

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

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, July 23, 2019. It was noted that the meeting had been announced and a notice posted at
3 City Hall.

4
5 Roll call was taken, with the following members present: Ald. Diane Wulf (acting Mayor and
6 serving for Mayor Joe Chilsen), Ald. Tom Smith, City Engineer Jarrod Holter, Jan Brock, Paul
7 Gleason, Steven Nott

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

12
13 Excused Absences: Mayor Joe Chilsen, Skip Temte, Craig Breitsprecher

14
15 **Item 2 – Approval of minutes from previous meeting**

16
17 Ald. Wulf noted the minutes from the July 16 Special Plan Commission meeting had come out
18 earlier Tuesday, and she asked that the Plan Commission only approve the minutes from the
19 regular June 25 meeting as the minutes from the July 16 meeting are a little more than 22 pages
20 long and she assumes commission members have not had time to review them.

21
22 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Steven, to approve the minutes from the June 25, 2019
23 regular Plan Commission meeting as printed and on file in the City Clerk’s Office.

24
25 On voice vote, motion carried.

26
27 Ald. Wulf noted the minutes from the July 16 Special Plan Commission meeting will need to be
28 approved at the August 27 Plan Commission meeting.

29
30 **Item 3 – Public Input (limited to 3 minutes per individual)**

31
32 Ald. Wulf called for anyone wishing to provide public input.

33
34 **James Makepeace**
35 **1620 Winnebago Street**
36 **La Crosse**

37
38 James, of Makepeace Engineering LLC, noted two of his clients are in attendance with him this
39 evening, and he told commission members he will be happy to answer any questions.

40
41 Ald. Wulf called three times for anyone else wishing to provide public input and closed that
42 portion of the meeting.

Reviewed 7/26/19 by Katie Aspenson

43
44 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**
45

46 **Item 4 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:00 P.M. (or immediately following Public Input)**
47 **– Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit application to allow the construction of an**
48 **automotive dealership/vehicle sales/repairs facility at 2520 Midwest Drive, Onalaska, 384**
49 **Theater Road, Onalaska, N4375 Theater Road/N4342 Germann Court, Town of Medary,**
50 **submitted by Jansen Dahl of CHASE 2010 LLC, on behalf of CHASE 2010 LLC, 3819**
51 **Creekside Lane, Holmen, WI 54636 and Judith Rockwood, N9495 Radcliffe Road,**
52 **Mindoro, WI 54644 (Tax Parcel #s 18-3568-40, 18-3570-70, and 9-93-0)**
53

54 Ald. Wulf opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the
55 Conditional Use Permit application request.
56

57 Ald. Wulf called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the Conditional Use Permit
58 application request and closed that portion of the public hearing.
59

60 Ald. Wulf called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the Conditional Use
61 Permit application request and closed the public hearing.
62

63 Katie said the applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to construct a new light motor
64 vehicle sales and service facility (Dahl Honda) to be located at 2520 Midwest Drive. All three
65 parcels have been merged into a single M-1 (Light Industrial) parcel for this project, which
66 includes the previous Rockwood property that was annexed into the city, and property that was
67 previously zoned B-1. The proposed development includes an approximately 24,000-square foot
68 facility containing office, retail showroom, service facilities, and guest amenities. The exterior
69 will have heavily landscaped display areas for new and used inventory. On-site parking will be
70 provided for retail inventory, wholesale inventory, customers, employees, and service vehicles.
71 Hours of operation for service and maintenance will be from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through
72 Friday, and 7 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Saturdays. All service work will be performed indoors. Hours of
73 operation for sales will be 8:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. Monday and Thursday; 8:30 a.m. to 6 p.m.
74 Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday; and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday. Parts and vehicle deliveries
75 will occur daily, with multiple parts and vehicle deliveries per day. The vehicles performing said
76 deliveries will vary from 18-wheel semi-trucks to box trucks and vans. The sale of vehicles,
77 vehicle repairs, et cetera, on a parcel in the Light Industrial District is permitted only by CUP per
78 Section 13-5-16 (g), and pursuant to standards set forth in Sections 13-8-11.
79

80 Katie noted there are four conditions of approval. While the city has no basis for denial of the
81 CUP, it has found a basis to impose said conditions:
82

- 83 1. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
84 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

