

Plan Commission Sub Committee

of the City of Onalaska

Tuesday, August 18, 2015

1

1 The Meeting of the Plan Commission Sub Committee of the City of Onalaska was called to order
2 at 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 18, 2015. It was noted that the meeting had been announced
3 and a notice posted at City Hall.

4
5 Roll call was taken, with the following members present: Skip Temte, Assistant City Engineer
6 Kevin Schubert

7
8 Also Present: Land Use and Development Director Brea Grace

9
10 Excused Absences: Ald. Jim Bialecki, City Engineer Jarrod Holter

11
12 **Item 2 – Approval of minutes from previous meeting**

13
14 Motion by Skip, second by Kevin, to approve the minutes from the previous meeting as printed
15 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 Kevin called for anyone wishing to provide public input.

22
23 **Tim Hagen**
24 **31437 Victory Lane**
25 **La Crescent, Minn.**

26
27 “We’re on [Item] No. 4. We’re proposing an indoor shrimp-raising facility, and we’re open to
28 questions.” Tim introduced General Manager Darcy Hanson, who welcomed any questions or
29 concerns from the Plan Commission Sub Committee.

30
31 Kevin told Kevin and Darcy they can be recalled for questions, if there are any, when the Plan
32 Commission Sub Committee addresses Item No. 4.

33
34 Kevin called three times for anyone else wishing to provide public input and closed that portion
35 of the meeting.

36
37 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

38
39 **Item 4 – Consideration for a Conditional Use Permit application to allow a commercial**
40 **shrimp-raising operation in an indoor facility in a Light Industrial (M-1) District at 570**
41 **Lester Avenue, Onalaska, WI 54650 submitted by Tim Hagen, 31437 Victory Lane, La**
42 **Crescent, MN 55947 (Tax Parcel #18-4012-0)**

43

Plan Commission Sub Committee

of the City of Onalaska

Tuesday, August 18, 2015

2

- 44 1. Conditional Use Permit Application Fee of \$150.00 (PAID).
- 45
- 46 2. Outdoor storage prohibited.
- 47
- 48 3. Removal of solid waste (i.e., spent shells and other byproducts) and refuse from the
- 49 premise to occur in a timely manner.
- 50
- 51 4. Parking area to be screened through the use of landscaping or fencing from adjacent
- 52 daycare playground.
- 53
- 54 5. CUP to be re-reviewed by the Plan Commission prior to on-site business expansions and
- 55 at the time of any significant expansions in quantities raised (either as a singular
- 56 expansion or a cumulative effect).
- 57
- 58 6. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed (through site plan review)
- 59 and approved by the City prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must
- 60 have all conditions satisfied and improvements installed per approved plans prior to
- 61 issuance of occupancy permits.
- 62
- 63 7. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
- 64 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
- 65 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
- 66 other conditions.
- 67
- 68 8. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in Plan Commission Sub-Committee Minutes
- 69 shall not release the property owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified
- 70 Development Code requirements.
- 71

72 Brea said this is a proposal for a CUP in an M-1 District and noted a public hearing is scheduled
73 at the August 25 Plan Commission meeting. Brea noted the following decision criteria were
74 utilized to review the submitted conditional use:

- 75
- 76 • **Compatibility:** The zoning of the land within 250 feet of the proposed site is Light
- 77 Industrial. The uses within 500 feet along the same street of the proposed site include a
- 78 car wash, telecommunication (cell tower) site, retail, a multitenant commercial building,
- 79 U.S. Fish & Wildlife offices and other professional offices. There also is a daycare
- 80 located behind the facility. The proposed use would not have outdoor storage and would
- 81 be required to move through the site planning process to ensure compatibility with
- 82 neighboring commercial uses.
- 83 • **Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan:** The Comprehensive Plan identifies this
- 84 area as a Mixed Use District. This district is intended to allow a mixture of
- 85 complementary land uses including housing, retail, office, service, and civic uses in an

Plan Commission Sub Committee

of the City of Onalaska

Tuesday, August 18, 2015

3

- 86 efficient, compact and relatively dense development pattern.
- 87 • **Importance of Services to the Community:** According to the Comprehensive Plan, a
 - 88 Land Use Objective of the city states, “*promoting compatible infill development (infill*
 - 89 *development occurs on land that is underdeveloped or vacant lots in development areas)*
 - 90 *throughout the city ...*” The proposed site is vacant and underutilized. According to the
 - 91 applicant, this business has the potential to bring new customers into the area as other
 - 92 shrimp-raising facilities have customers that drive from 200 miles away. The applicant
 - 93 also intends to offer education tours to schools, daycares and other interested parties.
 - 94 • **Neighborhood Protections:** The applicant will be required to move through the site
 - 95 planning process to ensure adequate parking, landscaping, lighting and architecture in
 - 96 addition to other factors for the business. The applicant does not intend to have outdoor
 - 97 storage, and odor is limited.
 - 98

