

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 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, May 26, 2020. 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 Kim Smith, Ald. Tom Smith,
6 City Engineer Jarrod Holter, Jan Brock, Skip Temte, Craig Breitsprecher

7
8 Also Present: City Administrator Eric Rindfleisch, Planning Manager Katie Aspenson, City
9 Attorney Amanda Jackson

10
11 Excused Absence: Jenny Akins

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

14
15 This item did not appear on the Zoom recording.

16
17 **Item 3 – Public Input (limited to 3 minutes per individual)**

18
19 This item did not appear on the Zoom recording.

20
21 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

22
23 **Item 4 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:00 P.M. (or immediately following Public Input)**
24 **to consider a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) filed by Lori Kopecky of Wireless Planning,**
25 **LLC of 2310 Mill Street, New London, WI 54961 on behalf of JLP Associates II of Eden**
26 **Prairie, 6500 City West Parkway, Suite 315, Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7701 and wireless**
27 **carrier US Cellular to replace six (6) existing antennas with six (6) new antennas and**
28 **replace three (3) Remote Radio Units (RRU) with twelve (12) new RRU, and replacing /**
29 **adding ancillary equipment to the existing telecommunications tower located at 9348 State**
30 **Road 16, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: # 18-3530-10)**

31
32 US Cellular is planning to modify the existing stealth telecommunications tower (light pole) at
33 9348 State Road 16. The modifications as drawn in the January 2, 2020 plan set propose to
34 remove the following: three (3) Bias-T units, three (3) B-2 RRU-11 Radios, and six (6) antennas
35 and associated cabling. The new proposed equipment includes six (6) panel antennas, twelve
36 (12) Remote Radio Units, and other ancillary equipment.

37
38 The Structural Analysis Report was prepared by Edge Consulting Engineers, Inc. to determine
39 whether the tower is structurally adequate to support both the existing and proposed loads
40 pursuant to the Structural Standard for Antenna Supporting Structures and Antennas, ANSI/TIA-
41 222-G. The results of their analysis state that the existing tower is structurally adequate to
42 support the proposed change in loading. Telecommunication structures and towers as an

Reviewed 5/29/2020 by Zach Peterson

43 accessory use are permitted only by Conditional Use Permit per the Accessory Uses Table in
44 Section 13.02.22-2 of the City of Onalaska Unified Development Code (UDC). While the city
45 has no basis for denial of the CUP, it has found a basis to impose the following conditions:

46
47 1. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
48 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied
49 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
50 **Substantial Evidence:** This condition provides notice to the owner/developer that they
51 are to follow procedure for orderly development in the City of Onalaska in order to
52 promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.

53
54 2. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
55 successors and assigns so long as the conditional use is being actively used. **Substantial**
56 **Evidence:** This condition acknowledges and provides public notice of the term and puts
57 the owner/developer and future owners on notice that they are bound by the conditions
58 and that they can continue the use as long as they follow the conditions and actively use
59 the conditional use.

60
61 3. Owner/developer shall abide by the City's Ordinances, Unified Development Code and
62 Building Code requirements, as amended. **Substantial Evidence:** This condition
63 assures the owner/developer understands that they must follow the city's Unified
64 Development Code and Building Code, which they are required to follow in every way,
65 and that as they are receiving the benefit of being allowed to have a use that is not within
66 the standards of the City's zoning code, failure to follow City ordinances may result in
67 loss of their Conditional Use Permit.

68
69 **(Note: The meeting as it appears on Zoom begins at this point).**

70
71 4. The Conditional Use Permit shall be reviewed every five (5) years to ensure continued
72 use. **Substantial Evidence:** This shifts the burden to the owner of the property to
73 provide proof that the use is active and continuing. Ensuring that existing permits are
74 still valid and being properly used ensures compliance with the City's procedures and
75 ordinances, and promotes interaction and communication with the City, which furthers
76 orderly development and the health, safety and welfare of the community.

77
78 Katie noted a public hearing is being held this evening and said only where no reasonable
79 conditions could exist to allow the Conditional Use, may a Conditional Use Permit be denied.

80
81 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
82 Conditional Use Permit.

83
84 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the Conditional

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

3

85 Use Permit and closed that portion of the public hearing.

86

87 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the Conditional
88 Use Permit and closed the public hearing.

89

90 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to approve with the four stated conditions a
91 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) filed by Lori Kopecky of Wireless Planning, LLC of 2310 Mill
92 Street, New London, WI 54961 on behalf of JLP Associates II of Eden Prairie, 6500 City West
93 Parkway, Suite 315, Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7701 and wireless carrier US Cellular to replace
94 six (6) existing antennas with six (6) new antennas and replace three (3) Remote Radio Units
95 (RRU) with twelve (12) new RRU, and replacing / adding ancillary equipment to the existing
96 telecommunications tower located at 9348 State Road 16, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: #
97 18-3530-10).

98

99 On voice vote, motion carried.

100

101 **Item 5 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:10 P.M. (or immediately following Public**
102 **Hearing @ 7:00 P.M.) to consider a Rezoning Request filed by Lawrence and Janet Kent,**
103 **14 Ryewood Circle, Homosassa, FL 34446, to rezone the property located at 606 Marcou**
104 **Road, Onalaska, WI 54650 from R-4 (Multi-Family Residential District) to R-1**
105 **(Residential District) for the purpose of allowing the construction of a single-family**
106 **dwelling at 606 Marcou Road, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: # 18-3566-403)**

107

108 1. Rezoning Fee of \$300.00 (PAID).

109

110 2. Park Fee of \$922.21 (per unit) due prior to obtaining a Building Permit. Note: if the Park
111 Fee increases in the future, the property owner will be required to pay the increased Park
112 Fee at the time of the development.

113

114 3. If future lot divisions are to occur, applicant/owner to a Certified Survey Map as
115 approved by the Common Council.

116

117 4. Any future improvements to this property will be subject to additional City permits.

118

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

122

123 6. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
124 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
125 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
126 other conditions.

127
128 7. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in committee minutes shall not release the
129 property owner/developer from abiding by the City’s Unified Development Code
130 requirements.

131
132 Katie said the Comprehensive Plan identifies this area in the Environmentally Sensitive District.
133 This district is intended for lower density single family development. The applicant intends to
134 rezone 606 Marcou Road from High Density Residential (R-4) to Low Density Residential (R-1).
135 This property is located within the Country Club Estates and is governed by existing covenants
136 and restrictions that prohibit multifamily residences and only allow single family developments.
137 The adjacent lots are zoned R-1 and the applicant would like to build a single-family home on
138 this lot which is prohibited in the R-4 Zoning District. Katie noted a public hearing is being held
139 this evening, and also that city staff has compiled seven conditions of approval for this
140 development.

141
142 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
143 rezoning request.

144
145 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the rezoning request
146 and closed that portion of the public hearing.

147
148 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the rezoning
149 request and closed the public hearing.

150
151 Motion by Craig, second by Skip, to approve with the seven stated conditions a Rezoning
152 Request filed by Lawrence and Janet Kent, 14 Ryewood Circle, Homosassa, FL 34446, to rezone
153 the property located at 606 Marcou Road, Onalaska, WI 54650 from R-4 (Multi-Family
154 Residential District) to R-1 (Residential District) for the purpose of allowing the construction of
155 a single-family dwelling at 606 Marcou Road, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: # 18-3566-
156 403).

157
158 Jan asked if Park Fee would have been paid when the property was originally platted, or if the
159 Park Fee is necessary because the applicant is requesting a rezoning.