3

- 85 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
86 **Substantial Evidence:** This condition provides notice to the owner/developer that they
87 are to follow procedure for orderly development in the City of Onalaska in order to
88 promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.
89
- 90 2. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
91 successors and assigns so long as the conditional use is being actively used. **Substantial**
92 **Evidence:** This condition acknowledges and provides public notice of the term and puts
93 the owner/developer and future owners on notice that they are bound by the conditions
94 and that they can continue the use as long as they follow the conditions and actively use
95 the conditional use.
96
- 97 3. Owner/developer shall abide by the City's Ordinances, Unified Development Code and
98 Building Code requirements, as amended. **Substantial Evidence:** This condition
99 assures the owner/developer understands they must follow the city's Unified
100 Development Code and Building Code, which they are required to follow in every way,
101 and that as they are receiving the benefit of being allowed to have a use that is not within
102 the standards of the City's zoning code, failure to follow City ordinances may result in
103 loss of their Conditional Use Permit.
104
- 105 4. The Conditional Use Permit shall be reviewed every five (5) years to ensure continued
106 use. **Substantial Evidence:** This shifts the burden to the owner of the property to
107 provide proof that the use is active and continuing. Ensuring that existing permits are
108 still valid and being properly used ensures compliance with the City's procedures and
109 ordinances, and promotes interaction and communication with the City, which furthers
110 orderly development and the health, safety and welfare of the City.
111

112 Katie noted a public hearing already has been held and said only where no reasonable conditions
113 could exist to allow the Conditional Use, may a Conditional Use Permit be denied.
114

115 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Steven, to approve with the four stated conditions a
116 Conditional Use Permit application to allow the construction of an automotive dealership/vehicle
117 sales/repairs facility at 2520 Midwest Drive, Onalaska, 384 Theater Road, Onalaska, N4375
118 Theater Road/N4342 Germann Court, Town of Medary, submitted by Jansen Dahl of CHASE
119 2010 LLC, on behalf of CHASE 2010 LLC, 3819 Creekside Lane, Holmen, WI 54636 and
120 Judith Rockwood, N9495 Radcliffe Road, Mindoro, WI 54644 (Tax Parcel #s 18-3568-40, 18-
121 3570-70, and 9-93-0).
122

123 Ald. Wulf referred to the staff report and noted Dahl Honda's stated hours of operation on
124 Saturdays will be from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. However, Ald. Wulf also referred to a letter prepared by
125 Dahl Honda representatives and noted the stated hours of operation on Saturdays are 8:30 a.m. to
126 5 p.m.

Reviewed 7/26/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

4

127
128 Tyler Dahl, of Dahl Honda, told Ald. Wulf hours of operation for sales on Saturdays will be from
129 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

130
131 Katie noted the time stated on the staff report (8 a.m.) is incorrect.

132
133 Ald. Wulf addressed the second sentence of the “Site Details and Neighborhood Protections”
134 paragraph on the handout prepared by Dahl Honda representatives – which reads, “*The*
135 *perimeter to the west and north around the lower parking lot area will contain vegetation*
136 *consistent with reaching the required 80-percent opaqueness*” – and she asked, “Does that mean
137 that eventually they will get to 80-percent opaqueness within ‘x’ number of years? Or upon the
138 day that they are planted they will be at 80-percent opaqueness?”

139
140 Katie responded, “They do not have to have it the day they are planted. They are allowed to
141 grow into that. That is tied to the landscaping plan the Plan Commission previously approved.
142 This is referring to that landscaping plan.”

143
144 Ald. Wulf asked Katie if there is a specific amount of time.

145
146 Katie said Dahl Honda must reach 80-percent opaqueness within a set number of years.

147
148 Jan asked if the mention of a lower parking lot is a reference to a separate parking lot, or if the
149 parking lot will be lower in elevation.

150
151 Katie said she believes the parking lot to which Jan is referring will be in the area previously
152 zoned B-1 and stated, “Lower as in they have the area out front, and lower is south of the
153 existing facility.”

154
155 James Makepeace said the plans always have referred to two distinct parking lots: one
156 immediately adjacent to and around the building, and another one further to the west. James said
157 the latter is the one that has been called the lower parking lot, and he noted it will be slightly
158 lower (an estimated one to two feet) in elevation compared to the other parking lot.

159
160 Ald. Wulf noted Paul has recused himself from Item 4 and is currently sitting in the audience.

161
162 On voice vote, motion carried, 5-0.

163
164 Ald. Wulf noted Paul has rejoined the rest of the Plan Commission members.

