



**CITY OF CEDARBURG  
Site and Architectural Review Board  
December 23, 2025  
Minutes**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Adam Voltz called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

- A. Council Member Kristin Burkart, Chairman Architect Adam Voltz, Plan Commission Co-Chairperson Jack Arnett, Architect Peter Damsgaard, Architect Paul Rushing

Also Present – City Planner Mary Censky, Administrative Assistant Theresa Hanaman, City Administrator Hilvo, and Mayor Thome

3. STATEMENT OF PUBLIC NOTICE

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

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. November 18, 2025

Council member Burkart made a motion, seconded by Co-Chairperson Jack Arnett, to approve the meeting minutes from November 18, 2025. The motion carried unanimously.

Architect Rushing requested an amendment to these minutes regarding the regular business, item D, Neumann Development, Inc. to include that he is in support and the applicant should more closely apply design principles that support and express walkability, connectivity, and a traditional neighborhood structure. The hierarchy of spaces and streets, a wider range of house designs, and more extensive integration of usable green space. He added that the applicant agreed to work directly with SARB to

do so.

5. REGULAR BUSINESS; AND ACTION THEREON

- A. Applicant Rebekah Luedcke, d/b/a A Geek Boutique, requests favorable recommendation to the Plan Commission of the site plan related to her proposed outdoor recreation/entertainment use in the side yard of her business located at W63 N633A Washington Avenue. This property, owned by Collins Investments LLC, is zoned part B-3 Central Business District, and part B-3 with HPD Historic Preservation Overlay District.

Planner Censky reported the applicant seeks Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approval to place a picnic table seating area in the side yard of their building in support of their A Geek Boutique gifts and games store. They also propose to erect a temporary tent(s) in this area from time to time to shelter certain of their planned events/activities.

Co-Chairperson Arnett asked about the type of pop-up tent the applicant intends to use and clarified that the tent(s) will not be erected for extended periods or year-round.

Architect Damsgaard suggested the applicant be required to display a sign(s) indicating that alcoholic beverages are not allowed in this yard/seating area.

**ACTION:**

Architect Damsgaard made a motion, seconded by Council member Burkart to send a favorable recommendation to the Plan Commission, to approve the applicants request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) as presented, subject to the conditions as written in the DRAFT CUP (see packet) and subject to the following additional conditions:

- 1) The applicant must display a sign indicating that alcoholic beverages in this yard/seating area are
- 2) The CUP must be fully executed and recorded prior to the start of the outdoor recreation/entertainment use at the site
- 3) Review and concurring recommendation for approval by the Landmarks Commission as to the specific style, size, type, and location of the tent, tables, and any related planters proposed to be placed in the HPD Historic Preservation Overlay zoning district portion of this site (i.e., any portion lying within 125-feet of the west edge of the Washington Avenue right-of-way) in support of this outdoor recreation/entertainment use, prior to signing and recording the CUP.

The motion carried unanimously.

- B. Applicant Glen at Quarry Park LLC, in c/o Joe Orendorf of Cornerstone Development, requests review, discussion, and favorable recommendation to the Plan Commission regarding the proposed architectural design strategies, covenants, and restrictions for homes to be constructed in their recently approved 24-lot single-family residential neighborhood, Quarry Park, proposed for development on 11.5 acres of vacant land located directly west of the properties located at 1067 and 1085 Washington Avenue. This property was

recently conditionally rezoned to Rs-3 Single-Family Residential w/ PUD Planned Unit Development Overlay.

Planner Censky went through the applicant's proposed private covenants and restrictions that will apply to their recently conditionally approved 24-lot single-family residential subdivision known as Quarry Park.

Board members considered whether the proposed restrictions effectively support the spirit, intent, purpose, principles, and standards outlined in both the City's Code and the Comprehensive Plan. They want to ensure that the regulations align with the community's vision for development.

During the discussion, Architect Rushing, along with Co-Chairperson Arnett, sought clarification on the specifications and guidelines regarding the street trees. Architect Rushing's inquiry focused on understanding the space between the back of the curb and the sidewalk. Planner Censky confirmed that the trees are designated as public city street trees. Architect Rushing then requested clarification on the size of the tree terrace and its placement, ensuring that the terrace is wide enough. Co-Chairperson Arnett also asked for clarification on Section 4.21, Paragraph C, specifically regarding the last sentence: "The lot owner shall be responsible for maintaining and replacing all street trees on their lot." and requested that this sentence be removed.