160
161 Katie told Jan that a Park Fee are paid when a Building Permit is pulled, and she said they
162 generally are noted on the plats. Katie said, “We lift them out so that if someone were to pull
163 this fee, it would be paid at the time they pull a Building Permit for a single-family dwelling.”

164
165 On voice vote, motion carried.

166
167 **Item 6 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:20 PM (or immediately following Public**
168 **Hearing @ 7:10 PM) to consider a Planned Commercial Industrial Development (PCID)**

169 **Amendment Application filed by Scott Truehl, Friede & Associates, 500 Utility Court, PO**
170 **Box 248, Reedsburg, WI 53959, on behalf of KD & White Holdings LLC, 205 5th Avenue**
171 **South, Suite 600, La Crosse, WI 54601 on the parcel located at 9430 State Road 16,**
172 **Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: #18-3578-20)**
173

- 174 1. PCID Amendment Fee of \$700.00 (PAID).
175
176 2. Abide by all conditions of original CSM Approval by the Common Council on June 13,
177 2000:
178 a. CSM fee of \$40.00 + \$10.00 per lot x 1 = \$50.00.
179 b. Storm sewer fee of \$4,920.00 per acre x 3.69 = \$18,154.80.
180 c. Green fee of \$219.00 + \$28.00 per acre x 3.69 = \$322.32.
181 d. Owner/developer to comply with applicable conditions of PCID for Pralle Center:
182 1) Developer will be required to sign fire hydrant maintenance agreement.
183 2) Require the installation of signal lights at "PH" and Hwy. 16 or other locations on
184 Hwy. 16, upon approval of the DOT. If not approved, DOT sign an agreement that
185 the City, nor the developer are responsible for the cost if they are installing in the
186 future.
187 3) The development is contingent upon approval of the DOT and the City for the exits
188 and entrances on Hwy. 16 and "PH".
189 4) Landscaping plan to be approved by the Sub-Committee.
190 5) Signs are to meet the City's Sign Code.
191 6) Parking requirements to be approved per City Code.
192 7) Storm Sewer Fee to be waived as developer installing the storm sewer himself.
193 8) The developer and Mr. Pralle are required to take whatever measures are necessary
194 to secure the outfall of the cattle pass areas to prevent erosion and must maintain it.
195 9) The developer required to pay Topography Fee of \$330.00.
196 10) Sidewalk to be installed on "PH" and extended out to Hwy. 16.
197 11) The City Engineering and Utility Departments to approve final sanitary sewer,
198 storm sewer and water plans.
199 12) The opening 125 feet North of Hwy. 16 on "PH" to be an ENTRANCE ONLY.
200 Traffic from "PH" will not be allowed to enter that opening.
201 13) The type of curbing within the area shall be concrete curb and gutter, wheel stops
202 and bituminous slanting.
203 14) Handicap ramps shall be installed per City Code and State Code.
204 15) The frontage roads within the parking lot shall be a minimum of 30 feet in width.
205 16) Security down lighting to be placed around the building and parking lot.
206 17) Minimum of 10 feet sidewalk required in front of all stores.
207 18) Minimum of 39 feet entrance way on "PH".
208 19) Developer to pay a fair proportion of the cost on the I-90/Hwy. 16 Interchange.
209 20) Storm Sewer plan to be approved by the DOT.

- 210 21) Any omission of any condition that was not mentioned, does not release the
211 developer from the PCID requirement code.
212
- 213 3. As noted in Condition #2 this development is based upon previously approved
214 developments by the Common Council with specific Conditions of Approval. Below are
215 Conditions of Approval that are still relevant to the proposed development today and the
216 developer shall be required to continue to complete the following conditions. Conditions
217 not listed below are either completed, not applicable to this development, or are
218 duplicative of other Conditions of Approval:
- 219 a. Signs are to meet the City's Sign Code.
 - 220 b. Parking requirements to be approved per City Code.
 - 221 c. The type of curbing within the area shall be concrete curb and gutter, wheel
222 stops and bituminous slanting.
 - 223 d. Handicap ramps shall be installed per City Code and State Code.
 - 224 e. The frontage roads within the parking lot shall be a minimum of 30 feet in
225 width.
 - 226 f. Security down lighting to be placed around the building and parking lot.
 - 227 g. Minimum of 10 feet sidewalk required in front of all stores.
228
- 229 4. Site Plan Permit required for new development in advance of building permit applications,
230 including detailed architectural plans, water, sewer, landscape, stormwater, drainage, erosion
231 control, and other required information/plans (fire accessibility, hydrant locations, etc.)
232
- 233 5. No new access to the site shall be allowed from Pralle Center Drive.
234
- 235 6. Traffic circulation pattern, including drive through and driveway locations to receive final
236 approval through city site plan approval.
237
- 238 7. Sidewalk to be extended along Pralle Center Drive from State Highway 16 to first westerly
239 driveway off Pralle Center Drive (Approximately 300 feet).
240
- 241 8. As the project site is equal to or greater than one (1) acre, a submittal of a digital and hard
242 copy of the WIDNR NR 216/NOI application, permit, and associated data is required a minimum
243 of ten days prior to the start of construction. Said data must be reviewed and approved by the
244 City Engineer before construction begins.
245
- 246 9. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
247 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and
248 improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
249
- 250 10. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
251 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not relieve
- Reviewed 5/29/2020 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

7

252 the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any other conditions.

253

254 11. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property
255 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements, as
256 amended.

257

258 Katie said the applicant is requesting to amend the existing Planned Commercial Industrial
259 District (PCID) to remove the existing TGI Fridays building and construct two smaller separate
260 buildings for retail/restaurant purposes. The first building (Building A) will be approximately
261 5,200 square feet, with a full drive-through, and the second building (Building B) will be
262 approximately 6,020 square feet, with a pick-up window. Katie referred to the proposed site
263 plan, which is a concept, and said a total of 94 parking spaces are being proposed to serve the
264 overall development. Katie told commission members this development is considered a "Major
265 Amendment" to the PCID as there is an increase in density (two structures in lieu of one
266 structure), which requires a public hearing. If approved by the Plan Commission this evening,
267 and by the Common Council on June 9, the city will record the attached conditions of approval at
268 the La Crosse County Register of Deeds to document the final list of approved conditions for all
269 future development opportunities. Katie noted both a site plan and a cover letter describing the
270 overall development in more detail have been included in commission members' packets. Katie
271 also noted there are 11 conditions of approval tied to this development.

272

273 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
274 Planned Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application.

275

276 **Scott Truehl, Executive Vice President, Friede & Associates**
277 **500 Utility Court**
278 **Reedsburg**

279

280 "Thank you so much for taking this item up this evening. As Katie had indicated, we are
281 proposing to take down the former TGIF building and reconstruct two smaller buildings. Each
282 of those buildings will be multitenant buildings. What they allow us to do is, especially given
283 the change in the world as a result of the virus, it will allow us to perhaps have each of those
284 buildings be smaller, multitenant-type buildings. Ideally, we're hoping that maybe we can start
285 one of those buildings yet this year, and perhaps the second one after the first one is complete.
286 They're in character with some of the other buildings in the area. At this point we do not have
287 leases, but we've had extensive interest on the part of some national-type tenants. Functionally, I
288 believe we're meeting all of the requirements with regard to setbacks and parking and the like.
289 Katie and I have had a couple of conversations, and I think we're comfortable with the
290 conditions that are identified in the staff report, with the one comment that the existing internal
291 drive is actually only 24 feet right now, not 30 feet as perhaps indicated in the original
292 document."

