

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

1

1 The Meeting of the Plan Commission of the City of Onalaska was called to order at 7:00 p.m. on
2 Tuesday, May 26, 2015. It was noted that the meeting had been announced and a notice posted
3 at City Hall.

4

5 Roll call was taken, with the following members present: Mayor Joe Chilsen, Ald. Jim Bialecki,
6 City Engineer Jarrod Holter, Jan Brock, Paul Gleason, Skip Temte, Craig Breitsprecher, Sue
7 Peterson

8

9 Also Present: City Clerk Cari Burmaster, Land Use and Development Director Brea Grace,
10 Planner/Zoning Inspector Katie Meyer

11

12 **Item 2 – Approval of minutes from previous meeting**

13

14 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Craig, to approve the minutes from the previous meeting as
15 printed and on file in the City Clerk’s Office.

16

17 On voice vote, motion carried.

18

19 **Item 3 – Public Input (Limited to 3 minutes per individual)**

20

21 Mayor Chilsen called for anyone wishing to provide public input.

22

23 **Chris Meyer, Dream Builders of Wisconsin**

24 **1589 Medary Lane**

25 **Onalaska**

26

27 “I am here for Items 10 and 11, if any questions come up while you have discussions on those
28 topics. The one item that I wanted to touch base on quickly is the addition of decks to the project
29 that we currently have under construction. The original project called for six concrete slabs out
30 the back, which as we all know is a non-porous area. Changing these areas to above-ground
31 decks helps in several ways. It gives us porous area for groundwater to soak into. It looks better,
32 in many people’s opinions. We want to hook the decks to the building. We can build the decks
33 without them. We can put them on four posts, but we would like to hook them to the building. I
34 guess that’s where the approval is needed. Hooking them to the building gives us a more stable
35 area. It is safer, and it’s actually more eye-appealing, too, when you’re looking at it. When I
36 was out in the neighborhood looking around, each and every deck that is in the neighborhood –
37 commercial and non-commercial – is attached to the building, just as we’re requesting to have
38 done. Thank you for your time.”

39

40 **Dennis King**

41 **315 French Road**

42 **Onalaska**

Reviewed 6/1/15

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

2

43
44 “I’m here to speak on the rezoning from R-1 to M-1. I talked to the gentleman here tonight
45 representing this, and the credit union is probably the best use of that land for us. We are not
46 opposed to that. However, we were wondering why we’re looking at M-1 versus the Transitional
47 Commercial zoning. We don’t know what’s going to happen with Parcel No. 2, and we’re
48 wondering why this Light Industrial ... It seems controversial when you say ‘industrial’ next to a
49 residential [area]. That is my concern. I do like what I see as far as the credit union. I think that
50 would be the best use for that property for us. But the number is an issue with me. Thank you.”

51
52 **Alan Ohm**
53 **404 French Road**
54 **Onalaska**

55
56 “I’m also on the board of directors of the Deer Creek Condominium Association. I share
57 Dennis’ concern that he just expressed as to why this should be zoned M-1. It seems to me,
58 again, that you have the zoning TC, [which is] the Transitional Commercial zoning [and] would
59 be appropriate for this site. I have no objection to a credit union being located on that corner,
60 either. The other thing that the Transitional Conditional allows is some aesthetic concerns and
61 some buffers. This does buffer a dead-end street that is used primarily by the residents. It’s all
62 residential use, so again, I share the concerns about converting this to M-1. Thank you.”

63
64 **Keith Heinze**
65 **206 South Elm Street**
66 **La Crescent, MN**

67
68 “I’m here for Item No. 6, and first of all I have to say that we truly appreciate Brea and Katie.
69 I’ve also talked to Cari, and they’ve been very helpful. We have a little bit of an issue with the
70 R-2 and going to P-1. We would like to build a storage shed, and the setbacks have become an
71 issue. So at their recommendation we’re getting this mess cleaned up. Also, today I dug into the
72 safe and I found the Articles of Incorporation . We really are Luther High School Association
73 and not Mississippi Valley. That was done in 1962, so I’m sure Pam from [La Crosse] County
74 will be taking care of that. We had some history to untangle a little bit, at your recommendation.
75 Thank you very much.”

76
77 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone else wishing to provide public input and closed that
78 portion of the meeting.

79
80 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

81
82 **Item 4 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:00 P.M. (or immediately following Public**
83 **Input) – Consideration of a rezoning request filed by Marianne Buchanan for Wesley and**
84 **Florence Spors Irrevocable Trust, W2815 Shorewood Court, West Salem, WI 54669, from**

Interim Single Family Residential District (R-1) to Light Industrial District (M-1) for development of property located at N4502 French Road and 200 French Road (Tax Parcels #18-4453-0 & 9-451-0)

1. Rezoning fee of \$150.00 (PAID).
2. Rezoning for Tax Parcel #9-451-0 contingent upon completion of annexation.
3. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
4. Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e., site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals).
5. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs, successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any other conditions.
6. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.

Brea said the proposed rezoning request is contingent upon the annexation of the parcel of land on which the single-family residence exists. The rezoning request is for two parcels, which are identified as Parcel No. 1 and Parcel No. 2 in commission members' packets. Brea noted the aforementioned parcels are being requested for rezoning. The parcel located in the City of Onalaska is currently zoned R-2. Brea said the parcel that is being annexed from the Town of Medary will be zoned R-1(Single-Family Residential) in the interim. Brea said the surrounding zoning districts include a mix of residential zoning districts on French Road. A Light Industrial zoning district is located directly across French Road from the proposal. The properties along the State Trunk Highway 16 frontage road are zoned Transitional Commercial. Brea said staff is proposing to extend the M-1 district across French Road both to Parcel No. 1 and Parcel No. 2. Brea referred to a zoning map on display for the Plan Commission and noted a majority of the city's commercial areas are zoned M-1. Brea said this is consistent with how the City of Onalaska has zoned commercial properties elsewhere in the city. Brea said buffers from commercial parking lots to residential areas would be required. Lot No. 2 would require buffers on the north and east sides once it is developed and if there is parking lot use in the area. Brea said staff recommends approval of the proposal with the six conditions listed in commission members' packets.

Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
Reviewed 6/1/15

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

4

127 rezoning request.

128

129 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the rezoning request
130 and closed that portion of the public hearing.

131

132 Mayor Chilsen called for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the rezoning request.

133

134 **Alan Ohm**

135 **404 French Road**

136 **Onalaska**

137

138 “I’m just going to repeat what I said. I don’t understand why, given the map and [the fact] it’s so
139 close to other TC zones it shouldn’t continue to be a Transitional Commercial zone. Across the
140 street is Midwest Gas, but it’s not an imposition. It seems to me that Transitional Commercial
141 would be the best way to zone this going forward. I don’t have the packets, so I’m not sure what
142 the six conditions are that are being placed on this even though it’s proposed to be changed in M-
143 1. Again, I’m just repeating that I would like to see this Transitional Conditional. Thank you.”

144

145 **Dennis King**

146 **315 French Road**

147 **Onalaska**

148

149 “I’d like to go along with what Alan says. We had an annual meeting, and all 30 of our members
150 expressed the same desire that they were scared of this ‘Industrial’ word. And this Transitional
151 Commercial seemed to allow more flexibility for our neighborhood. Again, we don’t have the
152 six conditions we’re talking about, so maybe Brea could read them to us.”

153

154 Mayor Chilsen promised that the six conditions would be read.

155

156 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the rezoning
157 request and closed the public hearing.

158

159 Brea read the six conditions and said, “The rezoning request that has been asked of the city is the
160 rezoning from the current district to the M-1 district. The Plan Commission’s actions will be
161 limited to an up or down vote on the zoning to the M-1 district. Because of publication
162 requirements we can’t decide to zone to something else. We would have to deny the rezoning to
163 M-1, republish a notice to zone it to the TC district and go back through this again.”

164

165 Craig said, “Brea, let’s talk about the obvious. Why M-1 as opposed to Transitional
166 Commercial? Obviously the client has requested that. Did we counsel them? Is there a reason,
167 because clearly a credit union would be allowed under either/or.”

168

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

5

169 Brea said the applicant had decided on the M-1 district after being presented with the options of
170 either M-1 or Transitional Commercial (T-C.). Brea said more commercial uses are allowed
171 under M-1, while there are very limited outright permitted uses under Transitional Commercial.