99 Brea said staff is recommending eight conditions of approval be added if the CUP application is
100 approved.

101
102 Motion by Skip, second by Kevin, to approve with eight conditions a Conditional Use Permit
103 application to allow a commercial shrimp-raising operation in an indoor facility in a Light
104 Industrial (M-1) District at 570 Lester Avenue, Onalaska, WI 54650 submitted by Tim Hagen,
105 31437 Victory Lane, La Crescent, MN 55947.

106
107 On voice vote, motion carried.

108
109 **Item 5 – Consideration of a Certified Survey Map (CSM) submitted by Andy Luttcgens of**
110 **Davy Engineering on behalf of Valley View Business Park, LLP, PO Box 325, Onalaska,**
111 **WI 54650 for the purpose of realigning Lots 1, 2 and Outlot 1 in the Nathan Hills Estate**
112 **Subdivision (Tax Parcels # 18-5941-0 and 18-5942-0)**

- 113
- 114 1. CSM Fee of \$40.00 + \$10.00 per lot x 2 lots = \$60.00 due before final approval of CSM
- 115 by the City.
- 116
- 117 2. Vacation/discontinuance of the Kurt Place right-of-way.
- 118
- 119 3. Recorded copy of Final CSM to be submitted to the City Engineering Department.
- 120
- 121 4. Owner shall abide by all requirements and conditions of the approval of the Nathan Hills
- 122 Estates Planned Unit Development.
- 123
- 124 5. New lot pins required. Intermediate lot stakes required for all lots over 150’ in depth.
- 125
- 126 6. The 10’ easement utility easement around Kurt Place to be dissolved and a new
- 127 permanent utility easement (i.e., for water, storm sewer, sanitary sewer) to be created

Plan Commission Sub Committee

of the City of Onalaska

Tuesday, August 18, 2015

4

- 128 over existing utilities and recorded with the Register of Deeds. A copy of the recorded
129 document to be provided to the City prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
130
- 131 7. Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e.,
132 site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals) and additional City fees (i.e.,
133 parks fees, green fee).
134
- 135 8. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
136 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
137 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
138 other conditions.
139
- 140 9. Any omissions of any conditions not listed shall not release the property owner/developer
141 from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
142

143 Brea noted that while the CSM is not creating a new lot, there will be a significant realignment,
144 thus requiring Plan Commission review. The outlots are changing in size with the proposed
145 changes to the storm water detention area. Brea said Lot 1 and Lot 2 also will be realigned with
146 the Kurt Place right-of-way discontinuance, which is scheduled for a public hearing at the
147 September 8 Common Council meeting. Brea said approval of the CSM would be contingent
148 upon the right-of-way discontinuance occurring. Brea noted staff has routed the application
149 through City Hall and obtained feedback. Brea said an item that needs to be addressed is a
150 separate parcel 18 to 20 feet wide and located in the Town of Medary on the south side of Lot 1
151 along State Trunk Highway 16. Brea noted she has spoken with a surveyor from Davy
152 Engineering, who said he believes the initial plan for Nathan Hills Estates originally included
153 this area. Therefore, this separate parcel should not exist. Brea noted the surveyor has attempted
154 to contact Dan Leis of La Crosse County to discuss this surveying question. However, Dan Leis
155 will not return to the office until Thursday, August 20.
156

157 Brea said, "It's the Zoning Department's position that until the county says otherwise, we are
158 going to look at their records and see that as a separate, standalone parcel in the Town of
159 Medary. As a separate parcel in the Town of Medary, it cannot be merged with a parcel in the
160 City of Onalaska through this CSM. The normal annexation process would have to be followed.
161 This question about if it's a previous surveying error or recording error, city staff and Davy
162 Engineering will consult with the county and work through this item prior to the Plan
163 Commission meeting. If it should be a standalone parcel, this Certified Survey Map can be
164 easily be changed to account for that. Aside from this item, the existing easements are in the
165 process of being released, and new easements will be established that cover the location of city
166 utilities."
167

168 Brea said staff recommends approval with the nine conditions listed in committee members'
169 packets.
170

Plan Commission Sub Committee

of the City of Onalaska

Tuesday, August 18, 2015

5

171 Motion by Skip, second by Kevin, to approve with the nine conditions a Certified Survey Map
172 (CSM) submitted by Andy Luttcens of Davy Engineering on behalf of Valley View Business
173 Park, LLP, PO Box 325, Onalaska, WI 54650 for the purpose of realigning Lots 1, 2 and Outlot
174 1 in the Nathan Hills Estate Subdivision. This is contingent upon the issue regarding the
175 separate parcel in the Town of Medary being resolved prior to the August 25 Plan Commission
176 meeting. If there is no resolution by August 25, this item will return before the Plan Commission
177 Sub Committee at its September 15 meeting.

