

**Board of Zoning Appeals  
of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

1

1 The meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 6:31 p.m. on Monday, March  
2 15, 2021. It was noted that the meeting had been announced and posted at City Hall.

3  
4 Roll call was taken, with the following members present: Ald. Diane Wulf, Ald. Steven Nott  
5 (alternate), Cindy Genz, Kristen Odegaard, Craig Breitsprecher

6  
7 Also Present (either in person or remotely): City Administrator Eric Rindfleisch, City Clerk  
8 JoAnn Marcon, Planning Manager Katie Aspenson, Ald. Jim Olson, Mayor Kim Smith, City  
9 Attorney Amanda Jackson, Code Enforcement Technician Peter McCall

10  
11 Excused Absence: Gargi Chaudhuri

12  
13 **Item 2 – Approval of minutes from the previous meeting (December 21, 2020)**

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

17  
18 On voice vote, motion carried.

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

21  
22 Ald. Wulf called three times for anyone wishing to provide public input and closed that portion  
23 of the meeting.

24  
25 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

26  
27 **Item 4 – Public Hearing: Approximately 6:30 p.m. (or immediately following public input)**  
28 **– Request for variance filed by Patrick & Sarah Lamke, 1593 Young Drive East, Onalaska,**  
29 **WI 54650, for the parcel located at 1593 Young Drive East, Onalaska, WI 54650 to allow**  
30 **two (2) variances from the Unified Development Code to install a retaining wall in the**  
31 **Medary Lane right-of-way and cross to an adjacent property (also owned by the applicant)**  
32 **waiving the three (3) foot retaining wall setback from a right-of-way requirement and**  
33 **waving the retaining wall side yard setback requirement (Tax Parcels #18-3766-2 and 18-**  
34 **3767-0)**

35  
36 Ald. Wulf reviewed the Order of Business for Public Hearing per Development Review  
37 Procedures Appeal:

38  
39 General Hearing:

- 40  
41 • Statement of the nature of the case by the Chairperson (Ald. Wulf).  
42 • Appellate side of the case (Applicant).

Reviewed 03/17/2021 by Katie Aspenson

**Board of Zoning Appeals  
of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

2

- 43 • Questions from the Board of Zoning Appeals members.
- 44 • Planning Manager’s side of the case (Katie).
- 45 • Questions from the Board of Zoning Appeals members.
- 46 • Statements from interested persons such as neighbors or abutting landowners.
- 47 • Questions from the Board of Zoning Appeals members.
- 48 • Appellate rebuttal.
- 49 • Board of Zoning Appeals will hold its final discussion and render a decision.

50

51 Ald. Wulf invited the applicant to address the board and explain the variance request.

52

53 **Patrick Lamke**  
54 **1593 East Young Drive**  
55 **Onalaska**

56

57 “Thank you for your consideration on the matter. I’m looking to put in a retaining wall at the  
58 outer margins of my property to keep the land around the house and my house from slumping  
59 downhill. A good portion of the lot and the house was built on fill. The embankments are far  
60 too steep for any kind of retaining wall. What was previously installed was actually just wood  
61 ties. We have a large maple on the corner of the property. The retaining wall block, I’m looking  
62 at using are manufactured by Strupp Trucking. They weigh about 2,500 pounds apiece. That’s  
63 the kind of structure and material that I feel I need to build in order to keep the land from moving  
64 and my house from settling. We want to try to maximize the amount of area around the house as  
65 much as possible because the retaining wall, once built, would otherwise if I started at my lot  
66 line would encroach on my tree, would diminish the size of my lot, and actually would end up  
67 taking the tree out. Where I’m looking to expand (the retaining wall) into is actually next to the  
68 driveway into the city park next to my house. It’s this area I already maintain. It’s already been  
69 approved by the city with no future plans to do any future improvement (to Medary Lane).  
70 Being able to utilize a margin of this city boulevard benefits the city because I’m already taking  
71 care of the property. It helps me maximize the amount of space I can use to try to keep my house  
72 from moving.”