165
166
167
168

169 **Item 5 – Review and Consideration of an annexation application for a La Crosse County**
170 **Parcel (Located North of Onalaska Dog Park) (4.01 acres total) filed by Ryan Wessel of**
171 **Broham Investments LLC, 9542 Frontage Road E. Highway 16, Onalaska, WI 54650 (Tax**
172 **Parcel #10-1151-0)**
173

- 174 1. Topography Map Fee: \$10.00 per acre * 4.01 acres = \$40.01 dollars (minimum fee).
175
176 2. Owner/applicant to be aware of a Park Fee in the amount of \$922.21 (per unit) to be paid
177 prior to the issuance of a building permit. \$922.21 x 134 units = \$123,576.14 dollars.
178 **UPDATED CONDITION**
179
180 3. Development is contingent upon City installation of water and sanitary sewer. Installation
181 of water and sanitary sewer is contingent upon City funding the project through the City
182 of Onalaska Capital Improvements Budget.
183
184 4. Developer to be aware that a development agreement will be needed to cover such items
185 as infrastructure costs, land transfer between developer, and parcel access, etc.
186
187 5. Annexed land to be placed in the Multifamily (R-4) Zoning District upon ordinance
188 adoption.
189
190 6. Annexation approval contingent upon future issuance of a Conditional Use Permit
191 request for multiple principle structures on a parcel or an approved Planned Unit
192 Development. **UPDATED CONDITION**
193
194 7. Owner/developer must notify City prior to any utility connection to City-owned utilities
195 takes place.
196
197 8. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City
198 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied
199 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
200
201 9. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,
202 successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not
203 relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any
204 other conditions.
205
206 10. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property
207 owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code requirements.
208

209 Katie said the Plan Commission is considering an annexation petition of approximately 4.01
210 acres by Ryan Wessel of Broham Investments LLC. There is no assigned address for this
211 particular property, which is located in the Town of Onalaska, just north of the Onalaska Dog

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

6

212 Park. The existing La Crosse County zoning is “Recreation and Natural Resources.” Katie
213 noted this area is completely surrounded by the City of Onalaska-owned land, including the
214 Aquatic Center to the north, and the Onalaska Dog Park is to the south and east. Vacant land is
215 located to the west. The Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as a Mixed Use District
216 (“Smart Growth Areas”) which allows for complementary land uses including housing (primarily
217 multifamily), retail, offices, commercial services, and civic uses in an efficient, compact
218 development. Katie noted Ryan and Aaron Wessel are managing partners of Broham
219 Investments LLC, and she also noted the Wessels own the property located at La Crosse County
220 Tax Parcel No. 10-1151-0 in the Town of Onalaska. Katie said they are looking to have their
221 property annexed into the city in order to propose a project to construct a multifamily residential
222 project in the City of Onalaska. Katie said the applicant plans to submit a capital improvement
223 request later this summer to have the city sewer and water extended to the parcel in order to
224 serve the proposed multifamily development. The applicant is requesting to have the property
225 annexed into the City of Onalaska with the Multifamily (R-4) District for zoning to
226 accommodate future proposed development. The proposal includes two apartments totaling 134
227 residential dwelling units (two 67-unit apartments), with a combination of underground and
228 surface parking. Katie said the Plan Commission is being asked to consider the annexation
229 request, and she noted there are 10 conditions tied to the development, including two that have
230 been updated since the July 9 Plan Commission Subcommittee meeting.

231
232 Motion by Paul, second by Ald. T. Smith, to approve with the 10 stated conditions an annexation
233 application for a La Crosse County Parcel (Located North of Onalaska Dog Park) (4.01 acres
234 total) filed by Ryan Wessel of Broham Investments LLC, 9542 Frontage Road E. Highway 16,
235 Onalaska, WI 54650 (Tax Parcel #10-1151-0).

236
237 Ald. Wulf asked Jarrod to address the capital improvement request.