The applicant, Joe Orendorf, is requesting direction on architectural review going forward.

Council Member Burkart voiced an interest in preventing architectural monotony across proposed designs.

Architect Damsgaard raised a concern regarding Section 4.4, which mandates the inclusion of attached garages in residential designs. He requested that the language be clarified, particularly in terms of design expectations and any potential flexibility to accommodate variations that might better suit individual properties.

Additionally, Architect Rushing expressed opposition to the concept of canted garages, arguing that they disrupt the architectural harmony of the neighborhood. He urged board members to give this issue careful consideration, emphasizing the need for cohesive design elements that enhance the character of the community.

Mayor Thome requested clarification from the architects on the SARB regarding canted garages. Architect Damsgaard expressed that he is not fundamentally opposed to canted garages, as they can fit well within the neighborhood; however, the goal is to ensure that they harmonize with the overall aesthetic, contributing to a solid street facade. Chairperson Voltz agreed with Architect Damsgaard's perspective, emphasizing the objective of creating a pedestrian-friendly, walkable community that fosters front porch engagement, while allowing for flexibility in garage designs.

**ACTION:**

This was a Discussion and Feedback item only. No action was taken.

- C. Applicant, Kate Schley, d/b/a Coach House Homes, requests favorable recommendation to the Plan Commission for Planned Unit Development Overlay rezoning based upon the revised concept presented for a seven lot/home single-family-detached residential infill development proposed for the properties located at W59 N367 Hilbert Avenue & W61 N394 Washington Avenue. This 1.78-acre site, owned by Wendell Lee LLC in c/o Paula Motte, is zoned Rs-5 Single-Family Residential.

Planner Censky reported that the applicant has revised the plan for a seven-lot, single-family detached residential Planned Unit Development (PUD), now called Eden Preserve. The updated plan still includes a private cul-de-sac street with curb, gutter, and sidewalks leading from Hilbert Avenue. However, communal entrance features, such as a fountain, pergola, and community building, have been removed, and there are no longer plans for a pedestrian walkway extending out to Washington Avenue. The project has been renamed to Eden Preserve.

In contrast to the original plan, each lot boundary now extends to the centerline of the private road, resulting in larger lot sizes. A concern of staff is who will draft and approve the necessary easements for access to the road, sidewalks, and public utilities that will run beneath the drive. This setup will also mean that any required streetlights or trees will be placed on the private lots.

With these larger lot sizes, the proposed floor area ratios (FAR) now comply with the maximum allowed in the Rs-5 district (36%), whereas most lots exceeded the FAR in the original plan. Proposed home sizes will range from 2,450 to 3,700 square feet, including attached garages. Each home will be custom-designed. Detailed architectural standards have not yet been provided. The applicant agrees to include, as a condition of the PUD, that each new home proposed to be constructed in this neighborhood would be subject to review and approval as for an "infill lot", prior to issuance of a building permit.

The proposed building setbacks are: front 25 feet (measured from behind the sidewalk), side setbacks of 4 feet, and rear setbacks of 15 feet for Lots 1-4 and 6-7, and 25 feet for Lot 5.

The applicant represents in their plan data table that all lots will fully comply with the Rs-5 maximum lot coverage ratio (i.e., the total footprint area of all structures on the lot/lot area) of 30%.

In the Rs-5 zoning district, the minimum lot size is 8,400 sq. ft. and 50 feet in width. The new plan proposes lot sizes ranging from 9,788 to 11,902 sq. ft., compared to the original plan's 6,300 to 11,000 sq. ft. Similar to the previous plan, none of the new lots will have the required 30 feet of frontage on a public street, though this can be waived by the Plan Commission per Section 14-1-90 of the Code.

As this time, Planner Censky does not recommend in favor of the requested rezoning as certain critical details remain to be presented in full form such as, but not necessarily limited to, the preliminary plat and the proposed architectural covenants and restrictions for the neighborhood. She would support clear feedback to the applicant and for the record as to the following specific requests of the applicant for relief from the Rs-5 District standards as follows:

1)Rear yard setbacks on Lots 1-4 & 6-7 of 15 feet vs 25 feet as required by Code.