178

179 On voice vote, motion carried.

180

181 **Item 6 – Discussion and Consideration of Changes to Zoning Fees**

182

183 Brea said staff has been examining zoning fees for more than a year, pointing out that the City of
184 Onalaska’s fees are substantially lower than those of other municipalities that are similar in size.
185 Staff performed a full evaluation of the city’s zoning permit fees, and the staff report included in
186 committee members’ packets list both the current fee and the staff-proposed fee. Brea referred to
187 the first page of the staff report and said staff recommends charging \$25 for a zoning verification
188 letter for a residential property, and \$100 for a zoning verification letter for a commercial
189 property. There currently is no charge. Brea said the proposal to charge \$100 for a commercial
190 property occurred after a discussion with Financial Services Director/Treasurer Fred Buehler and
191 City Attorney Sean O’Flaherty. Brea noted that committee members’ packets also include a list
192 of communities similar in size and development pattern to the City of Onalaska, and what they
193 currently charge. Brea said this list assisted staff in determining the city’s fee structure, noting
194 staff time spent on each application and direct expenses incurred by the city as a result of the
195 application also were taken into account.

196

197 Motion by Skip, second by Kevin, to approve Changes to Zoning Fees.

198

199 Skip asked Brea if any thought was given to the fact an increase in fees might impact growth in
200 the city.

201

202 Brea told Skip that this has been a factor in staff’s review of the fee changes, as has enforcement
203 and individuals possibly bypassing the permitting process. Brea said, “That was constantly in
204 our mind when we made our recommendation. We don’t want to step to the point where it’s
205 impeding growth or it’s impeding people applying. We’re presenting this for discussion. If we
206 do make a change to the Zoning Ordinance we have to hold a public hearing. Next week the
207 Plan Commission could recommend this to a public hearing if they feel these changes are
208 warranted.” Brea noted she will be meeting with the La Crosse Area Builders Association’s
209 government affairs group on September 2 and discussing the recommended fee changes. Brea
210 said she’d obtain feedback from the group prior to any public hearings held at the Plan
211 Commission level.

212

213 On voice vote, motion carried.

Reviewed 8/21/15 by Brea Grace

Plan Commission Sub Committee

of the City of Onalaska

Tuesday, August 18, 2015

6

214

215 **Item 7 – Review and discussion of 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, Chapter 10 --**
216 **Implementation**

217

218 Brea noted this is the final chapter of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update and said the Long
219 Range Planning Committee had attempted with Chapter 9 to select the crucial goals and develop
220 strategies for some of those important points. Brea said this is what is recommended for Chapter
221 10 and noted the Long Range Planning Committee has asked the Community Development
222 Authority, among others, to review this chapter. Brea also noted that several department heads
223 have been asked to provide input. Brea said the department heads have suggested changes and
224 said that Chapter 10 will be edited and returned to the Long Range Planning Committee for
225 discussion.

226

227 Motion by Skip, second by Kevin, to approve 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, Chapter 10 –
228 Implementation.

229

230 Skip complimented the work that has been done on the Comprehensive Plan Update.

231

232 Brea said she is not yet seeking the Plan Commission’s approval of Chapter 10 and suggested
233 instead recommending that the chapter be reviewed by the Plan Commission. Brea noted
234 approval of the Comprehensive Plan Update will occur after the Plan Commission holds a public
235 hearing.

236

237 Motion by Skip, second by Kevin, to amend the previous motion and recommend 2015
238 Comprehensive Plan Update, Chapter 10 – Implementation to the Plan Commission for review.

239

240 Vote on the amendment:

241

242 On voice vote, motion carried.

243

244 Vote on the original motion, as amended.

245

246 On voice vote, motion carried.

247

248 **Adjournment**

249

250 Motion by Skip, second by Kevin, to adjourn at 4:48 p.m.

251

252 On voice vote, motion carried.

253

254

255 Recorded by:

256

257 Kirk Bey

Reviewed 8/21/15 by Brea Grace