

Zoning Board of Appeals Agenda
May 19, 2026
Reedsburg City Hall Council Chambers
12:00 PM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMON COUNCIL MAY ATTEND THIS MEETING TO GATHER INFORMATION ABOUT A SUBJECT OVER WHICH THE COMMON COUNCIL HAS DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY. IF A QUORUM OF THE COMMON COUNCIL ATTENDS THIS MEETING, NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN BY THE COMMON COUNCIL AT THIS MEETING.

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

I. APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING HELD ON APRIL 30, 2026:

THE COMMITTEE WILL RECEIVE INFORMATION ON NON-AGENDA TOPICS BROUGHT BEFORE THE COMMITTEE BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. THE COMMITTEE WILL NOT DISCUSS THESE TOPICS, AND WILL NOT TAKE ACTION ON ANY OF THEM AT THIS MEETING

I. GENERAL BUSINESS:

- A. Consider a 2' front setback zoning variance request from the 20' front building setback requirement per §690 Schedule 1 for proposed garage addition – 600 Mary Ave; Parcel #276-0194-00000 – William Ganem & Sarah Pittz
- B. Consider electing Chairperson

II. ADJOURN:



The City of Reedsburg does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admissions or access to, or treatment of or employment in, its programs or activities. Disability-related aids or services, including printed information in alternate formats, to enable persons with disabilities to participate in public meetings and programs are available by calling (608) 524-6404. To be able to meet the needs of a request for a different format contact the City Clerk-Treasurer at 134 S. Locust Street, Reedsburg, WI at least 48 hours prior to the commencement of the meeting so that any necessary arrangements can be made to accommodate each request.

City of Reedsburg
Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes
April 30, 2026

Present: Walter Luepke, Richard Braun, Jesse Arias and Jerry Zuhlke
Absent:
Others: Max Buckner, Brian Duvall

Brian Duvall called the meeting to order at 12:00 PM.

Motion by Luepke, seconded by Zuhlke to approve the minutes from the February 17, 2026, meeting.

Motion approved 4-0

Consider a zoning variance request for the 25' front building setback per §690 Schedule 3 and for the 10' parking setback per § 690-64(B) for new building additions and tanks at Foremost Farms USA- Reedsburg Plant – 633 Booster Blvd; Parcel #276-1140-00000 – Excel Engineering – Eric Drazkowski, P.E.

Duvall reviewed the proposal, which if approved, would be the first step in the process. They would still need Plan Commission review and a city easement agreement.

Lisa Zelt, Foremost plant manager, stated that this project would minimize impacts, and that they would work with the city as needed. Other Foremost reps included Robert Mitcham, Eric VandenHeuvel, and Jim DeSonia. Katherine Hamblett stated that they moved there in 1948 when the plant was a smaller operation. The trucks have increased in size and usage. She questioned the 5th truck bay and if expansion would occur to the east. She is concerned with continued truck traffic and horn blowing, as well as past attitudes of truck drivers. The current boilers have been noisier lately.

Discussion was held on the number of truck bays going from 8 to 5.

Pat Warn stated that he has lived there since 1974, and that he drives trucks and has seen the traffic patterns in the area. He stated concerns about expansion, flooding, truck parking, and noise.

Misty Baker expressed concerns about access to the neighborhood from trucks and construction. She stated she bought her house two years ago and criticized the vibrations.

Zelt responded that access will remain on Booster and that the proposed project would mitigate many of the neighbors' concerns. She stated that they met with the fire dept, use no rail, trucks would not have to wait as long to load/unload, trucking would be more during daylight hours, more effective schedules, no new noise or vibrations, and 11 tanks would be decommissioned with 9 new installed.

Braun asked about future milk production, which they receive consistently but would be better able to handle the spikes. Arias stated that his first house was in an airport and railroad area and had to live with the impacts, as he knew this going into it. Buckner stated that this was a good investment that would help mitigate the concerns.

Motion by Braun, seconded by Luepke to approve the variance request as presented.

Motion approved 4-0

Motion by Arias, seconded by Zuhlke to adjourn at 12:59 pm.