293

294 **Kathy Anderson, Architectural Consortium, LLC**
295 **901 North 3rd Street, Suite 220**
296 **Minneapolis**

297
298 Kathy identified herself as being the architect working on this project, and she said. “I just
299 wanted to clarify that we’re planning on keeping the existing 24-foot drive aisle, which really is
300 a standard for two lanes of traffic – 12 feet apiece as opposed the clause that stated it should be
301 30 [feet].”

302
303 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the Planned
304 Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application and closed that portion of
305 the public hearing.

306
307 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the Planned
308 Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application.

309
310 Amanda told Mayor K. Smith a couple of individuals had joined the meeting late and said she
311 needs to change their settings. Amanda asked Mayor K. Smith to repeat her call for anyone
312 wishing to speak in opposition to the Planned Commercial Industrial Development (PCID)
313 Amendment Application so that the individuals who joined the meeting late may have an
314 opportunity to speak if they wish.

315
316 Mayor K. Smith called for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the Planned Commercial
317 Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application and closed the public hearing.

318
319 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to approve with the 11 stated conditions a Planned
320 Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application filed by Scott Truehl,
321 Friede & Associates, 500 Utility Court, PO Box 248, Reedsburg, WI 53959, on behalf of KD &
322 White Holdings LLC, 205 5th Avenue South, Suite 600, La Crosse, WI 54601 on the parcel
323 located at 9430 State Road 16, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: #18-3578-20).

324
325 Craig asked Scott if he knows the square footage of the existing TGI Fridays building.

326
327 Scott told Craig he believes it measures slightly more than 6,000 square feet.

328
329 Craig asked if the square footage of the structures in that area are being doubled.

330
331 Scott told Craig yes and said the square footage of the existing TGI Fridays building might be
332 7,000 square feet.

333
334 Jarrod said he believes the flow of traffic as shown will work, noting is in a service road that
335 wraps around that area and has a relatively low traffic count as it does not service many of the

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

9

336 buildings in the area. Jarrod said it appears that Building A and Building B is “a lot of building
337 in a small area,” and he noted a majority of the parking is off to the west of the buildings. Jarrod
338 said, “I just don’t know from a functionality standpoint how it’s going to function. It depends on
339 what the retail tenants are.” Jarrod said he agrees with Scott’s statement that the drive-through at
340 Building A likely is a desired feature, and he noted Building B would have a pick-up window at
341 which customers could pick up meals after ordering ahead. Jarrod said, “It appears to be a lot in
342 that space. I don’t know how it’s going to work in the whole entire development itself.”

343

344 Katie asked Jarrod to comment on the property owner’s request to reduce the existing internal
345 drive from 30 feet to 24 feet. Katie said the Plan Commission would need to amend Condition
346 3e to whatever spacing would be appropriate if it wishes to do this.

347

348 Jarrod said he has not taken any calls regarding any issues at the drive aisle in that area during
349 his 20-plus years of employment with the city. Jarrod also referred to Kathy Anderson’s
350 comment that 24 feet is a typical drive aisle width, and he noted the drawing included in
351 commission members’ packets includes the curb, which typically would not be included in the
352 drive aisle. Jarrod said 24 feet should be a sufficient width as long as there is no parking along
353 it, and he told commission members a ‘No Parking’ sign should be installed to ensure that no one
354 impedes on that drive lane and safety vehicles are allowed to get through. Jarrod said, “Twenty-
355 four feet would be the minimum that I would say that should be. It should function.”

356

357 Craig said his only concern is that, “with a lot of vehicular traffic in that area, egress in and out
358 of those facilities in that area could be a problem at some point in time. But I guess it’s a little
359 hard to sit here and judge this now. I would suspect business would suffer if that’s the case. It’s
360 just a concern, but all in all I guess I’m in favor.”

361

362 Mayor K. Smith noted the condition currently states 30 feet.

363

364 On voice vote, motion carried.

365

366 Jarrod asked commission members if they wish to address the drive aisle width.

367

368 Katie said, “We would need to address it, or it would be going to Council if moved forward, and
369 it could be addressed at that time if that’s what the Plan Commission would like. There was a
370 recommendation if you did reduce it to 24 [feet] that it could be signed as no parking to alleviate
371 a concern.”

372

373 Scott said he would not object to not allowing parking if the current width is approximately 24
374 feet.

375

376 Craig asked Katie if staff has the ability to make that recommendation to the Common Council.

377

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

10

378 Katie said it is possible to do so if that is what the Plan Commission wishes, noting that Item 6
379 has been approved without the amendment.

380

381 Mayor K. Smith reminded commission members she had restated for clarity that the width
382 currently is at 30 feet, also noting that no one had said anything. Mayor K. Smith said it had
383 been her understanding the Plan Commission wanted to keep the width at 30 feet, and she asked
384 Amanda what the cleanest available option is for the commission.

385

386 Katie said, "I could restate it at the Council [meeting] and have it in the packet as an updated
387 condition."

388

389 Amanda told commission members that likely would be the cleanest option, but she also said it
390 would have to be noted the recommendation came through at 30 feet.

391

392 Katie said this item will be placed on the Non-Consent Agenda at the June 9 Common Council
393 meeting.

394

395 Mayor K. Smith asked Katie to include installing a no parking sign.

396

397 City Administrator Rindfleisch told commission members one of them may make a motion to
398 reconsider the previous action, and if it passes by a majority the commission may amend the
399 original motion if commission members wish to go on record to reduce the existing internal drive
400 from 30 feet to 24 feet.

401

402 Amanda said that action will allow this item to be placed on the Consent Agenda for the
403 Common Council meeting.

404

405 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to reconsider approval of a Planned Commercial
406 Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application filed by Scott Truehl, Friede &
407 Associates, 500 Utility Court, PO Box 248, Reedsburg, WI 53959, on behalf of KD & White
408 Holdings LLC, 205 5th Avenue South, Suite 600, La Crosse, WI 54601 on the parcel located at
409 9430 State Road 16, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: #18-3578-20).

410

411 On voice vote, motion carried.

412

413 Katie said the motion the Plan Commission should make is a motion to approve the PCID
414 Amendment with the 11 stated conditions, and Condition 3e would be restated as follows: "*The*
415 *frontage roads within the parking lot shall be a minimum of 24 feet in width, and signed 'No*
416 *Parking.'* "

417

418 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. T. Smith, to approve with the 11 stated conditions a Planned
419 Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application filed by Scott Truehl,

Reviewed 5/29/2020 by Zach Peterson

420 Friede & Associates, 500 Utility Court, PO Box 248, Reedsburg, WI 53959, on behalf of KD &
421 White Holdings LLC, 205 5th Avenue South, Suite 600, La Crosse, WI 54601 on the parcel
422 located at 9430 State Road 16, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel: #18-3578-20). Condition 3e
423 would be restated as follows: *“The frontage roads within the parking lot shall be a minimum of*
424 *24 feet in width, and signed ‘No Parking.’ ”*

425
426 On voice vote, motion carried.