73

74 Ald. Wulf asked board members if they wish to ask the applicant questions.

75

76 Craig asked Patrick how long he has resided at his house.

77

78 Patrick told Craig he has lived there 27 years.

79

80 Craig asked Patrick if he had recently noticed the settling.

81

82 Patrick told Craig it has been “a long, gradual process,” and he said, “I think as some of the  
83 winters have become more extreme with some of the bigger, deeper freezes, the embankments

**Board of Zoning Appeals  
of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

3

84 are starting to move more.” Patrick described the situation as “the frog in boiling water  
85 comparison” in that “if you look at it every year, every year it’s hard to see the movement. But I  
86 have a mark on our foundation where the yard used to be, and now I know where the yard is.  
87 The last three years there was a noticeable change in our front sidewalk. As everything migrates  
88 southward, the sidewalk is starting to slump. My wife was probably the first to notice it because  
89 she has stability issues [due to] a muscle condition, and the sidewalk about two to three years ago  
90 became unwalkable for her because the pitch changed so much. It’s been a long, gradual  
91 process, but everything is definitely on the move.”

92

93 Cindy asked, “The location in the city right of way, is that just because of the maple tree? Is that  
94 why we’re going into the city right of way?”

95

96 Patrick told Cindy it also is about the size of the block and said, “By the time I have to come up  
97 to the height I need the block – and it varies because the lot or the margins of the lot are actually  
98 pitched in two different directions. In the very front yard nearest East Young Drive the wall will  
99 only be about a foot. But by the time I reach the southeast corner of the lot, I’m at 12 feet. So  
100 by the time I come up [and] I do my setbacks, if I was starting at my lot line I’d be halfway into  
101 my yard with the setbacks in the side because the blocks are 2 feet thick. I’m losing almost 8  
102 feet of yard if I start right at the lot line. The larger the margin you can give away from a  
103 building or the structure, probably the less overall movement.”

104

105 As there were no further questions from board members, Ald. Wulf invited Katie to make her  
106 presentation.

107

108 Katie told board members the property in question is zoned Low Density Residential (R-1), and  
109 that Patrick intends to construct a retaining wall in order to stabilize the ground on both the  
110 southern and eastern sides of the residence. Katie said there is notable steep anywhere from 66  
111 percent to 70 percent in others in terms of how great a slope that particular property has along the  
112 eastern and the southern sides. Katie said Patrick has noted he might need to complete up to  
113 potentially two more walls in order to obtain a sufficient amount of land to stabilize the ground.  
114 Katie referred to the conceptual plan included in board members’ packets and noted the southern  
115 portion of the retaining wall is proposed to be in the Medary Lane right of way. Katie also noted  
116 the Board of Public Works had approved the use of the right of way for this, pending approval of  
117 the variance request. Portions of the wall in its current location are shown to be located within  
118 both the floodway and the flood fringe. A retaining wall is an allowed use/structure within the  
119 R-1 District, and the City of Onalaska is required to contact the Wisconsin Department of  
120 Natural Resources as part of this process (this has been completed). Katie explained that in the  
121 event the retaining wall is proposed to be located in the floodway, the property owner will be  
122 required to meet all Wisconsin DNR standards and complete any necessary studies. Katie noted  
123 Patrick has been informed of this requirement if it is needed.

124

125 Katie told board members the proposed development requests two variances from the Unified

**Board of Zoning Appeals**

**of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

4

126 Development Code. Specifically, the request is to waive the street yard setback for a retaining  
127 wall, which is a minimum of 3 feet from the street yard, and allow construction in the right of  
128 way. There also is a request to waive the side yard setback. Katie noted this particular plan  
129 shows the right of way as it goes north to cross the property line, and she said that is why that  
130 setback would need to be waived. Katie said if Patrick does not need to cross the property line  
131 when he decides where the location would be, the variance then would fall away and become  
132 null and void.

133  
134 Katie explained that this is considered an Area Variance as it pertains in particular to setback  
135 relief, and she noted there are three Criteria for Review. Katie told board members she had  
136 reviewed all the criteria requests against both Variance Request No. 1, which pertains to the right  
137 of way, and Variance Request No. 2, which pertains to the side yard setback

138  
139 **1. Unnecessary hardship due to the unique physical limitations of the property and not**  
140 **the particular circumstances of the applicant. The unnecessary hardship must not**  
141 **be self-imposed by the applicant or prior owners of the property. Further, economic**  
142 **loss or financial hardship cannot serve as the basis for justifying a Variance.**

143  
144 • **Staff comments for Variance Request No. 1:** Due to the slopes that appear to be in  
145 excess of 30 percent on the eastern and southern sides of the property, the purpose of  
146 the variance is to assist in stabilizing the land through a series of retaining walls. In  
147 order to provide for two sets of walls, the retaining wall is needed to start further from  
148 the residence, which would require the wall to be installed in the Medary Lane right-  
149 of-way. **Yes, criteria met.**