172
173 Katie noted that both financial institutions and credit unions are outright permitted in the TC
174 District. Katie also noted that there are approximately only 20 uses under Transitional
175 Commercial compared to the majority of the other commercial and Light Industrial, which
176 allows more variety. Katie said, "It has almost the same amount of conditional uses that are
177 allowed, so it's much more restrictive in what you can actually do with it. There are other
178 standards, just as a whole, within screening and buffering that can be done that isn't necessarily
179 tied to Transitional Commercial, so we can still accomplish that (screening) without having that
180 zoning designation."

181
182 Jan noted that Midwest Gas likely has been at its current location for some time, while other
183 neighboring properties such as The Treehouse are newer. Jan said it is her understanding that the
184 credit union will be located on Parcel No. 1 and asked what is intended for Parcel No. 2. Jan
185 also asked if the residents are aware of other potential uses for the property should the credit
186 union fail.

187
188 Brea said it is her understanding that the credit union intends to hold onto Parcel No. 2 for future
189 growth and expansion. Brea said the applicant's representative is present and perhaps would be
190 able to provide a more detailed explanation. Brea noted the parcel across the street was rezoned
191 in 1987 for the natural gas holding tank, which was required to be screened. Brea said, "We do
192 have site plan approval that would be required for new construction on any of those sites.
193 Through site plan approval we'll look at compatibility with neighborhoods and design standards
194 so that it is compatible with neighborhoods. And [we'll look at] screening and buffering so that
195 we are protecting residential areas from commercial developments [including] headlights or
196 noise or trash blowing around. We would try to look at that during site plan review. As far as
197 future uses, if the credit union were to fail and what can go into the building; it's going to be
198 designed as an office. It will lend itself just how the building is built, [which is] more of an
199 office use and less of an industrial use."

200
201 Skip noted there are several credit unions in the city and asked if the majority of them are located
202 on parcels zoned M-1.

203
204 Brea said yes, noting a new Firefighters Credit Union is being constructed on Midwest Drive,
205 which is zoned M-1. Brea also noted Bremer Bank is located on a parcel zoned M-1.

206
207 Skip referred to two credit unions located on East Main Street that are on parcels zoned M-1 and
208 said it is natural that individuals who wish to construct a credit union would request M-1 zoning
209 if a majority of the credit unions in the city are located on parcels zoned M-1.

210

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
6

211 Paul asked if any M-1 use would be allowed once a parcel is zoned M-1.

212

213 Mayor Chilsen told Paul he is correct.

214

215 Paul noted that another M-1 use could be constructed with only site plan approval if a structure
216 on an M-1 parcel is razed and said, "I had the same concern. As I looked through the list of M-1
217 uses, there were a lot of them that seemed perfectly similar in terms of suitability. But there
218 were a couple that I was really surprised at. I don't remember what they were, but I think one of
219 them was a dry cleaning plant or a cleaning plant."

220

221 Katie noted the list of permitted uses include cleaning, pressing and drying establishments;
222 commercial bakeries; laboratories; storage; and sale machinery and equipment.

223

224 Paul said he believes this would include a dry cleaning plant and a commercial bakery, both of
225 which he considers to be industrial uses. Paul said, "I think the concern here is a little more
226 theoretical than real, but that was the same concern I had." Paul noted he recalls the rezoning
227 from 1987 to which Brea had referred earlier and said it had been zoned specifically for that use.
228 Paul said he believes the City of Onalaska had taken the position of wanting to see Transitional
229 Commercial along this corridor. Paul also suggested that perhaps in the future the natural gas
230 holding tank could be rezoned Transitional Commercial "after it outlives its usefulness."

231

232 Craig said, "I see nothing wrong with the use as proposed, and I guess I would like to hear from
233 the representative about what their position is right now as far as future plans for that site. But
234 one of the things that concerns me additionally is not so much whether it's M-1 or Transitional
235 Commercial, but we seem to be jumping back and forth as we go down that property. I realize
236 there is a road separating them, but we still seem to be jumping back and forth. I just wonder if
237 that's really necessary. That would be a question for the owners – can they survive with
238 something else that their neighbors would be more comfortable with and we could ensure a little
239 bit better outcome even though like Paul said, I think the concerns are more theoretical than
240 real."

241

242 **Ryan Olson, Coldwell Banker River Valley**
243 **118 7th Street South**
244 **La Crosse**

245

246 "I'm here on behalf of the credit union that is looking to locate. First of all, just to speak to the
247 strength of the credit union and the fear of failure, I would just say that they're looking to locate
248 in this area because their territory has increased through acquisition and it's a period of growth
249 for them. They are looking to make a significant investment in the parcel and therefore, in the
250 community. I think they don't have any plans to go anywhere for a long time. In fact, Co-op
251 Credit Union is one of the 20 largest credit unions in the State of Wisconsin, and they have
252 several locations. I think this might be No. 12 in the state, but it could be more. As far as the

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

7

253 two parcels, it's a package deal. They were purchased together, and therefore the rezoning is
254 being done together as well. I myself served on the Village of Holmen Board and was on the
255 Planning Commission as well, and the zoning ordinance is what it is. When we're given as far as
256 what the two choices are, the one that offers certainly more flexibility would be the M-1.
257 Therefore, that's why it was more attractive to the client – obviously not because they look to
258 utilize it to its fullest extent in terms of the uses that are underneath it, but just based on the use
259 that they intend to use it for would allow more flexibility than maybe what your Transitional
260 Commercial would allow. Again, I understand the concerns. But again, it's pretty clear what the
261 intended use is. They're not looking for any other use other than what they have. To my
262 understanding, there are no plans to develop that second parcel other than to just maybe allow in
263 case they need to develop a little bit onto that second parcel.”

264
265 Jan asked if the planned credit union will be a repository and drive-through and not an operations
266 center.

267
268 Ryan told Jan she is correct and noted Co-op Credit Union's headquarters are located in Black
269 River Falls.

270
271 Brea asked Ryan to address the timing of the development.

272
273 Ryan said Co-op Credit Union is “very anxious” to come into the City of Onalaska and begin the
274 project once the annexation and rezoning process is complete. Ryan said Co-op Credit Union's
275 original timeline likely was “more optimistic and aggressive” than what the Plan Commission's
276 timeline will allow and added, “We're adjusting accordingly.”

277
278 Ald. Bialecki asked Brea what protectors are in place for the residents under an M-1, noting that
279 a laundry processing plant could be permissible in the future on the second parcel. Ald. Bialecki
280 asked what protections the residents would have from the city to ensure that this would not
281 occur.

282
283 Brea noted that there are screening protections in place and said, “Historically in the city when
284 there has been an odor or a noise or a vibration issue from an industrial development, the
285 Planning and Zoning Department has responded to that and mitigated that so that there are no
286 negative impacts as far as those three potential impacts are concerned. It does come down to, if
287 it is a permitted use they don't need to come back to the Plan Commission. They can go through
288 site plan approval. There are a number of conditional uses in the M-1 district, so it's possible
289 that a conditional use will come forward. But again, the neighbors would be notified within 250
290 feet and we would have another public hearing and decide on the conditional use that's proposed
291 at that time.”

292
293 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Skip, to approve with the six listed conditions a rezoning
294 request filed by Marianne Buchanan for Wesley and Florence Spors Irrevocable Trust, W2815

Reviewed 6/1/15

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
8

295 Shorewood Court, West Salem, WI 54669, from Interim Single Family Residential District (R-1)
296 to Light Industrial District (M-1) for development of property located at N4502 French Road and
297 200 French Road.

298
299 Jarrod noted that Hansen Place, a “remnant street,” had been reconstructed within the last couple
300 of years and is not built for commercial traffic. Jarrod said he would not allow driveway access
301 to Hansen Place and would enforce this either through site plan approval or conditions. Jarrod
302 referred to the northern property line and suggested either building a fence or utilizing screening
303 that is 80 percent cover for the residents. Jarrod said any driveways should exit onto French
304 Road rather than Hansen Place and reiterated he believes there is a need for screening along the
305 northern property line.

306
307 Motion by Jarrod, second by Skip, to amend the previous motion and add two conditions
308 prohibiting driveway access off Hansen Place and requiring screening along the northern
309 property line that is 80 percent cover.

310
311 Vote on the amendment:

312
313 On voice vote, motion carried.

314
315 Original motion restated:

316
317 To approve with eight conditions a rezoning request filed by Marianne Buchanan for Wesley and
318 Florence Spors Irrevocable Trust, W2815 Shorewood Court, West Salem, WI 54669, from
319 Interim Single Family Residential District (R-1) to Light Industrial District (M-1) for
320 development of property located at N4502 French Road and 200 French Road.