427
428 **Item 7 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:30 PM (or immediately following Public**
429 **Hearing @ 7:20 PM) to consider a Planned Commercial Industrial Development (PCID)**
430 **Amendment Application filed by Colin Klos, MBA Architects, Inc, N5560 CR ZM, Suite 3,**
431 **Onalaska, WI 54650, on behalf of Mike Bishop, Massimo First Amendment and**
432 **Restatement Musa Revocable Trust, 4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 201B, Boca Raton,**
433 **FL 33431 on the parcel located at 9362 State Road 16, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel #:**
434 **18-3529-0)**

- 435
436 1. PCID Amendment Fee of \$700.00 (PAID).
437
438 2. Abide by all conditions of original Planned Commercial Industrial Development
439 Conditions approved by Common Council on February 8, 1988:
440 a. Grant a temporary entrance/exit until such time as Shopko is built; at that time, to
441 become entrance only.
442 b. Developer required to install the proper entrance/exit signs.
443 c. Lot to be contoured to drain into proposed catch basin.
444 d. Developer to install trees and shrubs, as per plan.
445 e. Developer to furnish City with a copy of cross easement obtained from Shopko.
446 f. Waive stormwater fee, in lieu of developer installing it, as per plan.
447 g. External lighting to be of shielded type and directed towards the building.
448 h. If anything other than a shoe store goes on this location, they must re-submit the PCID.
449 i. Any omission of conditions not listed shall not release the developer from any
450 requirements of the Subdivision Code.

451
452 3. As noted in Condition #2 this development is based upon a previously approved
453 development by the Common Council with specific Conditions of Approval. Below are
454 Conditions of Approval that are still relevant to the proposed development today and the
455 developer shall be required to continue to complete the following conditions. Conditions not
456 listed below are either completed, not applicable to this development, or are duplicative of other
457 Conditions of Approval:

- 458 a. Developer required to install the proper entrance/exit signs.
459 b. External lighting to be of shielded type and directed towards the building.
460

- 461 4. Delete Condition of Approval #2h from PCID as shown above and instead allow the
462 parcel's uses to be governed by Principal Uses dictated by the underlying zoning district
463 as listed in the Unified Development Code.
464
- 465 5. Site Plan Permit required for new development in advance of building permit
466 applications, including detailed architectural plans, water, sewer, landscape, stormwater,
467 drainage, erosion control, and other required information/plans (fire accessibility, hydrant
468 locations, etc.).
469
- 470 6. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
471 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied
472 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
473
- 474 7. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
475 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
476 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
477 other conditions.
478
- 479 8. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property
480 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
481

482 Katie told commission members the applicant is requesting to amend the current Planned
483 Commercial Industrial District (PCID) approved on February 8, 1988 to allow for retail sales and
484 to construct an addition to the principal structure. This development is considered a "Major
485 Amendment" to the PCID as there is a change in use requested from the original PCID (to allow
486 retail in addition to shoes), and an increase in density (building addition), which requires a public
487 hearing. The applicant is proposing to construct an addition of 1,237 square feet to the existing
488 4,507 square foot building, totaling 5,744 square feet. Further, they intend to subdivide the
489 structure to allow for two retail locations within the building. Katie said this amendment
490 required a public hearing. If approved by both the Plan Commission and the Common Council,
491 the city will record the attached Conditions of Approval at the La Crosse County Register of
492 Deeds to document the final list of approved conditions for all future development opportunities.
493 Katie said a proposed site plan showing the proposed buildings changes and other site amenities
494 has been included in commission members' packets, as has a cover letter that describes the
495 overall development. Katie noted there are eight conditions of approval tied to this development.
496

497 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
498 Planned Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application.
499

500 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the Planned
501 Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application and closed that portion of
502 the public hearing.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2020
13

503
504 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the Planned
505 Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application and closed the public
506 hearing.

507
508 Amanda noted there is an individual who appears to be trying to speak to the Plan Commission,
509 but no one can hear him.

510
511 Mayor K. Smith said she will give the individual another opportunity to speak to the Plan
512 Commission.

513
514 Amanda told the individual no one is able to hear him/her.

515
516 Craig told Amanda the phone number on the screen is his.

517
518 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to approve with the eight stated conditions a Planned
519 Commercial Industrial Development (PCID) Amendment Application filed by Colin Klos, MBA
520 Architects, Inc, N5560 CR ZM, Suite 3, Onalaska, WI 54650, on behalf of Mike Bishop,
521 Massimo First Amendment and Restatement Musa Revocable Trust, 4800 North Federal
522 Highway, Suite 201B, Boca Raton, FL 33431 on the parcel located at 9362 State Road 16,
523 Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel #: 18-3529-0).

524
525 On voice vote, motion carried.

526
527 **Item 8 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:40 PM (or immediately following Public**
528 **Hearing @ 7:30 PM) to consider an Application for a General Development Plan to create**
529 **the Eagle Business Condo Association Planned Unit Development (PUD) filed by Adam**
530 **Kirschner, Eagle Business Condo Association, 200 Mason Street #6, Onalaska, WI 54650**
531 **on behalf of the Eagle Business Condo Association, 200 Mason Street, Onalaska, WI 54650**
532 **for the City of Onalaska parcels at:**

- 533
- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 534 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 1 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 2 |
| 535 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 3 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 4 |
| 536 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 5 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 6 |
| 537 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 7 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 8 |
| 538 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 9 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 10 |
| 539 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 11 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 12 |
| 540 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 13 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 14 |
| 541 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 15 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 16 |
| 542 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 17 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 18 |
| 543 | • 200 Mason Street - Unit 19 | 200 Mason Street - Unit 20 |

- 544
545 1. Planned Unit Development: General Development Plan Application Fee of \$700.00
546 (PAID).
547
548 2. Owner/developer to abide by the Site Plan Permit #070628
549 a. Site Plan Fee of \$100.00.
550 b. Owner shall abide by all conditions of Conditional Use Permit.
551 1) CUP Fee of \$150.00
552 2) Owner shall submit detailed layout, landscape, drainage, and erosions control
553 plan in connection with site plan permit application.
554 3) Owner shall submit list of permitted uses and restrictions to be adopted as part
555 of this CUP. Permitted uses shall include M-1 principal uses plus the following:
556 automotive upholstery , distributors, painting, printing, publishing,
557 manufacturing, fabrication, packaging, and packing and assembly of the following
558 products; plastics, wood, electrical devices, jewelry & instruments.
559 4) Exterior storage and portable toilets shall be prohibited.
560 5) Signage master plan shall be required.
561 6) Owner shall submit enforcement procedures for condominium association.
562 7) Landscaping shall be required along south lot line facing Van Ripper Park and
563 Omni Center.
564 8) Owner shall submit typical building elevation and color schemes.
565 9) Exterior storage of inoperable vehicles is prohibited.
566 10) Owner/developer must pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved
567 by the city prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all
568 conditions satisfied and improvements installed per approved plans prior to the
569 issuance of occupancy permit.
570 11) Owner/developer must notify the city prior to any utility connection to public
571 utilities.
572 12) All conditions run with the land and are biding upon the original developer
573 and all heirs, successors, and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of
574 the property does not relieve the original developer from payment of any fees
575 imposed or from meeting any other conditions.
576 13) Any omissions of any conditions not listed in Plan Commission Minutes shall
577 not release the developer/property owner from abiding by the City's Subdivision
578 Ordinance and Zoning Code requirements.
579 14) Owner shall submit Notice of Intent for storm water requirement.
580 15) Owner shall submit a utility plan for review by city.
581 c. Lots 3 & 4 shall be combined for condo plat.
582 d. Owner shall submit project phasing plan.
583 e. Owner shall submit copy of restrictive covenants.
584 f. Sidewalk required – entire frontage.
585 g. Green Fee applied at building permit unless previously paid.