150 • **Staff comments for Variance Request No. 2:** The applicant owns the two subject  
151 parcels in question. The Unified Development Code allows retaining walls  
152 throughout a parcel and on rear and side parcel lines. The need for the variance is  
153 based on the issue that the retaining wall would cross parcel lines. As with Variance  
154 Request No. 1, there will be a series of two walls required for slope stabilization. In  
155 order to preserve existing vegetation and distance from the house, the variance is  
156 necessary. **Yes, criteria met.**

157  
158 **2. The Variance will not create a detriment to an adjacent or neighboring property,**  
159 **and will not be contrary to the public interest or public safety.**

160  
161 • **Staff comments for Variance Request No. 1:** The proposed location of the  
162 retaining wall in the city right of way is not contrary to the public interest. The  
163 installation of the retaining wall will also act as a barrier to ensure that land does not  
164 shift from private property into the city’s right of way. **Yes, criteria met.**

165 • **Staff comments for Variance Request No. 2:** The property owner owns the  
166 adjacent/neighboring property and has determined that the project is necessary due to  
167 topography concerns of both properties and is in the public’s interest. **Yes, criteria**

168 met.

- 169  
170 **3. The Variance shall not have the effect of allowing in any district uses prohibited in**  
171 **that district, permit a lower degree of flood protection that the flood protection**  
172 **elevation for the particular area or permit standards lower than those required by**  
173 **state law.**  
174

- 175 • **Staff comments for Variance Request No. 1:** Portions of the Medary Lane right of  
176 way are within the floodway. A retaining wall is considered a “structure” and would  
177 require fill according to Wisconsin DNR definition and is not a prohibited  
178 structure/use. If the retaining wall is to be located in the floodway, additional flood  
179 studies are required to ensure that appropriate flood protections would be in place at  
180 the time of construction. **Yes, criteria met.**
- 181 • **Staff comments for Variance Request No. 2:** Portions of the subject properties  
182 contain both floodway and flood fringe. As mentioned, a retaining wall is considered  
183 a “structure” and would require fill according to Wisconsin DNR definition and is not  
184 a prohibited structure/use. If the retaining wall is to be located in the floodway,  
185 additional flood studies are required to ensure that appropriate flood protections  
186 would be in place at the time of construction. If the retaining wall is to be located in  
187 the flood fringe, no additional flood studies are required and would not allow  
188 standards lower than those required by state law. **Yes, criteria met.**  
189

190 Katie told board members city staff recommends approval of the two proposed variance requests.  
191 If the Board of Zoning Appeals should approve the variance requests, at a minimum city staff  
192 recommends the following Conditions of Approval:  
193

- 194 1. Property owner to provide a detailed plan noting the exact location(s) of the proposed  
195 retaining walls to be approved by the City Engineer and Planning Manager.
- 196 2. Property owner is not allowed to encroach into the Wisconsin DNR-noted floodway  
197 unless a Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis/Study is obtained and provided to the City  
198 Engineer for review and approval prior to construction activities to ensure the proposed  
199 activities will not negatively impact the floodway. A Hydrologic and Hydraulic  
200 Analysis/Study is required when filling and/or constructing a permanent structure in a  
201 floodway per Wisconsin DNR floodplain standards.
- 202 3. Any omissions of any conditions not listed shall not release the property owner/developer  
203 from abiding by the City’s Unified Development Code requirements, as amended.
- 204 4. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the property owner and all heirs,  
205 successors, and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not  
206 relieve the original property owner from meeting any conditions.  
207

208 Ald. Wulf asked board members if they wish to ask Katie questions.  
209

**Board of Zoning Appeals  
of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

6

210 Cindy asked Katie if she has any concerns about allowing the retaining wall go across the  
211 property line. Cindy noted Patrick owns both properties, and she asked if the other property is  
212 unbuildable as it sits.

213  
214 Katie told Cindy it is not entirely unbuildable, and she noted city staff had spoken with Patrick  
215 about merging the two together. Katie said one of the concerns is that a significant portion of  
216 that property is located in the floodplain, and she told Cindy that technically is the largest hurdle  
217 Patrick would need to overcome if he were to receive a Letter of Map Amendment. Katie said it  
218 is possible to construct on that piece of property and added, “As it stands today, it would be very  
219 challenging to try and construct on it.”