321
322 On voice vote, motion carried, 7-0, with one abstention.

323
324 **Item 5 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:10 P.M. (or immediately following Public**
325 **Hearing at 7:00 P.M.) – Consideration of an Ordinance to Amend the Unified Development**
326 **Code, Section 13-6-6 regarding Telecommunication Structures and Towers**

327
328 Brea noted that changes to State of Wisconsin Statutes in 2013 removed some local control
329 regarding cellular telephone towers. Brea said the City of Onalaska is looking into revising its
330 Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with state statutes, which have sections that refer specifically
331 to cell phone towers and radio towers. Brea said the ordinance amendment refers to both cell
332 phone towers and radio towers, and also includes a section on any other tower such as a
333 microwave tower. Brea noted that the proposal was included in the Plan Commission Sub
334 Committee packet and that a public hearing is being held this evening.

335
336 Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
Reviewed 6/1/15

337 ordinance.

338

339 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the ordinance and
340 closed that portion of the public hearing.

341

342 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the ordinance and
343 closed the public hearing.

344

345 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. Bialecki, to approve an Ordinance to Amend the Unified
346 Development Code, Section 13-6-6 regarding Telecommunication Structures and Towers.

347

348 Paul asked Brea if she is confident the ordinance includes every possible way the city is
349 permitted to regulate the towers.

350

351 Brea said yes, noting she has been working closely with the City Attorney's office. Brea said
352 she also has met with a consultant from Short Elliott Hendrickson who serves as an advisor to
353 municipalities. Brea said the ordinance had been reviewed and stated, "I believe this is what
354 we're able to do."

355

356 On voice vote, motion carried.

357

358 **Item 6 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:20 P.M. (or immediately following Public**
359 **Hearing at 7:10 P.M.) – Consideration of a rezoning request filed by Keith Heinze for**
360 **Luther High School, 1501 Wilson Street, Onalaska, WI 54650, from Single Family and**
361 **Duplex Residential District (R-2) to Public and Semi-Public District (P-1) for the purpose**
362 **of merging three (3) parcels into one (1) parcel for property located at 1501 Wilson Street**
363 **(Tax Parcels #18-1023-1 & 18-1037-0)**

364

365 1. Rezoning fee of \$150.00 (PAID).

366

367 2. Exterior storage is prohibited.

368

369 3. Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e.,
370 site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals).

371

372 4. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
373 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied
374 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

375

376 5. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
377 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
378 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any

379 other conditions.

380

381 6. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in committee minutes shall not release the
382 property owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code
383 requirements.

384

385 Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
386 rezoning request.

387

388 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the rezoning request
389 and closed that portion of the public hearing.

390

391 Mayor Chilsen called for anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the rezoning request.

392

393 **Steven Lovrich**
394 **1626 Keller Court**
395 **Onalaska**

396

397 "I'm not in opposition, but all I get is they want to merge these three [parcels] together and I
398 don't know why. Is there a representative who can tell us that reason?"

399

400 Mayor Chilsen assured Steven his question will be answered.

401

402 Steven noted the map is not current and pointed out there no longer is a wooded area behind his
403 residence.

404

405 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the rezoning
406 request and closed the public hearing.

407

408 Katie noted that Luther High School and its athletic fields are currently located on three parcels.
409 Two of the parcels are zoned Single and/or Family Duplex (R-2), and the parcel where the
410 primary building is located is zoned P-1. Katie said Luther High School must follow special
411 setbacks when it needs to apply for Conditional Use Permits associated with future development.
412 Katie said staff is working with Luther High School to have all three parcels zoned P-1 (intended
413 to accommodate civic and institutional organizations such as schools and churches) and noted
414 that the Comprehensive Plan supports this. Katie said staff recommends that all three parcels be
415 zoned the same and merged together. Any future construction would require a CUP application.

416

417 Brea noted that Luther would like to create new athletic fields and an accessory structure north of
418 the school. Brea invited Keith to discuss Luther's long-range plans.

419

420 Keith noted the property that has been developed is located north of the football field, and also

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

11

421 noted Three Amigos is developing the property on the west side (north of the large parking lot).
422 Keith said Three Amigos had taken down trees, moved fill and lowered the berm. As a result,
423 there now is a site where a storage structure may be constructed. Keith said the structure would
424 be 40-by-80 feet. Keith also referred to a line on the map between the parcels and said there
425 were concerns over the 40-foot setback.

426
427 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Paul, to approve with the six listed conditions a rezoning
428 request filed by Keith Heinze for Luther High School, 1501 Wilson Street, Onalaska, WI 54650,
429 from Single Family and Duplex Residential District (R-2) to Public and Semi-Public District (P-
430 1) for the purpose of merging three (3) parcels into one (1) parcel for property located at 1501
431 Wilson Street.

432
433 Brea read the six conditions for Steven.

434
435 On voice vote, motion carried.

436
437 **Item 7 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:30 P.M. (or immediately following Public**
438 **Hearing at 7:20 P.M.) – Consideration of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application**
439 **filed by CADC Investments, LLC on behalf of Paul L. Nelson, 700 Angel Court, Holmen,**
440 **WI 54636, for the purpose of developing a multifamily development on the property**
441 **located at 2137 Sand Lake Road (Tax Parcel #18-4509-1)**

- 442
- 443 1. PUD Application Fee of \$700.00 (PAID).
 - 444
 - 445 2. Park Fee of \$922.21 (per unit) due prior to issuance of building permit.
 - 446
 - 447 3. Topography Map Fee of \$10.00 (per acre).
 - 448
 - 449 4. Payment of 1998 Special Assessments: \$8,399.52 for water and \$14,349.18 for sanitary
450 sewer.
 - 451
 - 452 5. Final Implementation Plan to be submitted for review and approval prior to any
453 development activities.
 - 454
 - 455 6. Owner/developer to provide a development schedule indicating construction
456 commencement and completion, project phases, the dedication of public improvements,
457 and administration of covenants.
 - 458
 - 459 7. FEMA Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) must be submitted to the City Engineer prior to
460 any grading work.
 - 461
 - 462 8. Owner/developer to submit a master grading and stormwater plan to be approved by the

- 463 City Engineer.
464
465 9. Owner/developer to submit a master utility plan for utility improvements for each
466 development phase to be approved by the City Engineer.
467
468 10. Owner/developer to submit final, colored renderings of architectural elevations with
469 details and materials to be approved by the Planning Department.
470
471 11. Owner/developer to submit a master open space with provision for maintenance to be
472 approved by the Planning Department.
473
474 12. Owner/developer to submit a master landscaping plan to be approved by the Planning
475 Department.
476
477 13. Obtain a survey from a qualified archaeologist as this site is located in the Sand Lake
478 Archaeological District. Final report to be submitted to the City prior to any earthwork.
479
480 14. Driveway access to Sand Lake Road to be approved by La Crosse County.
481
482 15. Developer to provide site distance calculations for proposed ingress/egress on Sand Lake
483 Road. Developer to install turn lanes if required.
484
485 16. Consideration of bus stop locations.
486
487 17. Owner/developer to install sidewalk to City standards along full length of Sand Lake
488 Road.
489
490 18. Site's location in B3 Airport Overlay Zoning District requires completion of the Land
491 Use Permit.
492
493 19. Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e.,
494 site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals). Owner/developer shall pay all
495 fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City prior to obtaining a building
496 permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and improvements installed
497 per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
498
499 20. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
500 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
501 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
502 other conditions.
503
504 21. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
13

505 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.

506

507 Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
508 PUD application.

509

510 **Alexis Meyer**
511 **700 Angel Court**
512 **Holmen**

513

514 Alexis said both she and Dale Brott are available to answer any questions and stated, "Our ideas
515 are the next step in which we already have three big buildings very similar to what we're looking
516 to do on this property. It would be very similar to what we've already done in exterior looks,
517 landscaping and providing quality homes for a number of individuals who are seeking them in
518 the Onalaska area."

519

520 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the PUD
521 application and closed that portion of the public hearing.

522

523 Mayor Chilsen called for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the PUD application.

524

525 **Dennis Borchert**
526 **2225 Sand Lake Road**
527 **Onalaska**

528

529 "I'm about the third parcel north of that. The only question and concern I think myself and my
530 neighbors have is if you've lived out there for 40 years like I have and seen the traffic going to
531 Menards on a Saturday morning, it's almost as bad as trying to get on a four-lane. I can't
532 imagine another 150 bedrooms, two people per apartment and another 300 cars coming out on
533 that corner along with all the development on the Krause property. I have a real concern on the
534 road right of way there and what's going to happen. The road is supposed to be rebuilt in
535 another four to five years, and they said they're not changing the design between the curb from
536 OT to S and SN. If there's no improvement, it's getting worse by the day. Thank you."