- 586 h. 1 - 2 ½“ caliper canopy tree required per 25’ of street frontage.
- 587 i. NR216 permit required + Nol.
- 588 j. Owner shall submit a detailed landscaping plan showing landscaping of rain gardens
- 589 and parking lot periphery.
- 590 k. All lighting shall be shielded down.
- 591 l. All signage require permits.
- 592 m. Portable toilets are not permitted.
- 593 n. Exterior storage is prohibited.
- 594 o. 12’ minimum required between structures.
- 595 p. Owner shall submit plan for lawn and landscape maintenance.
- 596 q. Knox box required – each unit – coordinate with Fire Department.
- 597 r. Hydrant may be required – coordinate with Fire Department.
- 598 s. Owner/developer must pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the
- 599 city prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions
- 600 satisfied and improvements installed prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit.
- 601 t. Owner/developer must notify the city prior to any utility connection to city owned
- 602 utilities.
- 603 u. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all
- 604 heirs, successors, and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property
- 605 does not relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed from meeting
- 606 any other conditions.
- 607 v. Tracking pad shall be included on erosion plan.
- 608 w. As-builts required prior to first occupancy.
- 609 x. Utility plan must be reviewed and approved by City Engineer.
- 610 y. Coordinate Fire Department access with Fire Chief.

611
612 3. In the event rebuilding is necessary, the applicant will be required to obtain a Site Plan
613 Permit required for new development in advance of building permit applications, including
614 detailed architectural plans, water, sewer, landscape, stormwater, drainage, erosion control, and
615 other required information/plans (fire accessibility, hydrant locations, etc.). Development
616 allowed to mirror existing site conditions as outlined in the Eagle Business Condo Association
617 (EBCA) Planned Unit Development.

618
619 4. Final Implementation Plan to be submitted for review and approval by the Plan
620 Commission and Common Council to complete the creation of a Planned Unit Development.

621
622 5. Owner/developer shall record with the La Crosse County Register of Deeds Planned Unit
623 Development Final Implementation Plan Conditions of Approval tied to the development. These
624 conditions shall not lapse or be waived as a result of any subsequent change in ownership of
625 tenancy.

626

627 6. If in the future the owner/developer creates Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Deed
628 Restrictions, etc. that at a minimum address maintenance, repair, and replacement of parking
629 lots/private drives, the buildings including all common areas and green spaces, stormwater
630 management/easement areas, as well as any ownership or use restrictions for the
631 parcel/development; a copy shall be provided to the Planning Department and recorded at the La
632 Crosse County Register of Deeds. Any amendments to the aforementioned document to be
633 recorded at the La Crosse County Register of Deeds and a copy provided to the Planning
634 Department.

635
636 7. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
637 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and
638 improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

639
640 8. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
641 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not relieve
642 the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any other conditions.

643
644 9. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property
645 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.

646
647 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of an
648 Application for a General Development Plan to create the Eagle Business Condo Association
649 Planned Unit Development (PUD).

650
651 **Adam Kirschner, Eagle Business Condo Association**
652 **200 Mason Street, No. 6**
653 **Onalaska**

654
655 "I have a couple things from the special conditions, Section 2 specifically. If I go to Section 2,
656 Number 5, it's asking for a Signage Master Plan. We don't have a Signage Master Plan in our
657 PUD. We requested simply that we would have two signs per unit, and then our street signs,
658 which is essentially what the city sign requirements are. I'm really not asking for anything
659 special. We're just asking for more of a condition in that way because we don't have 20
660 buildings, we have 20 units. We still want every tenant or every owner of each unit to be able to
661 have two per. The other thing is there's a condition in Section 2, Number 7, that says
662 landscaping along the southern lot line, which is what faces the Omni Center and the park.
663 There's actually not enough space there on the back of our property to have any kind of
664 landscaping. All we really have there is grass that we mow, and our property borders a what I
665 would say is kind of like an open pit for water runoff. Then there is a fenced-in area where the
666 municipality keeps all of their extra rubbish. We've been in communication with them to try to
667 hopefully get them to make that look a little nicer because it's pretty rough looking. Also, in
668 Section 2, if I go down to Number 13, letter c, it says Lots 3 and 4 are supposed to combine.

669 Katie, maybe you can answer that. Why would those be combining?"

670

671 Mayor K. Smith told Adam that Plan Commission members simply are listening at this time and
672 said they may return to his question during the discussion.

673

674 Adam said, "I'm not sure if 3 and 4 means Units 3 and 4, but 3 and 4 is one building, [and] it's
675 two separate units. Maybe there's something I don't know on that. [Regarding] 13h, is a piece
676 for trees along the main road, which would be Mason Street. I think it says 1 to 2 feet or
677 something of canopy every 25 feet or something like that. We actually don't have enough
678 setback space to put trees in there. We have bushes and such, but we don't have canopy
679 coverage, so that would be a requirement I don't think that we would ever be able to meet
680 because they would overhang the sidewalk. Then 13k asks for lighting to be shielded in a down
681 position. If this is essentially the new zoning as Commercial Business, I don't see how there
682 would be any specific lighting requirements. There are no houses or anything around the
683 property here. That requirement seems a little bit unusual. That's all I have."

684

685 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in favor of an Application
686 for a General Development Plan to create the Eagle Business Condo Association Planned Unit
687 Development (PUD) and closed that portion of the public hearing.

688

689 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to an Application
690 for a General Development Plan to create the Eagle Business Condo Association Planned Unit
691 Development (PUD) and closed the public hearing.

692

693 Katie told commission members the applicant is requesting to create a Planned Unit
694 Development (PUD) in response to the changes in the City of Onalaska's Unified Development
695 Code. Katie noted commission members' packets include a copy of a cover letter from Eagle
696 Business Condo Association (EBCA) that describes the overall development and requested
697 deviations from the Unified Development Code/Zoning Ordinance. Katie summarized them as
698 follows:

699

700 • **Setbacks**

701 ○ If a natural disaster of fire damages or destroys any physical building or current
702 structure within the EBCA, property owners and/or the association reserve the
703 right to rebuild using the exact same locations, sizes, and building materials,
704 including landscaping.

705 • **Parking**

706 ○ The development currently has seventy (70) general parking spaces and five (5)
707 handicap parking spaces. EBCA is requesting to retain the 75 parking spaces and
708 reserve the right to change the current configuration based on property
709 owner/tenant needs.

710 • **Signage**

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

18

- 711 ○ The property currently has two (2) monument signs. The first sign measures eight
712 (8) feet wide by sixteen (16) feet tall and a second sign that measures six (6) feet
713 by six (6) feet. In the event that one or both signs need to be replaced, refinished,
714 or modified, the EBCA reserves the right to do so in the same location, with the
715 same dimensions and design standards including illumination. The applicant is
716 also requesting that each of the twenty (20) units be authorized two (2) exterior
717 signs totaling up to 100 square feet and the signs may be one-dimensional, two-
718 dimensional, illuminated, or not illuminated. All signage is to be constructed
719 within the bylaws set forth by the association and its members. Units with glass
720 exterior doors and windows are to also be authorized to display their business
721 name, contact information, and special instructions (delivery, camera, parking,
722 etc.) without restriction.
- 723 ● **Permitted Uses**
 - 724 ○ Storage facility, personal
 - 725 ○ Manufacturing, light
 - 726 ○ Printing and publishing, large scale
 - 727 ○ Storage and sale of machinery and equipment
 - 728 ○ Warehouse and distribution facility
 - 729 ● **Special/Additional Requests**
 - 730 ○ The EBCA is requesting to construct a limited visibility fence up to eight (8) feet
731 in height along the south and east property lines to improve the aesthetics along
732 the municipality border / water run off ditch. Finally, EBCA reserves the right to
733 change or improve landscaping features such as shrubs, rock beds, bushes, and
734 decorative stone in accordance with association policies.

