

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

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, January 28, 2020. It was noted that the meeting had been announced and a notice
3 posted at City Hall.

4
5 Roll call was taken, with the following members present: Mayor Kim Smith, Ald. Tom Smith,
6 City Engineer Jarrod Holter, Jenny Akins, Craig Breitsprecher, Andrea Benco

7
8 Also Present: City Administrator Eric Rindfleisch, City Attorney Amanda Jackson, Deputy City
9 Clerk JoAnn Marcon, Planning Manager Katie Aspenson, Planning Technician Zach Peterson

10
11 Excused Absences: Jan Brock, Skip Temte

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

14
15 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. T. Smith, 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 with one abstention (Andrea).

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

21
22 Mayor K. Smith called for anyone wishing to provide public input.

23
24 **Marcia Horvath**
25 **1205 County Road PH**
26 **Onalaska**

27
28 “I know tonight is about the whole city, but I would like to talk about the proposed rezoning at
29 the south end of County Road PH. I think I speak for the entire neighborhood when I say that we
30 appreciate that the city has worked long and hard on the proposed rezoning and updating the
31 zoning codes, and that they are working to do what’s in the city’s best interest. We are very
32 grateful that you have listened to our neighborhood residents and agreed to keep the zoning for
33 the 12 homes at the south end of County Road PH as Single Family Residential. Also, I was
34 pleased to see that the 2020 proposed Zoning Map posted on the city’s website shows that the
35 zoning designation for the 12 homes has been changed from MU-N back to R-1 Residential.
36 Furthermore, I see the proposed zoning for Olive Juice Quilts has been changed from MU-C to
37 MU-N. The Mixed Use-Neighborhood is the closest thing to the current Transitional
38 Commercial, which will cease to exist. I do, however, have questions about two things which I
39 would like answered tonight. First, the proposed designation for the Bronston complex is Mixed
40 Use-Community, which is not residential-friendly. Since the 12 homes will be staying R-1
41 Residential, it seems that, like Olive Juice Quilts, the proposed zoning for the Bronston complex
42 should be changed from its current Transitional Commercial to Mixed Use-Neighborhood. The

Reviewed 1/30/20 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

2

43 complex is right next to residential properties, and the MU-N designation would be a better fit in
44 the neighborhood. It would correspond to the Mixed Use-Neighborhood zoning for the Center
45 90 complex on Sand Lake Road, and the 1400 to 1600 blocks on the north side of Main Street
46 that are in comparable settings.

47

48 Secondly, I am wondering why Stonefield Manor Senior Apartments is changing from R-4 High
49 Density Residential to Mixed Use-Community, which is focused on commercial use and not
50 residential. Why would this not remain High Density Residential since it is a residential
51 complex? Can you please address and answer the questions about the proposed zoning for the
52 Bronston complex and Stonefield Manor? Thank you.”

53

54 **Julie McGarry**
55 **1220 County Road PH**
56 **Onalaska**

57

58 “On behalf of my husband, Dick, and our many neighbors on the south leg of PH and throughout
59 the Mayfair area, we’d like to thank you once again for recognizing the value of keeping the 12
60 homes on the south leg of PH zoned R-1, and for recognizing that in the future it’s important to
61 maintain this zoning. Like Marcia, we have a concern regarding the zoning of the Bronston
62 property to Mixed Use-Community from Transitional Commercial Conditional Use Permit. The
63 Conditional Use Permit was nice because it offered us some protection for changes that could
64 possibly occur in the future in that area. They would have to go before the Plan Commission and
65 the Common Council to make any changes. As we understand it, with Mixed Use-Commercial,
66 they don’t have to do that – they can go in and put anything in that’s listed on the list. You’ve all
67 seen that list; we’ve had many discussions about what’s on that list. Of course, we’re also
68 concerned about Stonefield Senior Living Center. That is [currently zoned] R-4 High Density. I
69 don’t even see the rationale for changing that; again, if you could help explain that. The owners
70 of these properties at any time in the future can deviate from their original zoning uses. I would
71 like to know how we would address this in the future if something comes in that we as a
72 neighborhood feel would be undesirable. Can you let us know what recourse we have? Again, I
73 thank you for your service to the city, and for supporting us in our pursuit to stay residential.”