537

538 **Andrea Gunderson**
539 **2209 Sand Lake Road**
540 **Onalaska**

541

542 "We live next to the Hagens, right next door to Denny, and we also have major concerns with the
543 transportation, with the road being redone, and with the traffic being as bad as it is now on that
544 road. From what I've seen on the plans, it looks like it's going to have only one access point into
545 this apartment complex. We're wondering about school buses and school children. It's been a
546 single-family neighborhood out there, and my understanding is they don't have to get this

Reviewed 6/1/15

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

14

547 rezoned to have these huge apartment buildings. If this comes in, I just feel like we're going to
548 end up changing this to like a frontage road. If Mayo comes in and puts the hospital out here we
549 have to consider that traffic. We just would really like to keep it a single-family area out there.
550 Thank you."

551
552 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the PUD
553 application and closed the public hearing.

554
555 Brea said the project is at Stage 1, which is a request for a PUD approval, and noted there is no
556 rezoning necessary. Brea said three multifamily unit structures are being proposed, with two of
557 the buildings being three-story, 44-unit structures with both one- and two-bedroom apartments.
558 Approximately 11 townhomes are being proposed for the west side of the property. Brea noted
559 the area is in a floodplain and said a plan for significant grading work already has been
560 completed. Ponding areas are being proposed for the south side of the property, and there also
561 would be a ponding area between the proposed townhomes and the apartment complexes. Brea
562 said the developers wish to do the project in two phases and referred to a future property line on
563 the map. Brea said this area eventually could be split off and sold. Brea said staff has had
564 discussions with the Fire Department and noted the developer has made modifications to the
565 plans, including a fire lane that would allow Fire Department access to all four sides of both of
566 the larger structures. Brea pointed out a second access to Sand Lake Road and said it would
567 have to be controlled so that it only is for emergency access.

568
569 Brea said, "As staff has been looking at this, we consulted the Comprehensive Plan, which
570 identifies the property as Mixed Density Residential District, which is intended to accommodate
571 primary single family and duplexes or two-flat residential development with a limited amount of
572 higher density residential in the area along peripheral areas of the district. We also took a look at
573 the Menards area plan ... As we're reviewing the Menards area plan, I think what's being
574 proposed by the Mayo Clinic is larger than what the city envisioned when the Menards area plan
575 was done. Because this is on the edge of the Menards area I think we need to consider that, and
576 that's a point I wanted to raise for Plan Commission discussion. Should those standards apply
577 here? The plan does support this type of use – the mixed high-density residential – in this
578 location, and along the western side of Sand Lake Road."

579
580 Brea referred to a schematic for the multifamily buildings, noting there is brick planned at the
581 basement area of the structure. The sites will be a couple of feet higher than the elevation on
582 Sand Lake Road. There also is a proposal to have underground parking and porches. Brea noted
583 that the developers had submitted photographs of similar projects they had completed both in the
584 City of Onalaska and the Village of Holmen. Brea said that while there is no architectural
585 rendering of the townhomes, a photograph of a structure that would be similar in nature had been
586 submitted. A gazebo was submitted as a potential landscape feature that could be added to the
587 parcel.

588

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

15

589 Brea said, “As staff is reviewing this, the questions we have for the Plan Commission is, is the
590 density appropriate for this area? Is there enough usable space, because we have a lot of
591 stormwater ponds. A finalized landscaping plan will be submitted with the final implementation
592 plan, but staff feels that the architectural standards, landscaping, just the overall appearance, the
593 density of this site ... it matters. We’re kind of setting the tone for how the Sand Lake corridor
594 is going to be developed in the future. That’s why we want the Plan Commission to weigh in on
595 this because it’s a bit outside of the map for the Sand Lake Road [Menards] area. What is
596 appropriate for this site? Is the density appropriate? Is there enough usable space? The
597 architectural standards of what is being proposed – is that adequate for this site? There are some
598 things that we will continue to work with the developers on. The Planned Unit Development is a
599 two-staged process of the general development plan. Once that’s approved, they come back with
600 a final implementation plan, then site plan approval, then construction can start. The other
601 question is, is this the information the Plan Commission needs to make a decision on the general
602 development plan? Can the Plan Commission give a recommendation for changes needed that
603 can go into the final implementation plan? Do you have what you need?”

604
605 Jarrod referred to the proposed driveway location for the development, which is approximately
606 200 feet east of the west property line. Jarrod referred to a La Crosse County highway that is
607 slated to be repaved within the next four to five years and noted there will be no alterations to the
608 existing geometrics of the roadway. Jarrod said the developer will need to obtain a permit from
609 La Crosse County to have a driveway opening onto the site. Jarrod said at that time he would
610 work with the La Crosse County Highway Commissioner and noted that due to the number of
611 proposed units he utilizes the standard “nine trips per day” for each residential unit. This would
612 equate to between 600 and 900 trips per day coming out of the facility. Jarrod said it would be
613 necessary to widen the road and install a left-turn bay. Jarrod referred to an area of CTH S that
614 the city had reconstructed in 2012. However, the traffic splits, with some motorists continuing
615 on CTH S and other motorists turning onto CTH SN toward the Village of Holmen. Jarrod noted
616 the traffic projections will increase with the construction of the Mayo development and said, “If
617 proper protections are made for a left turn into the development that will be the major traffic
618 obstacle for this development.

619
620 As far as the site itself, it sits low and it’s within the 100-year FEMA delineated floodplain area,
621 so they will have to get a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FEMA in order to fill and
622 construct in this area. Those would all be approvals we would need before we’d approve any site
623 plan approvals. Those are approvals that have been received by other developers in this
624 watershed area recently, so I think that is something they could work out. With that, there is also
625 the stormwater management onsite. The preliminary plan does show a ponding area along the
626 rear southern property line ... Right now there is a lower area that goes on to the Hagen property,
627 which is the property to the west. They’re all approximately at the same elevation. The plan for
628 this area would be that the housing areas would be built up to get them above flood elevation.
629 They do show a stormwater ponding area between the townhomes and [one of the larger units]
630 and along the back property line. They would have to be sized to contain a 100-year storm

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

16

631 event. The stormwater from these units would have to go to a ponding area.”

632

633 Jarrod referred to the west property line that would be a sloped, grassy area and drain down to
634 the property line. However, the rest of the development would have to be internally contained to
635 the ponding areas already present. Jarrod said he believes that it is viable “in concept,” but noted
636 a Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources NR 216 Permit will be necessary. Jarrod also said
637 the LOMR materials will be evaluated for floodplain approvals, and also to ensure adjacent
638 properties will not be impacted by runoff from the site. Jarrod pointed out that there is a 12-inch
639 water main alongside the road, so there will be a water main stubbed in with fire hydrants.
640 Jarrod also noted sanitary sewer runs alongside Sand Lake Road, so the developer will have to
641 go out to the roadway to obtain sanitary sewer.

642

643 Brea referred to the Sand Lake Road handout and said, “I think there are a few things that could
644 be changed that would help set this area as a gateway and help create that design standard for this
645 corridor.” Brea referred to an image on display for the Plan Commission and noted that the
646 façade on the building on the left is staggered. Brea said this creates some visual interest. Brea
647 referred to another image and said the larger columns create visual interest. Brea said, “As we’re
648 moving forward, I think that’s the direction we probably should head architecturally with these
649 structures because I think that’s the direction we’re going to head for this corridor. I think we
650 also need to look at the usable green space. Creating a gazebo-type area is a nice amenity for the
651 facility. But as you look at the site plan, there’s not a lot of ‘high-and-dry’ land where this could
652 be located. So I think that has to be looked at – in part, looking at density too. Is the density
653 appropriate? As far as the direction this development is headed, I think we’re consistent with the
654 Comprehensive Plan and we’re consistent with the Menards area plan. The other thing I wanted
655 to mention was screening. These are very large, very tall structures, so they’re not going to be
656 completely screened, but screening headlights. As headlights are coming into this parking lot,
657 putting some sort of fencing up so that the headlights aren’t directed into the properties to the
658 south. That would be an important feature that could be added to the landscaping plan.