735
736 Katie addressed Item No. 2 and told commission members they are all of the past approvals that
737 are tied to this development. Katie addressed Item 2b and told commission members there
738 previously was a CUP issued for this development. That includes Item Nos. 1 through 13. Katie
739 addressed Item 2b(5) (*“Signage Master Plan shall be required.”*), and she said Adam has
740 requested could constitute as a Master Signage Plan. Katie next addressed Item 2b(7)
741 (*“Landscaping shall be required along the southern lot facing Van Riper Park and Omni
742 Center”*), and she said this was an original condition of approval. Katie said it would be up to
743 the Plan Commission to change this. Katie referred to Adam’s letter and said Adam had plans to
744 construct an 8-foot high fence along the entire southern property boundary so that it can be
745 another means of a screen if landscaping is ineffective.

746
747 Jarrod said the facility is basically cut off on the entire southern side, noting that the City Public
748 Works Facility wraps around the facility. Jarrod told commission members there is a salt shed
749 that cuts off most of the view of the south side, and he estimated there is approximately 100 feet
750 of stormwater pond before one reaches the Omni Center property. Jarrod said the condition for
751 the landscaping along the south lot line was required for this development before any of the
752 development went in with the city facilities there. Jarrod said he believes that condition probably

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

19

753 should be removed as it no longer is pertinent to what the city has as a city facility for the
754 viewshed.

755
756 Katie noted the Site Plan had called out all the CUP conditions, and she told commission
757 members, “Now we’re going to back to the original Site Plan when this project was constructed.”
758 Katie noted Lots 3 and 4 combined for a condominium plat that was completed, and she said it
759 now is a condominium plat with one building and two owners. Therefore, that condition has
760 been satisfied. Katie next addressed the one caliper canopy tree required per 25 feet of frontage
761 requirement, and she said if it is not available it would be up to the Plan Commission to approve
762 that the shrubs in lieu of the trees would be appropriate.

763
764 Jarrod noted it is for the boulevard.

765
766 Katie agreed that that is for the boulevard.

767
768 Jarrod said the present landscaping is between the buildings and the right-of-way, adding, “This
769 would be along the boulevard area that the trees are required in the city right-of-way.”

770
771 Mayor K. Smith asked Jarrod if there is room for trees there.

772
773 Jarrod said there should be room for trees, and he told Mayor K. Smith there might be trees
774 there.

775
776 Katie addressed Item 2k (“All lighting shall be shielded down”) and said this is a standard
777 condition of approval the city has for all commercial development. Katie said the city does not
778 want excessive light pollution, and she explained that shielded down means lighting is not
779 pointed up in the air. The light may point on buildings or the ground. Katie said the condition is
780 meant to limit lighting on the property so that it does not bleed onto adjacent properties. Katie
781 told commission members Adam will have to return before the Plan Commission with a Final
782 Implementation Plan if both the Plan Commission and the Common Council approve the
783 Application for a General Development Plan. Katie noted it likely will be very similar to what is
784 before the Plan Commission this evening.

785
786 Motion by Jarrod, second by Ald. T. Smith, to approve with the nine stated conditions an
787 Application for a General Development Plan to create the Eagle Business Condo Association
788 Planned Unit Development (PUD) filed by Adam Kirschner, Eagle Business Condo Association,
789 200 Mason Street #6, Onalaska, WI 54650 on behalf of the Eagle Business Condo Association,
790 200 Mason Street, Onalaska, WI 54650 for the City of Onalaska parcels at 200 Mason Street,
791 Units 1 through 20. Condition No. 2b(7) (“*Landscaping shall be required along south lot line
792 facing Van Riper Park and Omni Center*”) shall be removed.

793
794 Katie said Adam has requested two signs per business and told commission members that is

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2020
20

795 allowable within the city's code. Katie asked if the 100 square feet is a total per business, noting
796 the city's Zoning Code only allows one to have up to a total of 500 square feet per façade. Katie
797 said as an example if there were eight applicants in a particular building, they would be allowed
798 to have 800 square feet as opposed to what the city's code allows.

799
800 Skip asked if Adam is satisfied with the motion as it has been presented.

801
802 Adam told Katie he had looked at the street view and said the trees are there. Adam also told
803 Skip he is satisfied with the motion as it stands. Adam next addressed the question that had been
804 raised regarding signage, telling commission members, "Up to 100 square feet per tenant. We
805 don't have more than two units per building, so per façade the maximum amount that would be
806 per façade would be 400."

807
808 Katie told Adam that is allowable within the conditions.

809
810 On voice vote, motion carried.

811
812 **Item 9 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:50 PM (or immediately following Public**
813 **Hearing @ 7:40 PM) to consider a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment**
814 **Application of the Crestwood Estates filed by Jacob Burch, Logistics Development Group,**
815 **LLC, 2102 State Hwy 16, La Crosse, WI 54601 located at "State Road 16" at the end of**
816 **Crestwood Lane, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel #: 18-4483-1)**

- 817
818 1. Planned Unit Development Fee for \$700.00 dollars (PAID).
819
820 2. Adhere to all Crestwood Estates Planned Unit Development Conditions of Approval as
821 approved by the Common Council on February 12, 2019:
822 a) Park Fee of \$922.21 (per unit) due prior to issuance of building permit for each
823 buildable lot. 18 total lots * \$922.21/unit = \$16,599.788 dollars.
824 b) Topography Map fee of \$10.00 (per acre) \$10/acre x 23.16 acres = \$231.60 dollars to
825 be paid prior to obtaining a Building Permit.
826 c) Development is contingent upon City installation of water booster station along
827 Crestwood Lane. Installation of water booster station is contingent upon City funding the
828 project through the City of Onalaska Capital Improvements Budget, receiving necessary
829 permits and approvals, and obtaining lands for the water booster station.
830 d) Owner/developer to be aware that City water system provides service to elevation
831 930'; meeting Wisconsin DNR minimum pressure requirements. Owner/developer to be
832 aware Wisconsin DNR minimum water pressure supplied at a main is 35 psi, which
833 occurs at elevation 930' in the City of Onalaska High Service Zone. Water pressure for
834 owner satisfaction in a typical residential home is higher than the Wisconsin DNR
835 minimum. Lots 13-18 building pad and home elevations will exceed service elevation for
836 water system. Owner/developer to supply City with written plan for water service to these

- 837 lots. Owner/developer is required to inform all lot buyers of water pressures within the
838 Crestwood Estates development.
- 839 e) All infrastructure design for development to be approved by the City Engineer. Review
840 of street widths and pavement cross section with final approval by the City Engineer.
- 841 f) Phasing of construction of infrastructure in development to be coordinated with City
842 infrastructure installation along Crestwood Lane.
- 843 g) Final Implementation Plan to be submitted for review and approval prior to any
844 development activities.
- 845 h) Owner/developer shall record with the La Crosse County Register of Deeds, the legal
846 description of the Planned Unit Development and the Conditions of Approval tied to the
847 development. These conditions shall not lapse or be waived as a result of any subsequent
848 change in ownership of tenancy.
- 849 i) If in the future the owner/developer creates Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and
850 Deed Restrictions, etc. that at a minimum address maintenance, repair, and replacement
851 of parking lots/private drives, the buildings including all common areas and green spaces,
852 stormwater management/easement areas, as well as any ownership or use restrictions for
853 the parcel/development; a copy shall be provided to the Planning Department and
854 recorded at the La Crosse County Register of Deeds. Any amendments to the
855 aforementioned document to be recorded at the La Crosse County Register of Deeds and
856 a copy provided to the Planning Department.
- 857 j) Master Grading and Stormwater plan to be reviewed & approved by the City Engineer.
- 858 k) Thirty (30) percent slopes to be identified on a plan and also indicate a ten (10) foot
859 buffer surrounding the identified slopes. Building pads/residences/structures may not
860 infringe upon this area.
- 861 l) Owner/developer to submit a digital and hard copy of the WIDNR NR 216/NOI
862 application, permit, approval letter and associated data prior to construction to the
863 Engineering Department. A City Erosion Control Permit for greater than one (1) acre of
864 land disturbance is required before any earth moving activities occur. Permit to be
865 reviewed and approved a minimum of ten (10) days prior to construction activities.
- 866 m) All erosion control BMPs (Best Management Practices) to be installed prior to the
867 start of any construction activities. Swale areas/stormwater ponds to be dug prior to start
868 of construction and prior to initial grading to act as sediment traps. Track pad(s) to be
869 installed with a minimum of 3 to 6 inch stones, one (1) foot deep and fifty (50) feet in
870 length. All disturbed areas to have black dirt placed and seeded within seven (7) days of
871 disturbance.
- 872 n) Master Utility Plan (including any phasing) to be reviewed and approved by the City
873 Engineer including a schedule. Any utilities dedicated to the City of Onalaska shall be in
874 a dedicated right-of-way, outlot, or easement. Master Utility Plan to note hydrant
875 locations.
- 876 o) Land Preservation Plan (landscaping/open space/tree preservation) to be reviewed and
877 approved by the Planning Department.
- 878 p) Note tree removal / clearing / grubbing limitations on Grading Plan.

