

VILLAGE OF CALEDONIA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Village Hall, 5043 Chester Lane, Racine, WI 53402

Tuesday, September 30, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

1. Meeting called to order

Chairperson Kuemmel called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Roll Call: Board Members in attendance: Rosanne Kuemmel, Joan Rennert, Richard Mielke, John Barnes. Board members excused: Jacob Lovdahl, Ron Bocciardi.

Staff Present: Development Director Peter Wagner, Planner/Zoning Administrator Natalia Nery de Farias.

3A. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Rennert to accept the minutes of July 29, 2025. **Seconded by Barnes.** Motion carried unanimously.

4A. Public Hearing. Kuemmel read the variance request and the meeting process.

Public Hearing

Todd Dombrowski
12900 Northwestern Avenue
Franksville, WI 53126

Requesting variances from Section 16-10-3(a)(1): Area of Accessory Structures, and Section 16-10-3(a)(3): Height of Accessory Structures, to allow for the construction of a 36' x 44' accessory building, 1584 square feet in area and approximately 20 feet in height.

Kuemmel opened the Public Hearing portion of the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

Natalia Nery de Farias swore in appellant Todd Dombrowski, 12900 Northwestern Avenue, Franksville, WI 53126.

Dombrowski explained the request for a variance. He explained that the building is needed at the proposed dimensions to accommodate his belongings, which are currently stored outside on his property. A taller garage door is also needed due to the height of some of the items.

The Board asked the applicant if he had additional testimony to provide regarding his reasoning for the variance request. The applicant stated that he was unaware newer regulations were in place and that, under previous regulations, his parcel was allowed larger buildings.

Kuemmel asked three times if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the variance.

In favor: Cynthia Dombrowski, 12900 Northwestern Avenue, Franksville, WI 53126.

Mrs. Dombrowski added that their belongings, currently stored outside, are deteriorating over time and that a larger building would help preserve them.

In favor: Ruth Madson, 12633 Adams Road, Franksville, WI 53126.

Madson stated that her property abuts the applicant's along the west line and that they have had a

good relationship so far.

Kuemmel asked three times if anyone wanted to speak in opposition to the variance.

Against: None.

Kuemmel asked if the Zoning Administrator wanted to provide any testimony. The Zoning Administrator stated no. Kuemmel asked if the applicant wanted to provide additional testimony. The applicant stated no. Kuemmel asked the Board if they had any questions for staff or the applicant regarding the case.

The Board reminded the applicant that there is a set of criteria to be met for granting variances and asked if he had received instructions from staff on these criteria. Dombrowski replied that he had. Staff further explained the criteria and appeals procedure to the applicant.

The Board asked about the items the applicant is currently storing outside on his property. The applicant explained that he has expensive work equipment and boats. Staff and the Board reminded the applicant that economic hardship alone is not sufficient for granting variances. The applicant then added that the proposed building would not negatively impact his neighbors. Madson agreed.

Madson further stated that, regarding exceptional circumstances, the applicant's equipment is used for his work. Concerning preservation of property rights, she argued that the proposed building is necessary to keep the applicant's belongings from deteriorating. Finally, Madson stated that the purpose and intent of the building are consistent with the uses allowed in the district, as most of the equipment is typically used for agricultural purposes.

Kuemmel reviewed the appeals process with the applicant and then asked if there were any other questions. No further questions were asked. Kuemmel closed the public hearing at 9:30 a.m.

5. Board Meeting

5A. Deliberate the request of Case No. 25-004, Todd Dombrowski

Kuemmel reviewed the request with the Board and opened the floor for Board discussion.

Upon analysis of the testimony, the Board noted that most uses surrounding the property are either industrial or business. Additionally, similar structures in neighboring properties also exceed current area limits. A Board member added that the proposed building would not negatively impact the neighbors. Another Board member stated that, since the equipment is used for the applicant's livelihood, exceptional circumstances may apply. Lastly, the Board acknowledged that economic hardship was argued by the applicant, who indicated that his livelihood would be affected if the equipment remained stored outside.

The Board proceeded to discuss the findings of fact criteria for both variance requests:

- **Preservation of intent:** The proposed structure is consistent with the character of other structures in the district.
- **Exceptional circumstances:** The parcel is located in closer proximity to industrial uses in the surrounding area compared to other agricultural areas in the Village.