659

660 Additionally, more landscaping overall on the site would help it and just provide some screening
661 to the adjacent residences. Understand that they are asking for a 51-foot high building and not a
662 45-foot high building. One of the things about a PUD is that they’re asking for flexibility –
663 flexibility with the building height, [meaning] 45 feet to 51 feet, a different number of parking
664 stalls based on the ratio of single, one-bedroom apartments versus two-bedroom apartments. So
665 I think with that flexibility, there almost have to be some tradeoffs with making this development
666 more in line with the design standards that the city has envisioned and has adopted through the
667 Menards Area Plan of 2004.”

668

669 Mayor Chilsen asked if the questions to which Brea had referred earlier pertain to architecture,
670 green space and screenings.

671

672 Brea said there also are questions pertaining to density and if the Menards area plan is

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

17

673 applicable.

674

675 Ald. Bialecki said, “There’s one other thing I want to have looked at just one more time, and it
676 has to do with everything that could go out there in the next five to 10 years, is that road. What’s
677 proposed out there in five years? Have we covered ourselves out there? And I want to make
678 sure that we don’t do something similar to the issues we have out in Green Coulee Road right
679 now, although these are two unrelated things.” Ald. Bialecki also inquired about the
680 underground parking ramp, asking if it is considered part of the building or considered
681 infrastructure that could cause difficulties for the city should there be future problems.

682

683 Jarrod noted there are no publically deeded streets within the development.

684

685 Ald. Bialecki referred to a situation where a request had been made to the city to perform water
686 and sewer repairs 20 years after a PUD was granted. Ald. Bialecki said he wants City Attorney
687 Sean O’Flaherty to find out if the city will be responsible for any future financial obligations
688 with the underground parking ramp should it need to be repaired.

689

690 Craig said at times it appears there is the assumption that a PUD will automatically be
691 established for review. Craig said, “You should have to earn a PUD. As you stated, there are
692 flexibilities contained in such a development, and I think that’s a two-way street. It’s not just a
693 one-way street. It’s not just where the applicants come forward with their plan and it’s to be
694 kind of approved. I have real concerns here on a lot of different levels. Number one, as a
695 Planning Commissioner there’s nothing I can do to prevent a multitenant, nor do I think it’s
696 inappropriate at this location. But the sheer density here really concerns me. I think the use that
697 is being planned for this area may be excessive for what that area may accommodate given what
698 we know is going to happen in the future. And I think one of the things that can’t be
699 underestimated is the fact that this has to be part of a gateway coming in from that direction into
700 the City of Onalaska. And I think we really need to look at this as, this is going to end up being
701 one of our showpieces. And I think if we can’t project that all the way along there, I think we’re
702 failing somewhere. I’m concerned about stormwater. I think that’s going to continue to be an
703 issue. I don’t think that’s going to be easily mitigated. Just frankly, I think I have some real
704 concerns about moving forward with this tonight. I think there are so many concerns that need to
705 be addressed yet. I’m not willing to say, ‘Let’s go ahead.’ ”

706

707 Mayor Chilsen noted he has seen the developer’s previous work and said he agrees with Craig in
708 that the development needs to be a showpiece. Mayor Chilsen said he believes the development
709 will be a showpiece and stated, “Are there issues? Yes, there are issues. But I think we can
710 work these out. I would really like us to think about that very carefully.”

711

712 Paul said that while he agrees with most of what Craig said and stated he would like to address
713 more specific items that concern him. Paul said he does not agree that the development complies
714 with the Comprehensive Plan, noting there are two units out of approximately 100 that are in

Reviewed 6/1/15

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

18

715 two-flat or single-family buildings. Paul said, “This is basically a totally high-density,
716 multifamily development. I had to go back and refresh myself on the PUD code and see what it
717 is we were thinking about approving here. In your staff report, you state that it’s proposed as an
718 overlay zone over R-1. In Section 13-3-5(a) of the code, it states, *‘Permitted uses shall be*
719 *defined in the PUD proposal to the city, or in the case of an overlay district shall be consistent*
720 *with the permitted uses of the underlying districts.’* The underlying district is R-1, so that to me
721 says unless we rezone it to something else we can only approve R-1. I have concerns about the
722 common open space requirement, which is also in our code. It is to be 15 percent of the gross
723 land area, which is about eight-tenths of an acre. And that shall not include setback areas, street
724 right of way, parking areas and driveways, building sites, and inaccessible stormwater ponds.
725 Those stormwater ponds are, to me, inaccessible for any reasonable common use. I spent quite a
726 bit of time looking at that plan today, and I see no common area open space on that plan. [There
727 is] nothing that could be used for common recreation. I’m also concerned about the stormwater
728 pond as it’s drawn. It encroaches over onto a park trail that’s already dedicated to the city. And
729 if that hasn’t gone through the [Parks and Recreation] Board, I think it should. And just more
730 generally, I agree with some of the statements that this is a gateway to the city. The Menards
731 plan should apply to it, and I think that overall if this was approved we would be setting a very
732 low bar for additional development along that corridor in terms of materials and architecture.
733 And I guess I would extend that to landscaping. That plan is also a landscape plan. It has a plant
734 schedule, and there are 22 trees proposed and 33 shrubs for a five-acre site.

735
736 I am in agreement with Craig that there are so many issues to this that I would be very
737 uncomfortable going forward, and I think it boils down to trying to put too much density on the
738 site. And a PUD is supposed to be a give-and-take [process] where the developer gets some
739 things that make a better development for him or a more desirable development. But the city
740 also gets some things that make it better than a standard R-4. I don’t see where the city is getting
741 anything here.”

742
743 Brea referred to Section 13-3-5(a) and staff interpreted it “truly as an ‘or.’ ” Brea said the uses
744 have to be identified in the PUD. If they are not identified in the PUD, they have to match the
745 underlying zoning district. Brea cited the example of Nathan Hill Estates, noting some higher
746 density had been approved through the PUD and that the underlying zoning is R-1. Brea agreed
747 to consult with Sean and determine whether this has been interpreted correctly. Brea addressed
748 the common open space requirement and said she believes the developer will be close to the 15
749 percent because the size of the site is substantial. Brea noted there is a 25-foot setback from the
750 highway and the building is not parallel to Sand Lake Rd, so there are non-setback areas that
751 could be considered common open space. Brea said she’d ask the developer for calculations
752 based on the map. Brea said that while she believes the developer will meet the 15-percent
753 requirement, she is unsure that the intent of the common open space has been met. Brea said that
754 while she believes the gazebo is a nice feature, she is unsure of where it will fit. Brea suggested
755 making changes to the landscaping plan would help identify where the usable open space for the
756 residents would be.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

19

757
758 Paul said the common open space is “functional, accessible, and where possible adds to existing
759 common or public open space systems.” Paul said, “In my view, that’s intended to be maybe a
760 trail system or maybe a concentrated area where people can congregate or use. But I think it’s a
761 stretch to say that something like a 10-foot strip along people’s windows and outside their patio
762 doors is common open space. It may technically be, but I’m sure a lot of people don’t consider it
763 in that manner. I would be looking for more of a commonly available open space that is useful
764 as opposed to simply a measure of green square footage.”

765
766 Mayor Chilsen said, “It still boils down to the fact that we’re looking at those questions that were
767 brought up previously. Correct me if I’m wrong, but [it’s] architecture, green space, screenings,
768 and density.”

769
770 Craig said he believes there are geographical considerations that also need to be considered.
771 Craig said, “The more I look at this and the more I think about it, the more I’m concerned about
772 the water situation and how adjoining properties are going to be affected by whatever happens at
773 this site. We already know that there’s going to be significant runoff created. I’m really
774 concerned about that. Jarrod would have a better feel for that, but it still bothers me that we
775 don’t know enough about that.”

776
777 Craig expressed a desire to see more information related to the specific areas that have been
778 mentioned before voting. Craig said, “I don’t believe that a multi-density type situation is
779 impossible here. I’m thinking that this may be excessive, though.”

780
781 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Craig, to refer either for one or two months consideration of
782 a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application filed by CADC Investments, LLC on behalf of
783 Paul L. Nelson, 700 Angel Court, Holmen, WI 54636, for the purpose of developing a
784 multifamily development on the property located at 2137 Sand Lake Road.

785
786 Mayor Chilsen asked the motion be modified to state “refer it for not less than one month.”

787
788 Ald. Bialecki said he wants to give everyone involved sufficient time to prepare and answer all
789 the questions that have been asked this evening.

790
791 Mayor Chilsen said the developer will be given more time if the motion is stated “not less than
792 one month.”

793
794 Craig noted that this item will be referred for at least one month.

795
796 Paul said, “That’s open-ended on the long side.”