Motion approved 4-0

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Duvall
Zoning Administrator

City of Reedsburg Land Use Application

134 S. Locust St.
PO Box 490
Reedsburg, WI 53959

Ph: 608-524-6404
bduvalle@reedsburgwi.gov

APPLICANT: William Ganem & Sarah Pittz

ADDRESS: 600 Mary Ave **CITY:** Reedsburg **STATE:** WI

ZIP: 53959 **PHONE:** 608-██████████ **PARCEL #:** 276-0194

E-MAIL: ██████████

PROPERTY OWNER: (if different from Applicant) _____

LOCATION: (if different from address above) _____

LAND USE REQUEST

(Please describe one or more as applicable – attach extra pages/maps if necessary)

Certified Survey Map (CSM): _____

Conditional Use Permit: _____

For *CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT* requests, also answer "A, B & C" on back page.

Preliminary Plat: _____ **Final Plat:** _____ **Name of Plat:** _____

Rezoning - From: _____ **To:** _____

Site Plan Review: (See "B & C" on back page) _____

Zoning Appeal / Interpretation: _____

Zoning Variance: Side yard setback encroachment of 2 feet in an R-2 district

For *VARIANCE* requests, also answer "D" on back page.

Other or Annexation: _____

AFFIDAVIT

I certify that the information and plans submitted are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also give permission to City zoning officials to enter my property for inspection purposes and for a temporary Zoning sign to be placed in my yard prior to the meeting.

Sarah Pittz 5/1/26
Applicant Signature / Date

Sarah Pittz 5/1/26
Owner Signature / Date

Account #10-461500-00

**The applicant or representative
MUST ATTEND the meeting(s).**

/Users/sarahpittz/Desktop/Land_Use_Appl.doc

Cond Use Permit	\$200	_____
Cond Use-Agriculture	\$400	_____
Variance	\$125	<u>X</u>
Rezoning	\$200	_____
C.S.M.	\$175	_____
Subdivision Plat	\$610	_____
- w/ Stormwater Plan	\$100	_____
Site Plan Review	\$175	_____
Annexation	\$200	_____
Plan Amend	\$200	_____
Date Paid	<u>5-1-2026</u>	
Receipt #	<u>1.00069417</u>	

Staff Report

DATE OF MEETING: May 19, 2026 – 12:00 pm

APPLICANT: William Ganem & Sarah Pittz

LOCATION: 600 Mary Ave; Parcel #276-0194-00000

ZONING: R-2 Residential

PROPOSED LAND USE REQUEST: Zoning Variance

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY/IMPROVEMENTS: Consider a 2' front setback zoning variance request from the 20' front building setback requirement per §690 Schedule 1 for proposed garage addition.

General Findings

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

- North – Residential
- West – Residential
- South – Residential
- East – Residential

ZONING:

- North – R-2 Residential
- West – R-2 Residential
- South – R-2 Residential
- East – R-2 Residential

TOPOGRAPHY: Slopes up to east

STREET R.O.W./TRAFFIC/ACCESS: Mary Ave & Myrtle St; 66' ROW

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS/CONDITIONS: None known

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: Low-density residential

COMMENTS

ADMINISTRATOR:

AMBULANCE:

FIRE:

POLICE:

PUBLIC WORKS:

SCHOOL:

UTILITIES:

OTHER:

Variance Findings – § 690-12(B)

- 1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest.**
- 2. Substantial justice will be done by granting the variance.**
- 3. The variance is needed so that the spirit of the ordinance is observed.**
- 4. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of the zoning ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship.**
 - a. The Board finds that the parcel is zoned R-2 Residential.
 - b. The Board finds that the existing parcel contains a single-family house with attached garage.
 - c. The Board finds that §690 Schedule 1 requires a 20’ front lot line setback for a corner lot.
 - d. The Board finds that the applicant proposes an 18’ front setback for a garage addition.
 - e. The Board finds that the proposed addition would come out 6’10” towards Mary Ave.
 - f. The Board finds that the lot is on the corner of Mary Ave and Myrtle St; the proposed addition is on Mary Ave.
 - g. The Board finds that the lot size is about 27, 600 SF.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Variances are normally for land hardships, not personal ones. However there is case law on granting such variances too. And Reedsburg’s zoning ordinance does not address the combination of zoning and disabilities as another option other than a variance.

Exhibit List

- A. City of Reedsburg Comprehensive Plan
- B. Zoning Ordinance, City of Reedsburg, Wisconsin
- C. May 19, 2026, ZBA Agenda
- D. Land Use Change Application
- E. Staff Report
- F. Notice of Public Meeting

Variance Application – Side Yard Setback Encroachment

Property Owner(s): William Ganem & Sarah Pittz

Property Address: 600 Mary Avenue

Parcel Number: [Parcel Number]

Municipality: Reedsburg, WI

05.01.2026

To the Zoning Board of Appeals:

We respectfully submit this application for a variance to allow a two-foot encroachment into the required 20-foot side yard setback as part of a garage reconstruction project at the above-referenced property. The proposed modification would result in an 18-foot side yard setback for a small portion of the garage structure. This encroachment does not extend the full length of the setback; it is triangular in shape and diminishes over a 4-foot distance along the right-of-way.