238
239 Jarrod noted the area in question is located between south of Riders Club Road, and north of
240 Kramer Road and Schnick Road. Both Schnick Road and Kramer Drive are located within the
241 Town of Onalaska., and Kramer Road comes out to State Trunk Highway 35. Jarrod noted there
242 presently is no water and sewer along STH 35, and he told commission members that before the
243 STH 35 road project was installed, the Board of Public Works had gone on record to not have a
244 project coincide with the highway project to install water and sewer at that time as there was no
245 impending development occurring at that time. Jarrod said, “With this project, it will have to be
246 worked out with the developer’s engineer. The only available sewer and water presently is along
247 Riders Club Road. We would have to look at a couple different scenarios. The one scenario we
248 have looked at is the Engineering Department is running water and sewer from Schnick Road
249 and/or Troy Street to the south all the way up to Riders Club Road, or stopping at this parcel.
250 That would provide service, and it would also provide future service connections for people
251 either along Sunset Vista or in the Kramer Road/Schnick Road neighborhood that is presently in
252 the township. That project is probably in the neighborhood of \$750,000 to run that water and
253 sewer into that area. It will have to run against all the other capital improvements requests that

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

7

254 lie within the Capital Improvements Budget at that time.

255

256 We'll work with the developer's engineer on looking at other scenarios and other things that we
257 could do as possibilities, and we'll try to bring forward a project that seems feasible. Right now,
258 it looks like that probably is the best way to serve the whole area that we could get gravity sewer
259 without a lift station in the area and be looping the watermain all the way up through so we
260 would have a looped watermain in the area and not just a stub into the property. We have some
261 work to do on that so that will be part of the Capital Improvements Budget process. The
262 engineer for the developer has stated they probably will be requesting the Capital Improvements
263 Project within the next couple of weeks."

264

265 Paul asked if the Plan Commission may assume the developer has not been given a timeline by
266 the city as to when utilities will be available.

267

268 Jarrod told Paul that is the reason for Condition No. 3 and said it would have to be funded as part
269 of the Capital Improvements Budget.

270

271 Steven asked if it is correct to say the City of Onalaska is under no obligation to expedite the
272 funding for this, and that it will be based upon funds and the normal processes involved with the
273 CIB.

274

275 Jarrod told Steven he is correct; that is, unless the developer chooses to install the utilities
276 himself.

277

278 Ald. Wulf addressed the 10 conditions and asked Jarrod, "We're just saying that it is contingent
279 upon the city installing it? We're not promising we're going to, this commission, by approving
280 these 10 conditions ... We're not promising we are. It's just that the development is contingent
281 upon us doing it."

282

283 Jarrod told Ald. Wulf he does not believe so and said Amanda could give her opinion on the
284 matter.

285

286 Amanda referred to Jarrod's previous comments and said if there is an opportunity for the
287 developer to pay for some installation of water and sanitary sewer to allow for development, she
288 suggested amending Condition No. 3 to state the following: "*Development is contingent upon*
289 *installation of water and sanitary sewer.*"

290

291 Ald. Wulf asked Amanda if the word "City" would be removed from Condition No. 3.

292

293 Amanda said the word "City" would be removed from the first sentence, and said the second
294 sentence of Condition No. 3 should read as follows: "*Installation of water and sanitary sewer by*
295 *the City is contingent upon City funding the project through the City of Onalaska Capital*

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

8

296 *Improvements Budget.*” Amanda said revising Condition No. 3 would allow the developer to
297 self-fund the improvements if he chose to do so.

298
299 Ald. Wulf said per Amanda’s suggestion, Condition No. 3 would read as follows: “*Development*
300 *is contingent upon installation of water and sanitary sewer. Installation of water and sanitary*
301 *sewer by the City is contingent upon City funding the project through the City of Onalaska*
302 *Capital Improvements Budget.*”

303
304 Motion by Paul, second by Ald. T. Smith, to amend the previous motion and amend Condition
305 No. 3 to read as follows: “*Development is contingent upon installation of water and sanitary*
306 *sewer. Installation of water and sanitary sewer by the City is contingent upon City funding the*
307 *project through the City of Onalaska Capital Improvements Budget.*”

308
309 Ald. T. Smith asked, “Approving this tonight is giving us the green light to go ahead and start the
310 process to take a look at getting answers to all these pieces?”

311
312 Katie told Ald. T. Smith he is correct and said this process will last approximately four to five
313 months. Katie said, “If approved with these conditions tonight, it will go to the Common
314 Council, and eventually to the Administrative and Judiciary Committee following that process as
315 they see fit.”

316
317 Ald. Wulf said that while she has not yet seen the financial figures associated with the 2020 CIB,
318 she estimated this project could account for 25 percent of the budget.