797
798 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Craig, to bring back before the Plan Commission in no less

799 than one month consideration of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application filed by CADC
800 Investments, LLC on behalf of Paul L. Nelson, 700 Angel Court, Holmen, WI 54636, for the
801 purpose of developing a multifamily development on the property located at 2137 Sand Lake
802 Road.

803
804 Cari noted that the Plan Commission's next two meetings are scheduled for June 23 and July 28.

805
806 Ald. Bialecki stressed that this motion is not a reflection on the builder, who "has quality work
807 elsewhere in the city."

808
809 On voice vote, motion carried, 7-0, with one abstention (Skip Temte).

810

811 **Item 8 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:40 P.M. (or immediately following Public**
812 **Hearing at 7:30 P.M.) – Consideration of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application**
813 **filed by Paragon Associates on behalf of I&B of Hudson, LLC, 422 Callaway Boulevard, La**
814 **Crosse, WI 54603, for the purpose of subdividing Walnut Grove, Lot 2, into two (2)**
815 **buildable lots on the property located at 1005 Summers Day Lane (Tax Parcel #18-6307-0)**

816

817 1. Owner/developer shall abide by all conditions of Walnut Grove PUD approvals and all
818 plat approvals, including but not limited to:

819

820 A. All dwellings that are set back more than 50' from the public right of way must
821 have the following fire protection:

822 i. Driveway no steeper than 10% grade

823 ii. Driveway width 18' minimum

824 iii. Driveway must be designed to accommodate fire truck loading

825 iv. Structure must be maximum 400' laying distance to the nearest fire
826 hydrant

827

828 B. Structures shall not be permitted on ridgelines where they are sky-lined per
829 comprehensive plan recommendations.

830

831 2. A copy of the amended 20' Stormwater Easement across Lot 2 shall be provided to the
832 City prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

833

834 3. Ingress/Egress and Utility Easement across Lot 3, which serves Lot 2, to be amended as
835 needed for proposed reconfiguration of lots. A copy of the amendment easement to be
836 provided to the City.

837

838 4. Owner/developer must notify the City prior to any utility connection to public utilities.
839 Water and sanitary sewer for Lot 21 to be served from easement along South lot line.

840

- 841 5. At the beginning of the private road, Walnut Place (which provides access to Traci's
842 Plat), all house numbers accessed off that road shall be signed or the private road shall be
843 named as a private street.
844
- 845 6. All future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e.,
846 building permits, zoning approvals) and additional City fees (i.e., parks fees, green fee).
847 Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and improvements installed per
848 approved plans prior to issuance of the occupancy permit.
849
- 850 7. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
851 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
852 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
853 other conditions.
854
- 855 8. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property
856 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
857

858 Brea said this is a proposed modification to the Walnut Grove Subdivision PUD. It would
859 subdivide the existing Lot 2 into two buildable lots. Both of the new lots on Lot 2 would have
860 frontage on Summers Day Lane. The access for the second lot would be off the private Walnut
861 Place. Both of the new lots will have the minimum amount of frontage. The existing driveways
862 and sewer/water services all would be utilized as the density of the subdivision will be increasing
863 by one single-family unit. Brea said staff recommends approval with the eight listed conditions
864 of approval. Brea noted some of the original conditions of the Walnut Grove PUD, including the
865 steepness of the driveway and Fire Department access as well as the existing stormwater
866 easement which would have to be modified but could be completed after this PUD change would
867 occur.
868

869 Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
870 PUD application.
871

872 **Jeff Moorhouse, Paragon Associates**
873 **632 Copeland Avenue**
874 **La Crosse**
875

876 "We're here just to answer any questions that you may have regarding the technical aspects of
877 this."
878

879 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the PUD application
880 and closed that portion of the public hearing.
881

882 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the PUD

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
22

883 application and closed the public hearing.

884

885 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Craig, to approve with eight conditions a Planned Unit
886 Development (PUD) application filed by Paragon Associates on behalf of I&B of Hudson, LLC,
887 422 Callaway Boulevard, La Crosse, WI 54603, for the purpose of subdividing Walnut Grove,
888 Lot 2, into two (2) buildable lots on the property located at 1005 Summers Day Lane.

889

890 Skip asked Brea why Outlot No. 1 isn't just part of Outlot No. 2, noting that Outlot No. 1 has to
891 exist to have access to Outlot No. 2.

892

893 Brea said Outlot No. 1 was created to serve as a future access either as a driveway or a public
894 road. Brea referred to the map on display and noted that there are developable sites on the
895 adjacent Vogel property. Therefore, Outlot No. 1 would serve as the access to that area. Brea
896 said she does not recall why the two are separate.

897

898 Jeff noted that the two pieces of land have specific restrictions on them. One parcel is restricted
899 to ingress/egress, while the other parcel simply is land not to be used for ingress/egress.
900 Therefore, this is why they are separate. Jeff noted they are adjacent to each other, but serve
901 different purposes within the previous agreements.

902

903 Skip asked if the owner of Outlot No. 1 could be different than the owner of Outlot No. 2 and
904 said, "You've got two relying on a driveway who somebody else pays taxes on? That just
905 doesn't make sense to me."

906

907 Jeff said that while this may appear illogical, this was the intent of the agreements that were
908 being made at the time. Jeff said that while there is buildable land on Outlot No. 2, it is not
909 buildable as an outlot. In other words, some other activity such as a plat would have to occur in
910 order for it to become a buildable site. Jeff said this is why it was not made into a lot and it is
911 serving as an outlot that is not buildable.

912

913 Paul pointed out that there is a notation on the survey stating all of Outlot No. 1 and Outlot No. 2
914 are an access easement in favor of Parcel No. 10 to the east of Outlot No. 2, which is unplatted
915 parcels. Paul asked if there is a requirement that Outlot No. 1 and Outlot No. 2 are owned by the
916 same party who owns the unplatted land.

917

918 Jeff said the creation of the two outlots is not part of this current proposal and is part of the
919 previous plat approval. Jeff said he recalls the original requirement for access as well as extra
920 land in dealing with the neighboring Vogel property.

921

922 Craig said it seems as though the Plan Commission revisits this development every six to 12
923 months and alters something.

924

925 Jan asked if there are two parties who wish to build on each of the lots.

926

927 Jeff said yes and noted this originally was planned for a much denser development. Jeff also
928 noted that the market has changed and said, “The idea here is to do something that makes sense
929 at the time, and that does change. We apologize. The economy is a moving target, and we try to
930 make good guesses as best as we can. But I don’t think this proposal is contrary to the benefit of
931 the city.”

932

933 Sue, who serves as the Parks and Recreation Board representative, asked what previously has
934 come before the Plan Commission.

935

936 Brea noted the history of the subdivision is somewhat outlined on the staff report and said the
937 final implementation plan was approved in 2007. Brea said it originally was approved for 30
938 lots. Brea agreed with Jeff in that the market has changed and noted the subdivision was brought
939 back in 2009. Brea said at that time it was contemplated that larger lots would be more saleable.
940 Former Land Use and Development Director Jason Gilman performed an economic analysis on
941 30 lots versus 7 lots, and Brea said the result “looked to be kind of a wash” for the increased
942 dollar amount that the lots were going to be sold for as compared to the number of lots that were
943 originally proposed. Brea noted seven lots were approved in 2009 and said there were changes
944 to the configuration in 2012.

945

946 Paul described the request as “perfectly reasonable” and said he agrees that markets change.

947

948 Jan described the area in question as “beautiful” and noted there is currently only one residence
949 in this area.

950

951 On voice vote, motion carried.

952

953 **Item 9 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:50 P.M. (or immediately following Public**
954 **Hearing at 7:40 P.M.) – Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit application filed by**
955 **Steve Peters of Two Beagles Brewpub, 403 Cedar Bird Lane, Holmen, WI 54636, to allow**
956 **the operation of a brewpub at 910 2nd Avenue North (Tax Parcel #18-1276-0)**

957

958 1. Conditional Use Permit Fee of \$150.00 (PAID).

959

960 2. Contingent upon Site Plan Permit Approval prior to any construction activities (including
961 location of a cooling unit outside of the building), as well as necessary Building &
962 Plumbing Permits.

963

964 3. No outdoor storage.

965

966 4. Applicant agrees to install odor mitigation measures as dictated by negative impacts to

967 adjacent land uses as required by the Land Use & Development Director or Plan
968 Commission.