74

75 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone else wishing to provide public input and closed
76 that portion of the meeting.

77

78

Consideration and possible action on the following items:

79

80 **Item 4 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:00 P.M. (or immediately following Public Input)**
81 **to adopt the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map. Most updated versions available**
82 **online by 12:00 P.M. on Friday, January 24, 2020: <https://tinyurl.com/OnalaskaUDC>**

83

84 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the

Reviewed 1/30/20 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

3

85 adoption of the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map.

86

87 Katie read into the record the following email from Dr. Leo Bronston: *“I am unable to attend the*
88 *Plan Commission this evening. Thus, the intent of my correspondence is to voice my support for*
89 *properties located at 1200 & 1204 County Road PH proposal to be MU-C.”*

90

91 Mayor K. Smith asked Katie if she wishes to share any information in advance of the public
92 hearing.

93

94 Katie noted this is the public hearing for the Unified Development Code and the Zoning Map,
95 which is a project both the City of Onalaska and the Plan Commission have been working on for
96 more than 18 months. Katie described the previous code as being “very bulky” with several
97 sections. Katie said a significant amount of time was spent reorganizing the code into its new
98 configuration. The new code has six sections:

99

- 100 1. Introductory provisions, which address the authority for the city based on State of
101 Wisconsin Statutes to have the ability to zone. This section also addresses the map and
102 other administrative procedures.
- 103 2. The bulk of the ordinance as it is devoted to zoning districts (general divisions; base
104 districts; design overlay districts such as Planned Unit Developments, Downtown
105 Planned Unit Developments, Planned Commercial Industrial Districts, Natural and
106 Historic Resource Protection Overlay Districts; district-specific standards; use-specific
107 standards).
- 108 3. General development standards (parking and circulation standards; landscaping
109 standards; screening and buffering).
- 110 4. Subdivision standards (basic requirements for preliminary and final plats, Certified
111 Survey Maps, required improvements, land dedications).
- 112 5. Administration and procedures
- 113 6. Definitions

114

115 Katie said Hoisington Koegler Group, inc., the consulting firm that assisted the city with the
116 UDC rewrite, will be giving the city a clickable document when there are no more changes to the
117 code.

118

119 Mayor K. Smith asked Katie if she is expecting the Plan Commission to make a motion this
120 evening on the Unified Development Code, or if it still is continuing to evolve.

121

122 Katie told Mayor K. Smith the final draft is before the Plan Commission this evening and said
123 staff is seeking a recommendation to the Common Council.

124

125 Mayor K. Smith again called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the adoption of the Unified
126 Development Code and Zoning Map.

Reviewed 1/30/20 by Zach Peterson

127

128 **Marcia Horvath**
129 **1205 County Road PH**
130 **Onalaska**

131

132 Marcia asked if the Plan Commission will be answering the two questions both she and Julie
133 McGarry had raised during public input.

134

135 Mayor K. Smith said the format of the public hearing is to allow the public to speak prior to the
136 Plan Commission holding its discussion and then rendering a decision.

137

138 Marcia again addressed the proposed zoning of the Bronston complex, reiterating she believes
139 the Mixed Use-Neighborhood zoning designation would be a better fit for the neighborhood.

140 Marcia also stated she does not believe Stonefield Manor should be zoned Mixed Use-
141 Community as it already is zoned High Density-Residential. Marcia asked if the Plan
142 Commission will be discussing these topics.

