface of a building, a full color, scaled, and dimensioned, detailed graphic representation of the plan shall be submitted at the time of Sign Permit application. The Building Inspector shall refer all such applications to the Landmarks Commission for consideration and possible approval prior to issuing a Sign Permit.**
- 8) For the purposes of this specific section of the City Sign Code only, sign shall have the meaning "Any display which is used to advertise, identify, display, direct or attract attention to an object, person, institution, organization, business, brand, product, service, event, or location including words, letters, figures, designs, symbols, colors, or illumination".**
- 9) Any sign approved to be painted directly on to the surface of a building shall use materials and methods of application that are non-destructive to the surface of the building wall.**

Commissioner Strautmanis is concerned regarding this proposal because it sounds like the intent is to create these historic murals or painted signs on the walls. However, he worries about the possibility of a painted plywood sign being used instead saying "It feels like it could just become part of the building in a way that's not appealing. This does have the potential to look cheap." Which brings up the issue of allowing signs to be painted directly on the surface of the building.

If you look downtown, Commissioner Strautmanis thinks some people have circumvented this by using panels that resemble the wall and then placing the signs on those.

Commissioner Strautmanis asked Planner Censky if the City is allowed to control content. Planner Censky confirmed that Plan Commission and Landmarks Commission can prohibit “off-premises” signs. The City can also prohibit vulgarity and profanity, but other than those aspects, sign content cannot be controlled.

Planner Censky said there is a provision in the sign code stating that all signs must be maintained in sound condition.

Commissioner Strautmanis also mentioned that part of our sign code allows window decals, but when the City allows a lot of decals in the historic district, it feels inconsistent with the architectural character of the area. He believes that it must have been approved by the Landmarks Commission, but feels it detracts from the quality/character expected in the historic district. Planner Censky stated it’s often a question of whether it complies with the sign code. The sign code states that you can have up to 25% of a window covered with window signage, and in some buildings, that leads to a lot of decals.

Commissioner Arnett believes there are too many unanswered questions. For example, the idea of using a piece of plywood, fastening it to the building, and calling it a sign seems problematic.

Commissioner Voltz noted he worked with a property owner in Cedarburg on rehabilitating their property and went through the Landmarks and Plan Commissions. As an aside, the client asked about signage and was directed to the sign code. Commissioner Voltz asked Planner Censky if painted signs could be permitted, and she said no, as they are specifically prohibited by the sign code. He found this surprising, especially in Cedarburg, where we have existing examples of painted signs, like the one on the Washington House Inn. Another painted sign on the gallery building was recently revealed and is being preserved as a part of the history of that building and the community. These signs are/were a part of our history and reflect how signage was created in the past. Commissioner Voltz doesn’t believe we should prohibit them.

Council Member Fitzpatrick doesn’t have a negative view of the concept but thinks the City hasn’t worked out all the details. There are many regulations to consider. If you look at what is required to get past the Landmarks Commission, you won’t see a cheap piece of plywood with someone spray-painting "For Sale" on it. There are significant layers to this process, and while we cannot limit content, we still expect a well-crafted sign.

It’s believed that the requirement for approval by the Landmarks Commission addresses many of the concerns regarding signage. If a sign does not meet their standards, it simply won’t be approved. The city needs to consider any “what-if” scenarios, as any proposed signage must go through the Landmarks Commission for review, ensuring we avoid problematic signs.

Commissioner Strautmanis is in favor of allowing painted signs. His only question is: If a Site and Architectural Review Board is established in the future, will they also review signage?

Planner Censky mentioned currently, signage only goes through building inspection, except signs located in the Washington Avenue Historic District where all signs must be reviewed/approved by the Landmarks Commission, which is quite clear.

The motion was made by Commissioner Bublitz, seconded by Mayor Thome, supporting the changes in language as presented in the packet and adding an item 10 requiring a signature from the building owner on any application for a sign to be painted on a building. The motion was carried with Council Member Fitzpatrick, Commissioner Voltz, Bublitz, Scholz, and Mayor Thome voting aye. Commissioner Arnett and Commissioner Strautmanis voting nay.

REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE SMART GROWTH COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN UPDATE INCLUDING:

- **CHAPTER 8 – THE LAND USE ELEMENT.**
 - **TWELVE SMART GROWTH AREAS (SGA’S).**

The Plan Commission felt it was too late in the evening to start on this topic. A special meeting of the Plan Commission to go over the Smart Growth Areas was scheduled for March 18, 2024 at 6:00 PM.

COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PLAN COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Scholz thanked the Mayor for having Dr. Clark from the Cedarburg School District speak tonight regarding the Community Growth and Projections Report. Commissioner Strautmanis was surprised by the reported low number of students associated with multifamily housing as if there would be no kids impacted at all. Commissioner Arnett defined the definition of multifamily housing to include senior living and condos, which means it covers everything except single-family homes.

MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS - NONE

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Arnett, seconded by Commissioner Bublitz, to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Theresa Hanaman
Administrative Assistant