220  
221 Cindy asked if it is possible to add a condition “to see if we can avoid going over that property  
222 line,” and she said, “If that is a buildable lot, it could really cause a problem in the future.”

223  
224 Katie told Cindy it would be considered buildable if Patrick removed the floodplain from the  
225 property, and she said she does not believe that is Patrick’s intention. Katie said, “The other  
226 concern is that if it would be merged together, there is the possibility of additional taxes related  
227 to the fact that that property directly abuts the river. So it being a separate property, they do not  
228 have to pay what I believe is considered a View Tax, or something along those lines. But it is  
229 also possible that if they choose to stay out of the flood way that it would not cross the property  
230 line. Then this wouldn’t be an issue at that point in time.”

231  
232 As there were no further questions from board members, Ald. Wulf opened the public hearing  
233 and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the requested variance.

234  
235 Ald. Wulf called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the requested variance and  
236 closed that portion of the public hearing.

237  
238 Ald. Wulf called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the requested variance  
239 and closed the public hearing.

240  
241 Ald. Wulf welcomed questions from board members, either for Patrick or for Katie.

242  
243 Craig asked Patrick what type of block he anticipates utilizing.

244  
245 Patrick told Craig he plans to utilize blocks that are produced by Strupp Construction. The  
246 blocks are sculpted shaped cement blocks, and they measure 4 feet long by 2 feet deep by 2 feet  
247 high. Patrick noted the blocks are “very reasonably priced” for the amount of square footage one  
248 receives for the coverage, and he said they are easy to set since he generally works alone.  
249 Patrick referred to the January 12 Common Council meeting, at which time there had been a  
250 discussion regarding possibly staining the blocks, and he said the concrete blocks readily accept  
251 stains. Patrick told board members he plans to stain the blocks and seal the face so that they

**Board of Zoning Appeals**

**of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

7

252 blend more into the environment rather than the blocks having a gray concrete face.

253

254 As there were no further questions, Ald. Wulf welcomed a rebuttal from Patrick.

255

256 Patrick thanked board members for their consideration, and he also thanked Ald. Nott and Katie  
257 for their assistance.

258

259 Ald. Wulf read the following: “*All orders or decisions of the Board of Appeals granting a*  
260 *variance, exception or conditional use, or reversing any action or order of the administrator*  
261 *require the affirmative vote of four members.*” Ald. Wulf next addressed Section 13.05.23  
262 (D)(3) (“Criteria for Review”) and said that in order for the Board of Zoning Appeals to grant a  
263 variance, it must find that the applicant, which has the burden of proof, has demonstrated the  
264 following:

265

266 A. Unnecessary hardship due to the unique physical limitations of the property and not the  
267 particular circumstances of the applicant. The unnecessary hardship must not be self-  
268 imposed by the applicant or the prior owners of the property. Further economic loss or  
269 financial hardship cannot serve as a basis for justifying a variance.

270 B. The variance will not create a detriment to an adjacent or neighboring property. It will  
271 not be contrary to the public interest or the public safety.

272 C. The variance shall not have the effect of allowing in any district uses prohibited in that  
273 district; prevent a lower degree of flood protection that the flood protection elevation for  
274 that particular area; or permit standards lower than those required by state law.

275

276 Ald. Nott said, “I’ve been incredibly impressed with the patience and the cooperation of Patrick  
277 with the city staff. This has been an ongoing process that he’s been working with for at least six  
278 months. He’s been very, very patient with the roadblocks he needs to go through in order to do  
279 this the right way. I also understand that although we cannot consider the economic impact, this  
280 does ultimately go down to the viability of his own property over the rest of whatever that  
281 lifetime may be, whether it be years to decades, it will impact his house.”

282

283 Motion by Ald. Nott, second by Craig, to approve with the four stated conditions a request for  
284 variance filed by Patrick & Sarah Lamke, 1593 Young Drive East, Onalaska, WI 54650, for the  
285 parcel located at 1593 Young Drive East, Onalaska, WI 54650 to allow two (2) variances from  
286 the Unified Development Code to install a retaining wall in the Medary Lane right-of-way and  
287 cross to an adjacent property (also owned by the applicant) waiving the three (3) foot retaining  
288 wall setback from a right-of-way requirement and waving the retaining wall side yard setback  
289 requirement (Tax Parcels #18-3766-2 and 18-3767-0).