A clear recommendation is also requested pertaining to the extension of lot lines to the center of the road vs having the private street/sidewalk situated in an Outlot as was originally proposed. The Planning, Engineering and Utility staff are all wary of this approach without specific legal guidance to support it. If an Outlot solution is used, the lot sizes might all require PUD exceptions.

Other conditions recommended for your consideration include:

- Applicant must supply and receive approval of the fully detailed preliminary plat submittal as a prerequisite to obtaining a favorable recommendation for PUD rezoning.
- Applicant must supply and receive approval of the fully detailed architectural covenants and restrictions as a prerequisite to obtaining a favorable recommendation for PUD rezoning.
- Applicant will be required, as a condition of PUD rezoning, to:
  - Secure the approval of plans including, but not necessarily limited to, grading, drainage, erosion control, stormwater management, utilities, street trees, and street lighting, from the City Staff such as Engineering & Public Works, Light & Water, Fire Department, and Building Inspections.
  - Enter into a Development Agreement with the City for the construction of all required improvements.
  - Present a final plat, consistent with the preliminary approval, for approval by the Plan Commission and Common Council prior to issuance of any building permits or sale of any lots in the subdivision.

Council member Burkart opposes the extension of lot lines to the center line and rear yard setback reductions. She feels that the houses are just too large for the proposed lots and the neighborhood.

Chairperson Voltz noted that the current floor area ratio (FAR) in the neighborhood ranges from 0.21 to 0.34. Under the current proposal for Eden Preserve, the FAR would increase to approximately 0.35

Architect Damsgaard and Co-Chairperson Arnett support the proposed 15-foot setbacks.

Architect Rushing disagrees with the housing layout, stating that it should follow a more rectilinear pattern/orientation.

**ACTION:**

Architect Damsgaard made a motion, seconded by Architect Rushing, to not support the rezoning request at this time for lack of an actual preliminary plat and/or covenants and restrictions, but to give favorable feedback on the presented plan to the Plan Commission as follows: allowing the rear yard setbacks as shown and having the lot lines to the center of the private drive. Additionally, it will include the Planner's

recommendations noted above.

Architect Rushing made a motion to amend the original motion to include narrowing the 25 ft. rear setback, enlarging the cul-de-sac and circle in the center, turning the homes, having sidewalks on both sides of the street, detaching the garages, aligning the porches, and making the homes straight with the street. The motion died for lack of a second.

Council member Burkart made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Voltz to amend the original motion to keep the 25 ft front setback for the principal structure (measure from back of sidewalk), and require a 25 ft rear yard setback for the principal structure for every lot, and to include that every proposed new home will be subject to review and approval as for an infill lot with site and architectural plan review to the Site and Architectural Review Board and Plan Commission as part of the PUD. Voltz, Burkart, Rushing, and Damsgaard in favor. Co-Chairperson Arnett opposed.

Co-Chairperson Arnett made a motion, seconded by Council member Burkart to amend the amended motion to allow lots 1, 3, and 7 to have rear setback 15 ft. instead of 25 ft. and 2,4, 5, and 6 to have rear setback 25-feet. The motion carried unanimously. The original motion as successfully amended passed. Voltz, Burkart, Arnett, Damsgaard, in favor. Rushing opposed with specific emphasis that the infill plan as submitted does not adequately reflect the existing character of the surrounding neighborhood as prescribed by Cedarburg Architectural review principles, standards, and procedures.

- D. Applicant Lakeside Development Company, in c/o Brian Scheive, requests concept review, discussion and feedback on their plans to clear and redevelop the 3.04-acre property located at W66 N622 Madison Avenue, into a sixteen unit single-family detached 'front porch' neighborhood. This M-1 Limited Manufacturing District zoned property is owned by Oak Gap Madison Avenue LLC.

Planner Censky introduced the concept plan of a 16 lot/home single-family-detached residential Planned Unit Development for this site. Eight front-porch forward homes would face both Madison Avenue and St. John Avenue, each with an attached garage that is set toward the rear of the lot. Garage access would be via a 20'-wide private alleyway running between/behind the homes, extending from Cleveland Street to the north and a proposed new extension of Victoria Court to the south. Lot lines for each lot run to the center of the private alley. Planner Censky is concerned with this approach (vs having the alley as an outlot) questioning who will write, review and approve the critical easements needed from each individual owner, granting to each other owner, the public, the City,... pedestrian and driving access over the alley, and access to the City for service/repair/replacement of the public utilities such as sewer and water that might lie beneath the private alley.