- 879 q) City-furnished Inspector required during utility installations and developer to pay
880 costs.
- 881 r) As-builts of all utility work required to be submitted to the Engineering Department
882 within sixty (60) days of occupancy of first residential dwelling.
- 883 s) Owner/developer to obtain letters from utility service providers noting that there is
884 adequate power, natural gas, and telephone/internet services available to serve this
885 project and provided to the Engineering Department.
- 886 t) All lot pins to be installed at 150' (maximum interval).
- 887 u) Recommend 13R sprinkler systems for residences due to anticipated topography,
888 setbacks of homes of streets and non-direct driveways.
- 889 v) Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits
890 (i.e., site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals). Owner/developer shall pay
891 all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City prior to obtaining a
892 building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and improvements
893 installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
- 894 w) All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all
895 heirs, successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property
896 does not relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from
897 meeting any other conditions.
- 898 x) Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property
899 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
900
- 901 3. Park Fee of \$922.21 (per unit) due prior to issuance of building permit for each
902 buildable unit. $22 \text{ total unit} * \$922.21/\text{unit} = \$20,288.62$ dollars. Note: if the Park Fee
903 increases in the future, the property owner will be required to pay the increased Park Fee at
904 the time of the development.
905
- 906 4. Water booster station construction has been delayed and it is projected it may not be
907 available for use until end of 2020 (Date has not been confirmed). Building permits for
908 structures can be issued but no final occupancy will be issued until City has water booster
909 station is in service.
910
- 911 5. Applicant to create an Outlot for "Pond A" to be dedicated to the City of Onalaska and
912 provide an accessible access easement to the City for maintenance purposes.
913
- 914 6. Topography Map fee of \$10.00 (per acre) $\$10/\text{acre} \times 23.16 \text{ acres} = \231.60 dollars to
915 be paid prior to the City of Onalaska signing the Final Plat.
916
- 917 7. Applicant to note on Planned Unit Development and subsequent replatting documents,
918 shared driveway easements where applicable.
919

920 8. Applicant to re-apply for a new Preliminary Plat and Final Plat for Crestwood Estates
921 Subdivision to the City of Onalaska and Wisconsin Department of Administration.

922
923 9. Provided the Final Plat is approved by the City of Onalaska and Wisconsin Department
924 of Administration and after “Lot 9” is assigned a Tax Parcel Number. Applicant to apply to
925 rezone “Lot 9” as indicated in the proposed attachment from R-1 District to the R-3 District
926 to allow the construction of up to eight (8) units on a single parcel.

927
928 10. Once “Lot 9” has been appropriately zoned to the R-3 District, applicant shall submit
929 a Condominium Plat in accordance with Chapter 703, Wis. Stats. for approval by the
930 Wisconsin Department of Administration. Applicant to provide all associated documentation
931 submitted the Department of Administration to the City of Onalaska.

932
933 11. Any future improvements to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits
934 (i.e., site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals). Owner/developer shall pay all
935 fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City prior to obtaining a building
936 permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and improvements installed per
937 approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits

938
939 Katie said both the Common Council and Plan Commission previously approved a Preliminary
940 and Final Plat and a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for an 18-lot single-family residential
941 development located in the bluff systems of eastern Onalaska near Nathan Hill. The City of
942 Onalaska has not yet signed nor caused the Final Plat to be recorded as the infrastructure for this
943 subdivision has not yet been fully installed. This Planned Unit Development (PUD) amendment
944 request is to facilitate a change in the density of Crestwood Estates Subdivision. Included in this
945 staff report is the approved plat showing the current parcel configuration. Also attached is the
946 proposed PUD amendment which shows a new total of 15 parcels. The applicant is proposing to
947 merge the original Lots 9, 10, 11 and 12 into one lot as shown on the new map as Lot 9 to
948 contain four twindos. Katie said it is the intention that the new “Lot 9” will have three
949 driveways, with Twindos B & C being served by individual driveways, and Twindos A & D to
950 share a single driveway. The applicant may request to complete a separate condominium plat for
951 Lot 9 as the lot is intended to be under shared ownership. Katie said she and staff are in
952 communication with the Department of Administration Platting Department to determine if the
953 entire Crestwood Estates would need to be replatted or Lot 9 in particular. Regardless, a replat
954 includes both the Preliminary and Final Plat process which the applicant will be able to apply for
955 simultaneously. Katie noted there are 11 conditions of approval tied to this development, and
956 she told commission members Condition Nos. 8, 9, and 10 are the process the applicant would
957 need to follow if this is approved both by the Plan Commission and the Common Council.

958
959 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of a
960 Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment Application of the Crestwood Estates.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

24

962 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of a Planned Unit
963 Development (PUD) Amendment Application of the Crestwood Estates and closed that portion
964 of the public hearing.

965

966 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to a Planned Unit
967 Development (PUD) Amendment Application of the Crestwood Estates and closed the public
968 hearing.

969

970 Motion by Jarrod, second by Craig, to approve with the 11 stated conditions a Planned Unit
971 Development (PUD) Amendment Application of the Crestwood Estates filed by Jacob Burch,
972 Logistics Development Group, LLC, 2102 State Hwy 16, La Crosse, WI 54601 located at “State
973 Road 16” at the end of Crestwood Lane, Onalaska, WI 54650. (Tax Parcel #: 18-4483-1).

974

975 Jan asked if any of the adjoining lots have been sold to individuals who had the understanding
976 there would be single-family homes there and not twindos. Jan also asked if the number of
977 homes sites is doubling from four to eight.

978

979 Katie told Jan no parcels have been sold, and she also told Jan the density would be doubled
980 from four single-family structures to eight units (four twindos).

981

982 Jan asked if there would be any sewer-related issues with taking this action.

983

984 Jarrod told Jan the sewer and water system has been sized for these units, and he said, “Before
985 the street had the rock installed on it, the changes were made to the utilities to accommodate this
986 development you see in front of you today.”

987

988 Motion by Jarrod, second by Craig, to amend the previous motion and include that Lot No. 9,
989 Buildings A, B, and D must have a minimum 18-foot wide driveway with turning radius to allow
990 city fire truck access.