290

291 Craig noted he had driven past Patrick’s property and said, “There’s not a doubt in my mind that  
292 this is something that needs to be done. This is not something that, generally speaking, is  
293 something we run across often, so it definitely is unique to the property. And as much as we’re

**Board of Zoning Appeals  
of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

8

294 not supposed to consider any financial impact, whether it's for gain or loss, my heart goes out to  
295 the fact that it's going to cost some money. I think the end result is going to be beneficial for  
296 everybody, so I'm fully behind this."

297  
298 Motion by Ald. Wulf, second by Kristen, to amend the previous motion and add the words "and  
299 design" to Condition No. 1 so that it reads as follows: "*Property owner to provide a detailed*  
300 *plan noting the exact location(s) **and design** of the proposed retaining walls to be approved by*  
301 *the City Engineer and Planning Manager.*"

302  
303 Ald. Wulf noted she had spoken with city staff earlier Monday regarding her proposed  
304 amendment and said, "It's just simply to have some type of a drawing or just indication so staff  
305 knows what's going there so no one later [asks], "Did you put up?" just so we're all on the same  
306 page. And this is staff. It's, as it says, to be approved by the City Engineer and Planning  
307 Manager. It will be for the applicant to work with staff." Ald. Wulf added she also had spoken  
308 with Amanda regarding this.

309  
310 Ald. Nott said, "On its face I don't have an issue with it. But having seen how this has unfolded  
311 over the last many months, I do have a concern, and that's that we within the city have been  
312 moving the goalposts on Patrick quite a bit with everything from color to shrubs or no shrubs –  
313 things of that nature. So if we add that in with the design with the approval of the City Engineer  
314 and Planning Manager, I certainly would hope that we're not going to move the goalposts on him  
315 anymore because we're adding more and more costs to him by saying, 'Now we'd like to have  
316 something else.' "

317  
318 Ald. Wulf reiterated she had spoken with city staff earlier Monday and said she had appreciated  
319 Amanda's legal opinion. Ald. Wulf said, "In fact, I noted in my permanent record to be thinking  
320 about this for future conditions. The response was, anytime we're looking at adding conditions  
321 or anything, what city interest are we trying to protect? The reason why I added the words 'and  
322 design' ... I'm not looking for a rendering, but just so the applicant submits to staff pretty much  
323 what it is going to look like. I don't perceive that to be a hurdle or a cost of any kind. To me,  
324 that's a typical ask that staff handles much of the work after something gets passed at [the] Plan  
325 [Commission] and [Common] Council [levels]. That's what they do pretty much every day.  
326 Quite frankly, I've never heard feedback, but I'm not aware of that I'm hearing constituents say  
327 that staff was difficult to work with or that they had any onerous asks. I personally have found  
328 staff to be very fair, and I think that's why the City of Onalaska has a very good reputation of  
329 working with builders and constituents. I did ask staff beforehand about the ask, and they agreed  
330 that it would be good to know, what does it look like, before [Patrick] starts to work. I don't  
331 think that's really any different than if you're pulling a permit to do any work. The process is  
332 going on City of Onalaska land. But I'm not looking at creating any additional costs with this  
333 additional thing."

334  
335 Ald. Nott said, "I don't have a problem with [Patrick] presenting a design; I don't think that's



**Board of Zoning Appeals  
of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

9

336 unusual. But I am concerned that we do not go down a path of altering things that would be  
337 arbitrary in any design he would be submitting. His design needs to be safe and meet building  
338 standards – things of that nature. He has agreed that he’s going to do this coloration with the  
339 staining of the brick. But I’ve witnessed as this has gone through the process that, in my own  
340 view, we’re starting to cross into some arbitrary decisions that were being recommended to him.  
341 And I just don’t want to go down that path. If he’s going to present a design, it’s a design that  
342 meets the standards, and that’s it.”

343  
344 Craig told Ald. Nott, “I’m kind of with you, Steve. I don’t see on the face of it a lot of concern.  
345 But when I think of ... ‘and design,’ that’s a far-reaching term. Are we interested in the height?  
346 [Are we interested in] how many layers? Are we interested that it’s plum, or are we going  
347 beyond that here, because I don’t think we need to go there. Have a discussion with me, Katie,  
348 about, what do we require for a small retaining wall where they are allowed? Do we require  
349 designs?”