The purpose of this request is to improve the functionality and safety of our existing garage. The current structure is significantly undersized for modern vehicles and does not provide adequate space for safe ingress and egress. This limitation presents a particular hardship for our household due to a physical disability.

William Ganem, owner of the property, has a prosthetic leg due to combat-related injuries incurred in Iraq in 2004. Since purchasing this property in 2009, he has never once parked his vehicle inside the garage due to its limited width. For people with one (or multiple) prosthetic legs, the vehicle door needs to be all the way open in order to safely ingress and egress. The existing garage is not wide enough to accommodate the distance needed for this to occur. During winter months, icy conditions while parking outside have led to multiple falls for William when exiting the vehicle, including incidents where he has fallen underneath the truck due to stepping out onto ice. This represents a significant and ongoing safety concern and is the reason for reconstructing the garage at a wider width. While the footprint of the proposed structure is in the same location as the existing one, the additional width required to accommodate safe use of the structure encroaches into the side-yard setback requirement.

Importantly, the location of the proposed encroachment is along the side of our property that abuts a public street (Mary Avenue) on a corner lot. As such, the requested variance does not reduce spacing between neighboring structures or impact adjacent residential properties.

Findings in Support of the Variance

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest.

Granting this variance will not be contrary to the public interest. The proposed two-foot encroachment is minimal and occurs along a street-facing side yard on a corner lot, not along a shared property line with a neighboring residence. Therefore, it does not affect the proximity of structures, privacy, or access for neighboring properties.

Additionally, the improvement enhances safety by allowing a second vehicle to be parked inside the garage, reducing the risk of winter-related injuries associated with outdoor parking. The project will maintain the overall character of the neighborhood and will not negatively impact traffic visibility, drainage, or public infrastructure.

2. Substantial justice will be done by granting the variance.

Granting the variance achieves substantial justice by allowing reasonable and safe use of the property while imposing no measurable harm on others. Because the encroachment is along a street rather than toward a neighboring property, there is no adverse impact to adjacent landowners.

At the same time, denial of the variance would continue to create a disproportionate burden on our household due to mobility limitations. Approving the request ensures equitable consideration of a legitimate safety and accessibility need.

3. The variance is needed so that the spirit of the ordinance is observed.

The intent of the side yard setback ordinance is to preserve adequate space between structures, protect access to light and air, and maintain neighborhood compatibility. The proposed encroachment does not conflict with these objectives, as it does not reduce spacing between buildings on neighboring properties.

Because the encroachment is adjacent to a public street, the essential purposes of the ordinance remain fully intact. The variance therefore upholds the spirit of the zoning code while allowing a practical and safe improvement to the property.

4. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the zoning ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship.

Strict enforcement of the 20-foot setback creates an unnecessary hardship due to unique conditions affecting this property and household. The existing garage is too narrow to allow adequate parking of two modern vehicles with room to fully open vehicle doors, which is necessary for safe entry and exit for an individual with a prosthetic leg. As a result, the garage cannot be safely used for its intended purpose, forcing outdoor parking year-round.

The requested two-foot variance is the minimum necessary to alleviate this hardship and allow safe, functional use of the garage. The corner lot condition—where the encroachment faces a public street rather than a neighboring structure—further distinguishes this as a unique situation warranting relief.

Conclusion

We respectfully request approval of this variance to allow a two-foot encroachment into the side yard setback along Mary Avenue. The request is modest in scope, does not impact neighboring properties, and is necessary to ensure safe and practical use of the garage given the

circumstances described. We appreciate your time and consideration and are happy to provide any additional information, if required.

Sincerely,
William Ganem & Sarah Pittz

View of existing side yard adjacent to Mary Ave, looking west towards intersection of Myrtle St. & Mary Ave. Includes existing garage and pink stake for location of new extent of garage. The northeast corner of new garage structure is 18' from the sidewalk, but the garage sits at an angle, so most of the length of the garage will not encroach within the sideyard setback.



View looking south at garage and driveway from sidewalk adjacent to Mary Avenue. Depicts no nearby property owners near northeast corner of garage. Nearest pink stake is property line; pink stake in background is 18' away.