143

144 Mayor K. Smith said yes.

145

146 **Jacob Wallace**
147 **1214 County Road PH**
148 **Onalaska**

149

150 Jacob identified himself as the Senior Pastor at River of Life Assembly of God Church, noting
151 the church had sold Dr. Leo Bronston the parcel on which his property is located. Jacob told the
152 Plan Commission he wishes to speak in favor of adopting the Unified Development Code and
153 Zoning Map.

154

155 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the adoption of
156 the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map and closed that portion of the public hearing.

157

158 Mayor K. Smith called for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the adoption of the Unified
159 Development Code and Zoning Map.

160

161 **Julie McGarry**
162 **1220 County Road PH**
163 **Onalaska**

164

165 “When this goes through, can a developer come in to an area, such as our residential [area, which
166 is zoned] R-1, or let’s say the church property that the pastor is representing, and request that it
167 be rezoned to something else so that in the future we still could be coming before you at the
168 request of a developer? Is that correct?”

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

5

169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210

Mayor K. Smith explained that this is hearing and told Julie she may speak against the adoption of the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map. Mayor K. Smith also told Julie this is not a conversation.

Julie said, “The only thing I’m against is the Bronston property going to Mixed Use-Community rather than Mixed Use-Neighborhood, and Stonefield going to Mixed Use-Community rather than R-4.”

Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the adoption of the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map and closed the public hearing.

Motion by Craig, second by Ald. T. Smith, to adopt the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map, as presented by City of Onalaska staff.

Andrea asked that the questions raised by Marcia and Julie be answered before the Plan Commission votes on the motion.

Katie said, “To address the most recent question for the future, if a developer were to want to rezone property in the future, anyone can apply for a rezoning. Just like this evening and any other time, there would be a public notice sent out. The applicant would need to get the property owner’s signature on that application, essentially noting they agree with this and they would propose it to be rezoned. All properties within 250 feet would be notified of that in advance. Anything it is being rezoned to today or tomorrow will stay as is, but we don’t know in the future what development will occur. It’s entirely possible the developers in the future could choose to go on a property-by-property to rezone in the future – that’s definitely a possibility. Ultimately, it’s up to the Plan Commission and the Common Council to say ‘yea’ or ‘nay,’ but there is no stopping someone from asking.”

Craig noted a public hearing for a rezoning request is part of the process, also noting public input is taken into consideration.

Katie said, “The other questions related to the zoning for the Bronston property, and also Stonefield Manor. Stonefield Manor was proposed to be in the MU-C District. This was when we originally had the 12 properties that have been discussed this evening go to the MU-N [zoning]. This essentially continued on that; this property is also directly adjacent to MU-C land. We did sent notification to all of these property owners with our intended zoning change from what they are today. They all had opportunities to come in and talk to the city if they had questions or concerns or any issues with those zonings. To my knowledge, we did not hear from Stonefield Manor – Amanda, do you remember?”

Amanda said, “I can’t be certain. I did speak to a couple different apartment and/or senior living

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

6

211 complexes. I don't have my notes in front of me, so I don't know if I specifically spoke to them
212 or not."

213

214 Katie said, "I do know we did talk to Dr. Bronston. He did get our letters, and he called and we
215 had a conversation with him about it. You also heard his feedback through his email tonight that
216 he would like to retain the MU-C, as proposed by city staff."

217

218 Andrea asked why Stonefield Manor's zoning was changed from R-4.

219

220 Katie said, "We changed it to R-4 because an R-4 senior facility is outright permitted in the MU-
221 C District. We didn't keep it as R-4 because everything leading up to it became mixed use. It
222 was the intent that it was a Mixed Use District, so that's why it was changed and we brought it to
223 the MU-C because apartments and senior living are outright permitted in that district. We
224 basically allowed it to keep what it is today, with the focus on mixed use."

225

226 Amanda said, "A lot of the senior living-type apartment complexes are also offering additional
227 services above and beyond simply offering apartments, which really puts them in more of a
228 mixed-use category. They're offering fitness classes. They're offering different socialization.
229 They've kind of expanded beyond just your average apartment."