319
320 City Administrator Rindfleisch told commission members the action being requested this
321 evening is consideration of the annexation application, and he said he interprets the 10 conditions
322 as being a form of a pre-annexation agreement so that both parties are aware of the future
323 considerations to be made. City Administrator Rindfleisch said the action the commission is
324 taking is either to accept or decline the annexation request.

325
326 Vote on the amendment:

327
328 On voice vote, motion carried.

329
330 Paul said he is concerned that the city is bringing in this land and automatically zoning it as R-4
331 (Multifamily), and he inquired about the current zoning of the parcel.

332
333 Katie it is zoned “Recreation and Natural Resources.”

334
335 Paul expressed concern the city is going from what would be zoned Public in the City of
336 Onalaska’s Zoning Code to an R-4 zoning, “and we’re doing it without giving the public any
337 [opportunity]. It seems to me that that is a little bit out of the normal course of things, and it

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

9

338 concerns me that we're not going through the normal rezoning process. If it were R-4 land in the
339 township, I would probably be OK with it. But since it's not, I'm not comfortable circumventing
340 the rezoning process."

341
342 Katie told Paul there are two methods by which the city handles annexation requests, and she
343 said the city's standard is that every annexation that comes into the city is zoned R-1 (Single
344 Family Residential). Katie said the applicant subsequently is requested to make another
345 application, typically one month later, to rezone to whatever it is he/she intends to do. Katie
346 noted the city's ordinances allow, per the applicant, to state a different one up front, and she said
347 she believes this has occurred twice in the last couple years. Katie cited the Rockwood
348 annexation as an example of being zoned Business after it had entered the city being zoned Light
349 Industrial, and she noted the applicant had not had to go through the second round of rezoning.
350 Katie said the neighbors had been notified because a different property as part of that included a
351 rezoning, and she noted that is not the instance in this case. Katie said the Plan Commission
352 does not have to accept the R-4 zoning if its members are uncomfortable with doing so, noting it
353 can be zoned R-1 and the applicant then may be asked to apply for R-4 zoning at the next
354 available opportunity, which is Wednesday, July 31. The public would be notified via the
355 rezoning.

356
357 Katie said, "Bear in mind, depending on when the development moves forward, if it's in this
358 year they could attempt to do a Conditional Use Permit. That would have a public hearing to
359 have two structures on a single parcel. Granted, we know the restrictions that are tied to a
360 Conditional Use Permit that it's very difficult for the city to deny it, and to listen to the feedback
361 of the public, as different from a rezoning application. There is also the potential for a Planned
362 Unit Development if they either meet the five acres via working with the city on the development
363 agreement, or if we change our ordinance to reduce that number, there is a public hearing
364 associated with a General Development Plan at that time. Those are the different applications
365 that may or may not come forward as tied into here. That is something the Plan Commission
366 could change; it would be amending Condition No. 5 from Multifamily and instead going to
367 Single Family Residential, which is what we do typically do."

368
369 Paul said he is aware the Plan Commission has the authority to do what is proposed here and
370 reiterated he is uncomfortable with it, stating, "It's a big leap for me."

371
372 Ald. T. Smith said he understands Paul's point of view and his desire for consistency, and he also
373 asked if the parcel could be something different than R-4.

374
375 Katie said the applicant could apply for a rezoning application, "and depending upon the public
376 feedback, the Plan Commission and the [Common] Council may not approve it. That is
377 definitely a possibility. It doesn't guarantee it. What this does is if you approve it that it comes
378 in as R-4, it just is R-4 and there is no neighbor notification required as part of the annexation
379 petition process."

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

10

380
381 Jan asked if there are other multifamily dwellings in that area, noting a majority of the homes
382 located to the east are single-family dwellings.

383
384 Katie told Jan there are single-family dwellings on 3rd Avenue North and Red Cedar Court,
385 which are located directly east of the Aquatic Center. Katie also noted there are multifamily
386 dwellings, twindos, and single-family houses to the south and close to Stuhr Court.

387
388 City Administrator Rindfleisch said, “If we look at this as a pre-annexation agreement without
389 the assurances of what their plan is, why would they come into the city at all? They’re being
390 open about what the plans are here. We have a diagram. They’re interested in being in the city.
391 They’re announcing to the public what their intention is. If we accept the annexation, it’s in the
392 city. We’d have to detach it later on. For you as a Plan Commission to then say, ‘Maybe we’ll
393 accept it, [and] maybe we won’t accept it,’ I’m not sure why they would come in the first place.
394 There are multifamily [dwellings] in the area and they are in the town, so it’s an opportunity for
395 us to decide long-term how you want this development to occur. As Plan Commissioners, do we
396 wish to accept the annexation? We’re doing a project down here [Great River Residences] of
397 just over 100 units ... At this point [there are] potentially 134 units coming in [with this project].
398 All the stories of what benefit the City of Onalaska may gain from the 103 units we have on the
399 waterfront is probably the same argument I have for 134 units on Highway 35 as well. I would
400 much rather see this development occur within the city than in the Town [of Onalaska].”