- **Economic hardship:** No findings of fact are solely based on this criterion.
- **Preservation of property rights:** Other properties in the vicinity have been allowed to construct similar structures.
- **Absence of detriment:** Based on the testimony, granting the variances would not negatively impact other properties in the vicinity.

5B. Decision on Case No. 25-004, Todd Dombrowski

Rennert made a motion to grant the requested variance for Case No. 25-004 for a building height of approximately 20 feet for a proposed 36' x 44' accessory structure based on the Board's findings of fact. **Seconded by Mielke.** The vote is 4 – 0 to grant the variance request. Motion carried.

Rennert made a motion to grant the requested variance for Case No. 25-004 for a building area of 1584 square feet for a proposed 36' x 44' accessory structure based on the Board's findings of fact. **Seconded by Barnes.** The vote is 3 – 1 to grant the variance request. Motion carried.

4B. Public Hearing. Kuemmel read the variance request and the meeting process.

Public Hearing

Robert & Gary Prochaska
10416 6 Mile Road
Caledonia, WI 53108

Requesting a variance from Section 16-10-1(c):
General Requirements, to allow for the construction
of a 120' x 120' pole building with a side setback of
7.5 feet.

Kuemmel opened the Public Hearing portion of the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

Natalia Nery de Farias swore in appellant Gary Prochaska, 6203 County Highway H, Caledonia, WI 53108.

Prochaska explained the request for the variance. He stated that two buildings previously located in the same area burned down, and the applicants would like to rebuild them as one structure using the existing foundations. He added that the fire was beyond their control. Lastly, the applicant noted that they received a call from a neighbor inquiring about the location of the proposed structure because the public notice did not include that information.

The Board asked the applicant to explain the need for a 7.5-foot setback. The applicant stated that, at the time the previous buildings were constructed (1961 and 1978), setback requirements were not as strict. The added that property lines have changed over time due to inheritance settlements and to comply with previous Village requirements, including the recording of an easement on the property.

Kuemmel asked three times if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the variance.

In Favor: Mark Prochaska, 10408 State Highway 38, Caledonia, WI 53108.

Prochaska explained that, when the lot was divided, an agreement was made among family members regarding the distribution of land, which determined the located of the current lot lines.

Kuemmel asked three times if anyone wanted to speak in opposition to the variance.

Against: None.

Kuemmel asked if the Zoning Administrator wanted to provide any testimony. The Zoning Administrator stated no. Kuemmel asked if the applicant wanted to provide additional testimony. The applicant and Mark Prochaska stated that neighboring properties belong to either their partnership or other members of the Prochaska family. The Board then asked if Mark Prochaska was in favor of the request. He replied yes.

The Board questioned the reasoning behind the location of the proposed building. The applicant stated that buried utility lines would need to be relocated if the structure were moved to another area of the property.

Kuemmel reviewed the appeals process to the applicant and then asked if there were any other questions. No further questions were asked. Kuemmel closed the public hearing at 10:33 a.m.

5. Board Meeting

5C. Deliberate the request of Case No. 25-005, Robert and Gary Prochaska

Kuemmel reviewed the request with the Board and opened the floor for Board discussion.

Upon analysis of the testimony, the Board determined that the fire created an exceptional circumstance for the property and that granting the variance would not cause any detriment to neighboring properties.

The Board proceeded to discuss the findings of fact criteria:

- **Preservation of intent:** The previous buildings destroyed by the fire were consistent with the purpose and intent of the A-2 District – to support farm operations. The proposed structure aims to replace them to allow the continuation of a similar use.
- **Exceptional circumstances:** The fire that destroyed the previous buildings constitutes an exceptional circumstance. Additionally, the location of buried utility lines limits alternative placements of the new structure.
- **Preservation of property rights:** Granting the variance will preserve the property owner's rights by allowing reconstruction of a similar structure on the lot.
- **Absence of detriment:** Granting the variance will not cause detriment to neighboring properties, as the structure is located farther from most neighbors and, according to testimony, would not negatively impact them.

5D. Decision on Case No. 25-005, Robert and Gary Prochaska

Rennert made a motion to grant the requested variance for Case No. 25-005 for a 7.5-foot side yard setback for the construction of a 120' x 120' pole building based on the Board's findings of fact. **Seconded by Barnes.** Motion carried unanimously.

6. Continuing Business

None

7. Adjournment

Rennert made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Barnes.
The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Prepared by,

Natalia Nery de Farias,
Planner/Zoning Administrator
Village of Caledonia

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Wagner
Development Director
Village of Caledonia

DRAFT