350  
351 Katie told Craig that the City of Onalaska does not require a permit for a retaining wall and said,  
352 “There are no true designs that we have to review. If someone wants to put up a retaining wall,  
353 they’re able to just do that provided they follow our rules. Our rules are setbacks and our  
354 heights, so the maximum height of the retaining wall that they would be allowed to do is 6 feet  
355 with a 3-foot terrace if they wanted to do a series of walls. So for my understanding and the  
356 design – and Patrick, please feel free to join in – we’re not looking at adding any landscaping at  
357 this point, primarily because if you look at it from an enforcement standpoint, 50 years from now  
358 do we want to be enforcing it if shrubs died when they were originally installed? No one wants  
359 to do that. But in this case, we’re looking at the type of material that he’s looking at doing,  
360 which he already described to you, which was the poured concrete block in the different  
361 formation. And then also that you were considering doing the staining of it so it wouldn’t be the  
362 gray tone. That’s the design that we’re looking at doing. It’s the material that he’s going to use,  
363 and what a color of it would be. I’m not looking for a rendering in a great amount of detail.

364  
365 Oftentimes, people will come forward with architecture, and its staff reviewing it. So this is, as  
366 Diane alluded to, something that we look at often, and we take a variety of designs. We have  
367 people that bring in samples, [and] we have people that give us very elaborate renderings of  
368 buildings. We take the run of the mill, we work with the applicant and what they’re able to  
369 provide us, and move along.”

370  
371 Cindy said, “I think we’re more trying to protect so that somebody doesn’t bring in reconstituted  
372 concrete or leftover cement from a sidewalk somewhere. I think we’re trying to protect so that  
373 it’s more aesthetically pleasing. I don’t think Katie is meaning that she wants to actually rule on  
374 how it’s going to be built.”

375  
376 Craig said, “With all due respect, [Patrick] has already indicated the type of material that’s being  
377 used in concrete slabs.”

**Board of Zoning Appeals**

**of the City of Onalaska**

Monday, March 15, 2021

10

378  
379 Cindy said, “Right, so I don’t see a problem with it.”

380  
381 Craig said, “And as part of the public record, I don’t think we need to worry about reconstituted  
382 concrete or any of that other stuff.”

383  
384 Cindy said, “I just meant that’s what it’s trying to protect against by saying they just want to  
385 review it by the design.”

386  
387 Craig said, “And I just think a basic review of that, but I just don’t want to see this get to the  
388 point where all of a sudden we’re dictating, ‘Now we want this block to be here.’ Let’s not  
389 micromanage this. I think the purpose of these variances is clear and necessary. And I think as  
390 long as reasonable care and good, quality work is done, that’s what we need to be concerned  
391 about – nothing more.”

392  
393 Cindy told Craig she agrees with him.

394  
395 Amanda told board members that while Patrick has indicated the type of material he intends to  
396 utilize, “that’s not a condition that’s included in this. Part of that review would be staff verifying  
397 the materials, which is something the city may have an interest in. Going back to what you said  
398 initially, Diane, is looking at what the city would care about, [which is] the longevity of this to  
399 make sure that the materials used are going to stand the test of time as it is something that’s  
400 being put on city property as to opposed to on private property.”

401  
402 Vote on the amendment:

403  
404 On voice vote, motion carried.

405  
406 Original motion restated:

407  
408 To approve with the four stated conditions – including an amended Condition No. 1 that reads  
409 “*Property owner to provide a detailed plan noting the exact location(s) and design of the*  
410 *proposed retaining walls to be approved by the City Engineer and Planning Manager.*”  
411 – a request for variance filed by Patrick & Sarah Lamke, 1593 Young Drive East, Onalaska, WI  
412 54650, for the parcel located at 1593 Young Drive East, Onalaska, WI 54650 to allow two (2)  
413 variances from the Unified Development Code to install a retaining wall in the Medary Lane  
414 right-of-way and cross to an adjacent property (also owned by the applicant) waiving the three  
415 (3) foot retaining wall setback from a right-of-way requirement and waving the retaining wall  
416 side yard setback requirement (Tax Parcels #18-3766-2 and 18-3767-0).

417  
418 On roll call vote: Kristen Odegaard – aye, Cindy Genz – aye, Craig Breitsprecher – aye, Ald.  
419 Steven Nott – aye, Ald. Diane Wulf – aye. Motion carried, 5-0.

Reviewed 03/17/2021 by Katie Aspenson

**Board of Zoning Appeals  
of the City of Onalaska**  
Monday, March 15, 2021  
11

420

421 **Adjournment**

422

423 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. Nott, to adjourn at 7:11 p.m.

424

425 On voice vote, motion carried.

426

427

428 Recorded by:

429

430 Kirk Bey