230

231 Craig said, "Just as a personal observation, I think all of us – including myself – at times look for
232 guarantees 30 years down the road. There's just no such thing. As much as I was in favor of
233 holding off on the rezoning of the PH properties, I also believe that with developers, where
234 applicable, I'm not interested in overly burdening them with restrictions, either. I think it's being
235 fair to everybody, and I'm in favor of exactly what's being proposed. I think staff has done an
236 excellent job. It's very well-organized. It's user-friendly. And we've come an awful long way
237 from where we were a year and a half ago. Staff [did] outstanding work."

238

239 City Administrator Rindfleisch said, "There was a brief question as to, why not conditional uses
240 versus outright permitting. That would be due to Act 67, which places restrictions on planning
241 commissions now from imposing conditions. Our way around that is to designate what is
242 permitted in various districts to avoid that inability later on to really restrict our ability to do
243 conditional uses."

244

245 Katie said, "It also had the feel you were allowed to have a lot of public input. Like Ms.
246 McGarry had noted, they would receive public hearing notices every time there would be a
247 Conditional Use Permit application. They would know when something would be up for
248 discussion. With Act 67, it was very, very difficult for the city to ever deny a Conditional Use
249 Permit. Even though there may have been reasons given by the public to deny a Conditional Use
250 Permit, we actually can't, so that public input is almost for naught, other than specifically
251 notifying them what may be coming. The ability to add conditions is no longer there. We're
252 very restricted in what we can do. That's why in addition to the permitted category with

253 permitted uses, we also created permitted, with standards. Now very specific uses, many of
254 which used to be conditional uses are now permitted with standards. We took what conditions
255 we would historically add to those uses, and now we mandate them if they should ever want to
256 do one of those. In the end, the city is better protected and we're treating all these new uses the
257 same in the future."

258
259 Craig said, "When Act 67 first came down, I think I can almost speak for the Plan Commission
260 [when I say] I don't think there was anybody excited to see that simply because the state saw fit
261 to wrest a great amount of control away from communities and cities to governed developments
262 and really put the burden on you to show why it shouldn't be that way. I think this route,
263 permitting uses with conditions, is the right way to go, and it takes back some of that control
264 again."

265
266 Andrea asked, "The Mixed Use-Neighborhood would be more restrictive than the Mixed Use-
267 Commercial, and more protective for the neighborhood, if that were the zoning that were
268 applied, for instance, to Bronston, wouldn't it?"

269
270 Katie said, "There are fewer commercial uses that you can do in Mixed Use-Neighborhood as
271 opposed to Mixed Use-Commercial. With that particular property, it was Transitional
272 Commercial, but there were many uses that were considered conditional. There is a concern of
273 downzoning, which we can't do because of the loss in the ability of uses they would have had in
274 that original district."

275
276 Ald. T. Smith said, "I've been through this from the very beginning. The process has been a
277 long process, and I agree with Craig that I think we're [going in] a good direction and doing the
278 best we can. The state has kind of put our arms around some of it to ourselves, so I think this is a
279 way that is fair. I also like the public input. A lot of people have been here several times. I
280 think it's really important from the Plan Commission that we did hear out. We heard from the
281 [residents along] PH. We heard from the people on Mason Street. We had several areas that had
282 concerns, and we were able to work with them to make it a win-win for everybody. Not
283 everybody wins everything, but I think we're in a better position going forward. I think the
284 planning committee and your folks have done a great job. I'll support it."

285
286 Motion restated:

287
288 To approve the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map, and to adopt it as presented.

289
290 On voice vote, motion carried with one abstention (Andrea).