- 969
970 5. Compliance with City Ordinance 9-2 including but not limited to obtaining a Discharge
971 Permit.
972
973 6. Removal of spent grain and other byproducts from the premise in a timely manner as
974 determined by the Land Use & Development Director.
975
976 7. CUP to be re-reviewed by the Plan Commission prior to onsite business expansions (i.e.,
977 packaging operations) and at the time of any significant expansions in quantities brewed
978 (either as a singular expansion or a cumulative effect).
979
980 8. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
981 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied
982 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
983
984 9. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
985 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
986 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
987 other conditions.
988
989 10. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in the minutes shall not release the property
990 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
991

992 Katie said Steve Peters has requested a CUP to allow the operation of a brewpub at the restaurant
993 previously known as Seasons by the Lake. Katie said the intention is to repurpose the restaurant
994 and install a small brewing system with a full bar and restaurant. Katie noted that Steve and his
995 wife are in attendance this evening and willing to answer questions. Katie also noted that staff
996 utilized the following five decision criteria to review the development:
997

- 998 • **Compatibility:** The restaurant is zoned B-1 (Neighborhood Business). The majority of
999 land within this area is commercial, with some residential.
1000 • **Consistency with Comprehensive Plan:** The Comprehensive Plan defines this area as
1001 Commercial, and thus the use is consistent.
1002 • **Importance of Services to the Community:** One of the land use objectives within the
1003 Comprehensive Plan states "to capitalize on opportunities for infill and redevelopment
1004 along the corridors." State Trunk Highway 35 is a major commercial corridor as the
1005 Great River Road within the City of Onalaska, and this development has the potential of
1006 creating a destination on the Great River Road.
1007 • **Neighborhood Protections:** There have been at least two restaurants in this area. What
1008 the applicant is proposing is similar, with the addition of the small brewing system that

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
25

1009 would be within the facility. Steve plans to coordinate with a local farmer to utilize the
1010 spent brewing materials on a routine basis.

- 1011 • **Conformance with Other Requirements of City/State Ordinances/Statutes:**
1012 Applicant to obtain all required city, state and federal licenses as required.

1013
1014 Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
1015 CUP application.

1016
1017 **Steve Peters**
1018 **403 Cedar Bird Lane**
1019 **Holmen**

1020
1021 Steve stated he will answer any questions the Plan Commission may have for him.

1022
1023 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the CUP application
1024 and closed that portion of the public hearing.

1025
1026 Mayor Chilsen called for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the CUP application.

1027
1028 **Bob Muth, Second District Alderperson**
1029 **317 Spruce Street**
1030 **Onalaska**

1031
1032 “I live just a block and a half from the restaurant, and I still have the same concerns I brought up
1033 at the [May 19 Plan Commission] Sub Committee [meeting], that being any odor. I’ve lived near
1034 a brewery. Skip and I had a conversation about that after the meeting, but I’m still concerned.
1035 I’ve talked to some of my neighbors since that meeting. They have the same concerns I have
1036 about any odor. I don’t like it like the brewery down in La Crosse. I understand it’s a small
1037 brewery and contained, but I’m also worried about hauling the stuff away, the noise, and the
1038 odor. That’s going to change the environment around this restaurant where we have a lot of
1039 senior residential folks who live in that area. I’m concerned about what this brewery is going to
1040 entail. Is it going to involve odor? Is it going to involve large trucks coming to haul away the
1041 leftover material? At what time? I’ve got a lot of questions about what the impact is going to
1042 be.”

1043
1044 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the CUP
1045 application and closed the public hearing.

1046
1047 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Craig, to approve with 10 conditions a Conditional Use
1048 Permit application filed by Steve Peters of Two Beagles Brewpub, 403 Cedar Bird Lane,
1049 Holmen, WI 54636, to allow the operation of a brewpub at 910 2nd Avenue North.

1050

1051 Ald. Bialecki noted that Condition No. 4 discusses odor control and asked that this condition be
1052 clarified. Ald. Bialecki asked that the concerns expressed by Ald. Muth be addressed.

1053
1054 Steve said he understands Ald. Muth's concerns, noting he was a brewery employee for 10 years.
1055 Steve said, "The biggest consideration is to get rid of the spent grain as rapidly as you can. The
1056 spent grain is where that odor comes from. The other place the odor comes from at the
1057 commercial brewery in downtown La Crosse is they have an anaerobic reactor on that site. We
1058 won't have an anaerobic reactor. All of our ____ will be dumped down the drain. It has no time
1059 to build up that odor. It's a really bad odor, and I agree. I'm not sure if there is any way to
1060 measure the odor, but if we ever have any complaints we will definitely address them
1061 immediately."

1062
1063 Ald. Bialecki asked, hypothetically, if the Plan Commission has the authority to call back the
1064 CUP if any or all of the conditions are violated over time.

1065
1066 Brea told Ald. Bialecki he is correct.

1067
1068 On voice vote, motion carried.

1069
1070 **Item 10 – Review and Consideration of a substantial alteration determination for the**
1071 **Nathan Hill Estates Subdivision Planned Unit Development (PUD) for 402-412, 422-432,**
1072 **and 442-452 Coronado Circle (Lots 3 and 4 of Certified Survey Map 1601242), submitted**
1073 **by Chris Meyer of Dream Builders of Wisconsin, LLC, 1589 Medary Lane, Onalaska, WI**
1074 **54650 on behalf of Brian Miller of Nathan Estates, LLC (Tax Parcel #18-5955-4 & 18-5955-**
1075 **5)**

- 1076
1077 1. Obtain site plan approval for the proposed modifications to the principle structures.
1078
1079 2. Accessory structures for residential properties are allowed up a maximum of twenty (20)
1080 percent of rear yards. Proposed deck square footages (109 SF/deck) to be included as
1081 part of the allotted twenty (20) percent calculation. If proposed decks are not
1082 constructed, the full twenty (20%) area for accessory structure square footage may be
1083 utilized.
1084
1085 a. Building #1 (Units 402-412) has approximately 5,850 square feet in the rear yard
1086 allowing a maximum total of 1,170 square feet for accessory structures. Six (6) decks
1087 at 109 SF/deck amount to 654 square feet. Approximately 516 square feet remain for
1088 future accessory structures on this lot.
1089 b. Building #2 (Units 422-432) has approximately 7,650 square feet in the rear yard
1090 allowing a maximum total of 1,530 square feet for accessory structures. Six (6) decks
1091 at 109 SF/deck amount to 654 square feet. Approximately 876 square feet remain for
1092 future accessory structures on this lot.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

27

- 1093 c. Building #3 (Units 442-452) has approximately 10,805 square feet in the rear yard
1094 allowing a maximum total of 2,161 square feet for accessory structures. Six (6) decks
1095 at 109 SF/deck amount to 654 square feet. Approximately 1,507 square feet remain
1096 for future accessory structures on this lot.
1097
- 1098 3. Applicant shall abide by all requirements and conditions of previous Drainage and
1099 Stormwater Plan approvals and with previous subdivision and plat approvals for Nathan
1100 Hills Estates.
1101
- 1102 4. Rear yard to maintain a 10-foot buffer along rear property line for drainage purposes.
1103
- 1104 5. The addition of decks will restrict future accessory structures.
1105
- 1106 6. Owner/developer must pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
1107 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied
1108 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of the occupancy permit.
1109
- 1110 7. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
1111 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
1112 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
1113 other conditions.
1114
- 1115 8. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in the minutes shall not release the property
1116 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
1117

1118 Katie said this request is to review and determine whether the proposed changes to the Nathan
1119 Hill Estates Subdivision PUD constitute a substantial alteration. This pertains to Lots 3 and 4 of
1120 the noted Certified Survey Map, which are the remaining parcels on the outer ring of Coronado
1121 Circle. The proposal is for one modification to the PUD; specifically, the construction of
1122 attached decks to the rear of the six-unit structures in place of the approved concrete patios. The
1123 proposed change would decrease the required 30-foot setback from 30 feet to 17 feet. Katie
1124 noted the approved site plan layout and the modification request in letter form had been included
1125 and said, "As the applicant is requesting the approval of the proposed changes, we would ask that
1126 the Plan Commission first determine if in fact this is a substantial or a non-substantial change. If
1127 the change is non-substantial, the requested modification may be approved or denied by the Plan
1128 Commission. The Plan Commission Sub Committee did move it forward as a non-substantial
1129 change."

1130
1131 Katie reviewed the eight conditions of approval with the Plan Commission.
1132

1133 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Craig, to approve with eight conditions a non-substantial
1134 change for the Nathan Hill Estates Subdivision Planned Unit Development (PUD) for 402-412,

Reviewed 6/1/15

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
28

1135 422-432, and 442-452 Coronado Circle (Lots 3 and 4 of Certified Survey Map 1601242),
1136 submitted by Chris Meyer of Dream Builders of Wisconsin, LLC, 1589 Medary Lane, Onalaska,
1137 WI 54650 on behalf of Brian Miller of Nathan Estates, LLC.