The proposed extension of Victoria Court by the applicant will require that they secure a small portion of land from the owner of the lot to the south, owned by Brunswick Corporation, in c/o Mercury Marine.

The Rs-5 Single-Family Residential Zoning District is among the districts considered to comport with the Medium Density Residential Land Use Classification of this site.

Co-Chairperson Arnett is in favor of the setbacks. Council member Burkart is pleased with the unique developments and is okay with the density and lot sizes including calculating them to the center of the alley.

Architect Rushing said it is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, a little monotonous as to the architectural designs. He suggested that some of the homes include a bonus room over the garage. He also suggested flipping the homes, so some garages are next to each other. He was in favor of the front porches forward as presented.

**ACTION:**

Council member Burkart made a motion, seconded by Architect Rushing to send a favorable recommendation to Plan Commission for concept approval to rezone this site from existing M-1 Limited Manufacturing to Rs-5 with a Planned Unit Development Overlay (PUD) and to include the following exceptions:

Relief from the basic standards of the Rs-5 district are requested as follows:

- Maximum density permitted (using 3.04 acres) = 15.86 Proposed density = 16
- Minimum required lot size = 8,400 sq.ft. Proposed lots = 7,900 sq.ft.(With lot area measured to the centerline of the alley)

The applicant represents in their narrative and concept site plan that all lots will fully comply with the other standards of the Rs-5 district including as to, for instance:

- Maximum floor area ratio (i.e., the total square footage of all buildings on the lot/lot area) of 36%
- Maximum lot coverage ratio (i.e., the total footprint area of all structures on the lot/lot area) of 30%;
- Minimum required lot width of 50 feet.
- Front building setback of 25 feet.
- Side setbacks of 4 feet.
- Rear setbacks of 25 feet.\* (\*Note that these setbacks are being calculated from the centerline of the alley).

The motion carried unanimously.

- E. Review, discussion and possible action/recommendation to the Plan Commission for Code updates to modify/expand upon the standards as set forth in Title 13 Zoning Code, Chapter 1 Zoning Code, Article F. Site Plan and Architectural Review.

Architect Damsaard requested clarification regarding flat roofs in residential

neighborhoods and suggested this be added for future zoning details.

Council member Burkhardt expressed a desire for the requirement regarding the repetition of identical elevations within 500 feet to be expanded. She feels that the current regulation allows for too much monotony, similar to what was seen in Fairway Village. While she doesn't want to impose excessive restrictions, she believes there should be more variety than every five houses.

Joe Orendorf from Cornerstone asked about the scope of the ordinance, specifically whether it is limited to certain areas or if it applies more broadly. He requested clarification regarding new construction, remodeling, and transitions on new homes, using stone as an example to illustrate where the guidelines begin and end.

Council member Burkart responded that this code pertains to residential properties.

Planner Censky clarified that the code will apply to all infill lots that go through the Site and Architectural Review Board (SARB) and the Plan Commission. It also assists the city in evaluating covenants and restrictions for new developments.

Architect Rushing requests the Board continue to study the ordinance to bring it back and discuss.

**ACTION:**

This was a Discussion and Feedback item only. No action was taken.

**6. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SITE AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS**

NONE

**7. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

NONE

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

City of Cedarburg is an affirmative action and equal opportunity employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, veteran status, or genetic information.

City of Cedarburg is committed to providing access, equal opportunity and reasonable accommodation for individuals with disabilities in employment, its services, programs, and activities. To request reasonable accommodation, contact the Clerk's Office, (262) 375-7606, email: [cityhall@cityofcedarburg.wi.gov](mailto:cityhall@cityofcedarburg.wi.gov).

**MEMBERS – PLEASE NOTIFY CITY PLANNER'S OFFICE IF UNABLE TO ATTEND THIS MEETING.**

A motion was made by Council member Burkart, seconded by Co-Chairperson Arnett, to adjourn the meeting at 11:36 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Theresa Hanaman  
Administrative Assistant

[MIN\_SIGNATURES]