291
292 **Item 5 – Review and Consideration of a request to extend the Final Plat submittal**
293 **requirement for one year, as requested by Kevin Fry, on behalf of Elmwood Partners, 1859**

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

8

294 **Sand Lake Road, Onalaska, for the 4th Addition to the Country Club Estates Plat (Tax**
295 **Parcels: #18-3566-100 & 18-4479-0)**

296

297 Katie told commission members this is a request to consider a one-year extension to February 11,
298 2021, allowing the 4th Addition to the Country Club Estates Plat to be submitted later than the
299 36-month filing requirement after the approval of the Preliminary Plat. The Common Council
300 approved the Preliminary Plat for the 4th Addition to the Country Club Estates Plat in 2012, and
301 there have been annual extension requests since 2015. Katie told committee members the
302 applicant was unable to attend this evening's meeting due to a medical issue and said he hopes
303 the Plan Commission will consider the extension. Katie said she had spoken with the applicant
304 and told commission members he intends to file a new General Development Plan and follow it
305 up with a Final Implementation Plan as part of a Planned Unit Development. Katie said, "One of
306 the reasons of slowing the process from last year is that we were under this process and writing a
307 new ordinance. [The applicant] wanted to see how it would apply to [his] particular parcels."

308

309 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Andrea, to approve a request to extend the Final Plat
310 submittal requirement for one year, as requested by Kevin Fry, on behalf of Elmwood Partners,
311 1859 Sand Lake Road, Onalaska, for the 4th Addition to the Country Club Estates Plat (Tax
312 Parcels: #18-3566-100 & 18-4479-0).

313

314 Craig said, "I'm not a believer in giving another one-year extension. I think we've down this
315 road on so many things over the years. I understand that we're rewriting our Zoning Code, but
316 I'm not buying that that's the reason why this has been put on hold. I think economic conditions,
317 especially considering the fact it is zoned Residential, how much better does the economy have
318 to get for the ability to sell homes or anything residential? I'm not seeing this. I would almost
319 rather have them, if they're going to start putting together new plans, file again, and bring those
320 plans to us – not under this extension, but under a new application."

321

322 Jarrod said, "When I look at this area, it's been a longstanding development within the city. The
323 First Country Club Plat came into the city in 1995 on Country Club Lane. They followed a
324 marketing strategy going around the golf course. They had a lot of successful plats going down
325 Country Club Lane and around and kind of moving their way around the golf course. The plat
326 they're trying to sell lots in right now stagnated. I think in 2018 the developer actually sold a
327 few lots in that subdivision and thought things were coming around, and then in 2019 they didn't
328 sell any lots again. I think they are hopeful they can sell lots in that area, but I think they're
329 trying to wait out and see what happens with the market. I do agree with Craig: When is enough,
330 [and] when is the market going to change? I think part of the development in the Country Club
331 general, from a Plan Commission standpoint, is it was a lot different market 25 years ago when
332 those lots first went on the market. It probably is going to need some sort of revitalization and a
333 different look to keep that area viable so we get more development in that area for the city, and
334 hopefully we can open it up to some residential development of some kind."

335

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

9

336 Craig said, "I like the idea of being able to develop that, but in my heart I don't believe that there
337 is a firm plan today, [nor is there] a direction, either on their part or anything that's been
338 communicated usefully to the city that tells us there is something forthcoming in the not-too-
339 distant future. I would rather that they just submit a new plan under a new application knowing
340 that they're going to move forward with it."

341
342 Andrea noted it has been approximately 1½ years since she last served on the Plan Commission
343 and said, "For the years prior, every year we renewed this. I don't understand – what purpose
344 does just renewing this at this point serve? Why would they want to do that instead of just
345 dropping this and resubmitting everything when they finally have a plan? It must cost the city to
346 renew this every year."

347
348 Katie told Andrea there is no cost to the city to renew it as the city is essentially "letting it ride."
349 Katie said, "They don't want to give us the Final Plat and then put in all the improvements if
350 they're not ready to sell the land."

351
352 Ald. T. Smith said, "I thought we were encouraged because of all the rezoning changes to see
353 where this would end up them. That was one of my impressions from an earlier discussion."