991

992 Jarrod told commission members he wanted to ensure a fire truck could have access, noting that
993 a truck would have to back out as there would not necessarily be a turnaround. Jarrod said, “I
994 just want to make sure that when we do the final Site Plan Review we can adhere to that
995 condition to make sure we can get a fire truck in there.”

996

997 Craig said he agrees with Jarrod’s assessment, noting the two had discussed this earlier Tuesday.
998 Craig said it already is difficult for emergency vehicles to enter and exit this area, and he told
999 commission members he believes the adjustment will be a tremendous help.

1000

1001 Vote on the amendment:

1002

1003 On voice vote, motion carried.

Reviewed 5/29/2020 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, May 26, 2020
25

1004
1005 Original motion restated:
1006
1007 To approve with the 11 stated conditions – and a new, 12th condition stating that Lot No. 9,
1008 Buildings A, B, and D must have a minimum 18-foot wide driveway with turning radius to allow
1009 city fire truck access – a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment Application of the
1010 Crestwood Estates filed by Jacob Burch, Logistics Development Group, LLC, 2102 State Hwy
1011 16, La Crosse, WI 54601 located at “State Road 16” at the end of Crestwood Lane, Onalaska, WI
1012 54650. (Tax Parcel #: 18-4483-1).
1013
1014 Skip told Jarrod he is looking at Units A and D, and he asked who is responsible for snow
1015 removal on the long driveway.
1016
1017 Jarrod told Skip they are private driveways the condominium development will have to maintain,
1018 adding the condominium development will be responsible for pavement maintenance and
1019 clearing snow.
1020
1021 Skip asked if all four units will have to establish a homeowners’ association.
1022
1023 Jarrod said yes.
1024
1025 Mayor K. Smith asked if that exceeds the setback allowances the city has for fire control.
1026
1027 Katie said yes and told Mayor K. Smith the developer was allowed to set his own building sites
1028 as part of the original PUD. Katie said, “You don’t have to follow your standard setbacks.”
1029
1030 Mayor K. Smith noted the Elmwood Development is steep and said longer distances had been
1031 allowed, thus making it very difficult for a fire truck to reach its destination. Mayor K. Smith
1032 said she does not want to enter into a similar situation.
1033
1034 Katie noted the city still has the original conditions from when both the Plan Commission and
1035 the Common Council reviewed this. Katie said, “Specifically tied to that would be [Condition]
1036 No. 2u, [which is] recommending 13-R sprinkler systems for all of the residences due to the
1037 anticipated topographies, setbacks of homes, of streets, and non-direct driveways. We did not
1038 require it at that time. But as this will be recorded, if approved, anyone purchasing a home will
1039 see these conditions and the recommendations of the Council and the Plan Commission.”
1040
1041 Mayor K. Smith asked, “With this pending approval from the state, are we anticipating any
1042 changes that we’ll have to accommodate coming down from the state looking at the plans?”
1043
1044 Katie said, “They will need to reapply for a new Preliminary Plat if this is approved by the
1045 Council. In discussions with the state, they walked me through what process is necessary. They

1046 have to apply for a new Preliminary Plat and Final Plat, which they can do at the same time.
1047 That will also not just go through the state, but it will also go through the city. Then, provided
1048 that we approve that, Lot 9, they will have to come back once a city tax parcel has been assigned
1049 in order to allow it to go from an R-1 District to an R-3 District. That's the only zoning district
1050 outside of multifamily that would allow up to eight units, which is what they'd like to do on this
1051 parcel. Subsequently, once the rezoning is in place, then they can go and apply for a
1052 condominium plat and establish the homeowners' association that Skip was mentioning
1053 previously. It's a three-step process. The developer is aware of these conditions and what
1054 process they need to follow."

1055
1056 On voice vote, motion carried.

1057

1058 **Item 10 – Consideration of 2020 Plan Commission Sub-Committee Meetings**

1059

1060 Katie asked commission members if they wish to conduct the June 23 Plan Commission meeting
1061 via Zoom, or if technology allows, they would be seated in the Common Council Chambers and
1062 the public would come in via Webinar.

1063

1064 Craig, Ald. T. Smith and Skip all stated they wish to meet in the Common Council Chambers,
1065 with the public utilizing Webinar.

1066

1067 Katie said the hybrid approach still would allow a commission member to participate if he/she
1068 felt uncomfortable with entering the Common Council Chambers.

1069

1070 Katie next addressed the Plan Commission Subcommittee meetings, noting they typically are
1071 short in duration. Katie said it is her understanding Plan Commission members like to provide
1072 input regarding overall development, and Plan Commission Subcommittee members wish to
1073 know what the full Plan Commission is thinking. Katie told commission members she
1074 recommends not holding subcommittee meetings for the remainder of 2020 simply to test it out.
1075 Katie said additional Plan Commission meetings may be scheduled if they are needed, and she
1076 also said the subcommittee may be called to have an additional meeting, if needed. Katie said,
1077 "We're always asked to look for efficiencies in staff time and expense. And I believe no longer
1078 having the subcommittee would achieve both of those goals. But as it is ultimately the
1079 subcommittee of the Plan Commission, I'm looking for your feedback on this this evening."

1080

1081 Jarrod noted the Plan Commission Subcommittee was created in the late 1980s due to the
1082 development occurring within the community, and he said the Plan Commission meetings were
1083 going so long and discussing such technical items that meetings were scheduled two weeks
1084 ahead of time as then-Mayor Shirleigh Van Riper wanted to have better preparation leading up to
1085 the public hearings and give developers an opportunity to adjust issues. Jarrod said, "I think with
1086 what staff has done over the last 15 years, [they] have meetings with those developers ahead of
1087 time. A lot of the subcommittee items really get taken care of at the staff level, so we are

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

27

1088 addressing those with the developers beforehand and making sure that the plans already are to
1089 the Plan Commission level when they go to subcommittee.

1090
1091 I agree with this. Our subcommittee meetings over the years have gotten less and less technical,
1092 [and there is] less and less going on because I think staff does a really good job of reaching out to
1093 developers, and also through our Site Plan process we solicit comments and do a much better job
1094 in the last 15 years of getting site plans committed and trying to get them in and go over them
1095 before the meeting. I'm in concurrence with what Katie is stating."

1096
1097 Ald. T. Smith, who has served as Plan Commission Subcommittee Chair, said the last couple
1098 meetings have lasted between five and 10 minutes, and he also said many of the items are
1099 rehashed at Plan Commission meetings. Ald. T. Smith said, "I really do think it makes sense to
1100 not have the subcommittee. If there is a special reason why we need to, then we'd call one on
1101 demand. I agree with what Katie was proposing. I think it's a good idea."

1102
1103 Skip, a longtime member of the Plan Commission Subcommittee, noted the subcommittee really
1104 cannot take any action when public hearing are forthcoming, also noting commission members
1105 must listen to the information provided at public hearings before they can render a decision.
1106 Skip said there have been instances when subcommittee members have been able to "clue in" a
1107 petitioner to certain directions so that he or she is better prepared to answer questions at Plan
1108 Commission meetings.

1109
1110 Katie told commission members she will cancel Plan Commission Subcommittee meetings for
1111 the remainder of 2020, and she said she probably will ask commission members at the December
1112 Plan Commission meeting if they wish to continue without subcommittee meetings, or restart
1113 them in January 2021.

1114
1115 Mayor K. Smith noted the Finance and Personnel II Committee option is only utilized at budget
1116 time and said she believes this would be a similar situation.

1117
1118 **Adjournment**

1119
1120 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. T. Smith, to adjourn at 8:19 p.m.

1121
1122 On voice vote, motion carried.

1123
1124
1125 Recorded by:

1126
1127 Kirk Bey