1138
1139 Paul said it is his understanding that the decks could be constructed and placed on four posts
1140 without being attached to the homes. Paul asked if doing so would be within the current code.

1141
1142 Brea said the Commercial Building Inspector has determined that it would be considered an
1143 accessory structure if it is a detached structure. However, the moment it is attached to the
1144 principal structure it becomes part of the principal structure. Thus, the deck would be required to
1145 follow the 30-foot required setback for the principal structure.

1146
1147 Paul said it is his understanding that the Plan Commission is deciding whether or not the
1148 developer will be required to install two more posts per deck.

1149
1150 Craig said it is not unusual to be viewed in this way.

1151
1152 Skip questioned the wording of Condition No. 2c and Condition No. 5.

1153
1154 Katie noted that every lot is allowed to have up to 20 percent of the land to be accessory
1155 structures. Katie noted she had examined the original site plans that were proposed and looked
1156 at how much land was available. Katie said it is an estimate and admitted she did not have exact
1157 amounts. Katie said this is an attempt at noting how much rear yard is currently present versus
1158 the size of the decks, the total number of the six decks, and the subtraction.

1159
1160 Skip asked if there will be more green space if decks are installed.

1161
1162 Katie said this is a possibility.

1163
1164 On voice vote, motion carried, 7-0, with one abstention (Sue Peterson).

1165
1166 **Item 11 – Consideration of a Certified Survey Map (CSM) submitted by John Schmitz of**
1167 **Point Surveying on behalf of Brian Miller of Nathan Estates, LLC, 121 West Franklin**
1168 **Street, Sparta, WI 54656 for the purpose of subdividing Lots 3 & 4 of Certified Survey**
1169 **Map 1601242 into three (3) buildable lots on Coronado Circle in the Nathan Hills Estates**
1170 **Planned Unit Development (Tax Parcels #18-5955-4 & 18-5955-5)**

1171
1172 1. CSM Fee of \$40.00 + \$10.00 per lot x 3 lots = \$70.00 due before final approval of CSM
1173 by the City.

1174
1175 2. Recorded copy of Final CSM to be submitted to City Engineering Department.

1176

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
29

- 1177 3. New lot pins required. Intermediate lot stakes required for all lots over 150' in depth.
1178 Lot lines shall be up at time of footings. Verify setback of existing structure upon
1179 placement of pins.
1180
1181 4. New revised plans required for all firewalls (roof sections).
1182
1183 5. Re-grade the 20' stormwater easement along the southern lot line.
1184
1185 6. Final lift of asphalt on Coronado Circle to be installed as required by Nathan Hills PUD
1186 approvals.
1187
1188 7. Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e.,
1189 site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals) and additional City fees (i.e.,
1190 parks fee, green fee).
1191
1192 8. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
1193 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
1194 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
1195 other conditions.
1196
1197 9. Any omissions of any conditions not listed shall not release the property owner/developer
1198 from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
1199

1200 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Paul, to approve with six conditions a Certified Survey Map
1201 (CSM) submitted by John Schmitz of Point Surveying on behalf of Brian Miller of Nathan
1202 Estates, LLC, 121 West Franklin Street, Sparta, WI 54656 for the purpose of subdividing Lots 3
1203 & 4 of Certified Survey Map 1601242 into three (3) buildable lots on Coronado Circle in the
1204 Nathan Hills Estates Planned Unit Development.
1205

1206 Brea noted that there are nine conditions in the Plan Commission packet, compared to six
1207 conditions in the Plan Commission Sub Committee packet. Brea noted that the CSM had been
1208 routed through staff for comments, and these comments had been returned after the May 19 Plan
1209 Commission Sub Committee meeting.
1210

1211 Motion by Ald. Bialecki, second by Paul, to approve with nine conditions a Certified Survey
1212 Map (CSM) submitted by John Schmitz of Point Surveying on behalf of Brian Miller of Nathan
1213 Estates, LLC, 121 West Franklin Street, Sparta, WI 54656 for the purpose of subdividing Lots 3
1214 & 4 of Certified Survey Map 1601242 into three (3) buildable lots on Coronado Circle in the
1215 Nathan Hills Estates Planned Unit Development.
1216

1217 On voice vote, motion carried, 7-0, with one abstention (Sue Peterson).
1218

1219 **Item 12 – Consideration of a Certified Survey Map (CSM) submitted by Jeff Moorhouse of**
1220 **Paragon Associates on behalf of I&B of Hudson, LLC, 422 Callaway Boulevard, La Crosse,**
1221 **WI 54603, for the purpose of subdividing Walnut Grove Lot 2 into two (2) buildable lots on**
1222 **the property located at 1005 Summers Day Lane (Tax Parcel #18-6307-0)**
1223

- 1224 1. CSM Fee of \$40.00 + \$10.00 per lot x 2 lots = \$60.00 due before final approval of CSM
1225 by the City (PAID).
- 1226
- 1227 2. Park Fee of \$922.21per residential unit x 2 = \$1,844.42. Park fee to be paid prior to
1228 issuance of a building permit.
- 1229
- 1230 3. Recorded copy of Final CSM to be submitted to City Engineering Department.
1231
- 1232 4. New lot pins required. Intermediate lot stakes required for all lots over 150' in depth.
1233
- 1234 5. Verification of square footages of existing and new lots.
1235
- 1236 6. A copy of the amended 20' Stormwater Easement across Lot 2 shall be provided to the
1237 City prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
1238
- 1239 7. Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e.,
1240 site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals) and additional City fees (i.e.,
1241 parks fee, green fee).
1242
- 1243 8. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
1244 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
1245 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
1246 other conditions.
1247
- 1248 9. Any omissions of any conditions not listed shall not release the property owner/developer
1249 from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
1250
- 1251 10. Certified Survey Map approval contingent upon approval of Planned Unit Development
1252 (PUD) amendment to split Lot 2.
1253

1254 Brea said this subdivision would be contingent on the PUD occurring. The proposed subdivision
1255 would create the lot line as proposed as part of the amendment to the PUD for Lot 2. Brea said
1256 staff recommends approval with the 10 conditions listed in the Plan Commission packet.
1257

1258 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. Bialecki, to approve with 10 conditions a Certified Survey Map
1259 (CSM) submitted by Jeff Moorhouse of Paragon Associates on behalf of I&B of Hudson, LLC,
1260 422 Callaway Boulevard, La Crosse, WI 54603, for the purpose of subdividing Walnut Grove
1261 Lot 2 into two (2) buildable lots on the property located at 1005 Summers Day Lane.
1262

1263 On voice vote, motion carried.

1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305

Item 13 – Review and discussion of Amendment to Title 2 Chapter 4 of the City of Onalaska Code of Ordinances pertaining to powers of the Plan Commission (FIO)

Brea said as staff was scrutinizing the CUP process for cell phone towers, it was discovered in the Zoning Ordinance that the Plan Commission has final approval authority for CUPs. The Common Council is the appellate body. Brea noted that the city has not been following this as the Common Council has been giving final approval of CUPs. Brea said staff is “taking a pause” and recognizing that the Zoning Ordinance identifies the Plan Commission is the body that has final approval authority for CUPs. Brea also noted that the Plan Commission has the final approval authority on site plans brought before the commission. Brea noted that the Administrative and Judiciary Committee held the First and Second Reading at its May 6 meeting, and this item also appeared on the May 12 Common Council agenda.

Skip noted he had suggested that the duties of the Plan Commission Sub Committee also should be stated.

Brea noted she had spoken with Sean and said there is a separate ordinance that refers to the Plan Commission Sub Committee. Brea said Sean does not recommend any changes to the ordinance that establishes the Plan Commission Sub Committee.

Item 14 – Review and discussion of 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, Chapter 8 – Intergovernmental Cooperation

Katie noted that all of the chapters that have been reviewed are viewable on cityofonalaska.com and said the Long Range Planning Committee is moving forward on Chapter 9 – Land Use.

Brea noted that the list of intergovernmental agreements is under review.

Adjournment

Motion by Ald. Bialecki to adjourn at 8:57 p.m.

Mayor Chilsen noted he had reviewed Robert’s Rules and said there is no need for a second on a motion to adjourn.

On voice vote, motion carried.

Recorded By:

Kirk Bey