354
355 Katie said the applicant had anticipated selling more lots in 2019 based on lot sales in 2018;
356 however, that did not come to fruition. Katie said, "That's why they came back this particular
357 year."

358
359 Craig said, "I'm not sure that staff, to my knowledge, in all the years I've been on [the Plan
360 Commission], has ever encouraged somebody to wait or move forward with some type of
361 development. I don't see that as the city's role. That is the province of the developer themselves
362 to make that determination when it's appropriate to move forward. Clearly they have not seen
363 that that's the case. I say get this off the books and let them come forward when they have a firm
364 plan in place that they're ready to move on."

365
366 Ald. T. Smith inquired about the ramifications if the Plan Commission votes not to grant the
367 extension.

368
369 Katie said the plat is gone if the Plan Commission denies the applicant's request to grant the
370 extension and he does not put in the improvements. Katie said the applicant could come in at a
371 later date with a Planned Unit Development and run the Preliminary Plat process in tandem. The
372 applicant also could do this after the fact. Katie said, "It essentially would require them to
373 resubmit to the state [and] to resubmit to the city, pay new fees, [and] staff review."

374
375 Craig said, "It doesn't take away any rights from them. They lose nothing. They're living off of
376 a previous application that clearly, the intentions just aren't there right now. And there's no
377 promise in the foreseeable future that there is something."

Reviewed 1/30/20 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, January 28, 2020
10

378
379 City Administrator Rindfleisch noted a similar situation had occurred with the French Valley
380 development regarding requests for one-year extensions, and he said the Plan Commission had
381 approved a one-year extension and stated it would be the last one granted.

382
383 Katie said, “Last year they did the final one for them.”

384
385 City Administrator Rindfleisch said, “They did not get it in, so they did not apply after that. That
386 may be another alternative: to go on record saying we’ll potentially do one, but this is the last
387 one unless the plat comes in.”

388
389 Craig asked City Administrator Rindfleisch if that is binding.

390
391 City Administrator Rindfleisch told Craig it isn’t and said the Plan Commission may change and
392 take different options the next time.

393
394 Motion restated:

395
396 To approve a request to extend the Final Plat submittal requirement for one year, as requested by
397 Kevin Fry, on behalf of Elmwood Partners, 1859 Sand Lake Road, Onalaska, for the 4th
398 Addition to the Country Club Estates Plat.

399
400 On voice vote, motion carried, 4-1 (Craig).

401
402 **Item 6 – Review and Consideration of a proposed Site Plan Amendment for 1785 East**
403 **Main Street, Onalaska, WI 54650 (Tax Parcel: #18-725-1)**

404
405 Katie said this is a proposed Site Plan Amendment, noting it was approved in 2005 by the Plan
406 Commission for a Conditional Use Permit to install a telecommunication facility at 1735 East
407 Main Street. The Common Council gave it final approval on December 13, 2005. Katie noted
408 the original conditions of approval, as well as the conditions of approval tied to the Site Plan and
409 background information of this property, have been included in commission members’ packets.
410 Katie also noted an updated easement agreement was not included in the packet, but it would
411 move forward to the February 11 Common Council meeting for consideration. Katie said the
412 Site Plan Amendment would remove the condition that the applicant must maintain the road to
413 the tower as the road is located on City of Onalaska land.

414
415 Andrea asked Katie to clarify what is being requested.

416
417 Katie said staff is proposing that the applicant no longer has to maintain the road to the tower,
418 and she told Andrea staff is working with the applicant on an easement agreement that would
419 allow the applicant to have access through city property to the site.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

11

420

421 Motion by Craig, second by Jarrod, to approve a proposed Site Plan Amendment for 1785 East
422 Main Street, Onalaska, WI 54650 (Tax Parcel: #18-725-1).

423

424 Craig said he believes this is the only solution to a difficult situation that has “piled up over the
425 years.”

426

427 Jarrod explained that this cleans up access to the cell phone tower site through city property and
428 said it follows the existing road that goes to the city’s reservoir site. Jarrod said he believes that
429 was the original path that was supposed to be taken, noting the city did not own this property
430 when the cell phone tower was originally installed. Jarrod said, “It might be a little different if
431 we didn’t already have the existing road there and already have a use for it where we’re going up
432 the hill. ... It’s kind of cleaning up an old item. There’s a new owner of the cell phone site, and
433 they realized this isn’t theirs.”

434

435 Andrea said she wishes to add a condition that the easement right disappears when the cell phone
436 tower is no longer present.

437

438 Amanda told Andrea, “We’re working on it. We just don’t have the updated version of the
439 easement agreement for tonight. Sean O’Flaherty’s office [O’Flaherty Heim Birnbaum Kirchner
440 & Curtis, Ltd.] is handling the drafting of the easement. They just didn’t get it to us to get it to
441 you tonight. There will be language that the easement terminates in the event that the property is
442 no longer used for telecommunication purposes.”

443

444 For clarification, Craig asked Amanda if what Andrea is asking will be addressed in the
445 easement agreement.

446

447 Amanda said it will be and told Craig it will go before the Common Council.

448

449 For clarification, Mayor K. Smith told commission members the easement agreement will not
450 come before them and will go before the Common Council.

451

452 Amanda said, “You have most of it. We’re essentially just adding one line to it on the
453 termination. Otherwise it substantially will be in the same form that you have in this packet.”

454

455 On voice vote, motion carried.

456

457 Motion restated:

458

459 To approve a proposed Site Plan Amendment for 1785 East Main Street, Onalaska, WI 54650.

460

461 Andrea asked if the Plan Commission is approving the amendment coming from O’Flaherty

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, January 28, 2020
12

462 Heim Birnbaum Kirchner & Curtis, Ltd., and she said she wants to approve the one that
463 terminates the easement right.

464
465 Amanda told Andrea, “You’re not approving the easement tonight. Review and consideration of
466 the Site Plan Amendment is on [the agenda].”

467
468 Craig said it is his understanding the easement agreement is a separate document.
469

470 City Administrator Rindfleisch noted the Common Council and not the Plan Commission would
471 have purview over an easement located on city land.

472
473 Amanda noted the Plan Commission had approved the easement, pending review and sign-off by
474 the legal department, at its December 17 meeting.

475
476 Motion restated:

477
478 To approve a proposed Site Plan Amendment for 1785 East Main Street, Onalaska, WI 54650.
479

480 On voice vote, motion carried.
481

482 **Item 7 – Update on proposed amendments to Title 14 Sign Ordinance**

483
484 Katie said the Sign Ordinance clarifies the new zoning districts, incorporates sections of the
485 Unified Development Code that still pertain to signage and needed to be removed and placed in
486 the appropriate chapter. Rules pertaining to digital billboards can be found in the new section.
487 Katie cited the following changes:

- 488
- 489 • The city no longer will limit the number of canopy signs one may have. Katie said the
490 goal is to allow individuals to advertise throughout their businesses.
 - 491 • The sign base is no longer counted as part of the overall square footage of the sign in
492 mixed-use neighborhoods. Katie said, “You can be severely limited in how much square
493 footage you can have. We want people to be able to use that type of signage instead of
494 over-signing with temporary signage. We would rather have people invest in permanent
495 signage.”
 - 496 • Staff is adjusting the language pertaining to temporary signage to state that all residential
497 properties are allowed one sign per frontage for the entire year. Individuals may do with
498 the sign as they please, provided it is less than 3 square feet.
- 499

500 **Adjournment**

501
502 Motion by Craig, second by Andrea, to adjourn at 7:50 p.m.
503

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, January 28, 2020
13

504 On voice vote, motion carried.

505

506

507 Recorded by:

508

509 Kirk Bey