401
402 Paul asked if the Town of Onalaska is in a position to provide utilities to the proposed
403 development.

404
405 City Administrator Rindfleisch said that while it is not, he told Paul there are other forms of
406 multifamily that it could provide. City Administrator Rindfleisch said it would have to be less
407 dense, and that he is certain they need the density to offset the costs for the park fees and
408 infrastructure costs.

409
410 Steven said it is his understanding the developer still could proceed with the development if the
411 Plan Commission does not approve the annexation application – it just would not be located in
412 the City of Onalaska.

413
414 City Administrator Rindfleisch said, “My policy recommendation generally is if there is an
415 annexation request – and we have 10 conditions here that really establish the pre-annexation
416 agreement, if you will – we know what the intent to be at this point in time. If they don’t
417 purchase it, someone else may purchase it or not annex it or develop it. We don’t know. It’s the
418 bird in the hand of what we’re aware of versus the two that perhaps we don’t.”

419
420 Paul said the Plan Commission does not know if there would be public input either in support of
421 or in opposition to this project. Paul referred to the minutes of the July 9 Plan Commission

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

11

422 Subcommittee meeting and said he remembers reading about a person who resides to the north of
423 this property who had expressed some concerns about the project. Paul said that while he is
424 uncertain how this citizen had found out about the project as there was no public notice, “perhaps
425 there is some concern over it. I realize that city property surrounds this. It’s a little bit of a
426 unique situation, but that doesn’t mean that the public shouldn’t have a right to have input.”
427

428 Katie said, “If they wanted to do any sort of development outside of what their current zoning is
429 if they didn’t annex, they would have to rezone in [La Crosse] County, and that would require a
430 public hearing if they didn’t come into the city for that. The reason that Ms. Schuppel [Margo
431 Schuppel, the citizen whose letter Katie read into the record at the July 9 Plan Commission
432 Subcommittee meeting] was aware of it is because the developer took it upon themselves to
433 contact neighbors and show them the plans to let them know it was their intention. It was not a
434 formal public hearing notification. I don’t know if the residents were aware they could make
435 comments to the city regarding it. I think it was just more of the fact that it was this is what
436 they’re intending on doing and the city is considering an annexation. The developer did that on
437 their own regard. City staff have talked with the neighbor to the north to try to answer some of
438 her questions in addition to after that letter did come in.”
439

440 Paul asked about the extraterritorial rights the city would have in a case such as this.
441

442 Katie told Paul the last time a project moved forward on this particular property the developer
443 was seeking to construct mini-storage warehousing. Katie said city staff was notified because
444 the city was within 250 feet of the proposed development, attended the public hearing and stated
445 the city did not support that type of project. Katie said, “We were involved in their rezoning
446 request.”
447

448 City Administrator Rindfleisch said, “We don’t have any say. We can’t reject it outright.”
449

450 Katie noted the City of Onalaska was only an interested party at that time as a neighboring
451 property owner.
452

453 Paul said, “My original opinion stands that I’m uncomfortable with doing this. And that’s not
454 even to say I wouldn’t vote for rezoning at some point, but I’m uncomfortable with the way it’s
455 happening.”
456

457 City Administrator Rindfleisch asked Jarrod if the property being referred to is in the City of
458 Onalaska or the Town of Onalaska.
459

460 Jarrod said the residential neighboring property to the north is located in the Town of Onalaska.
461 Jarrod also said, “There is actually some of the city-owned lands, and there are a couple of
462 residential houses just to the south of those, in the township.”
463

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

12

464 Jan referred to the minutes from the July 9 Plan Commission Subcommittee meeting and
465 inquired about a family who had expressed concern, stating she did not understand the cause of
466 their concern.

467
468 Katie referred to the letter from Margo Schuppel she had read into the record at the July 9 Plan
469 Commission Subcommittee meeting, and she told Jan both she and Jarrod had spoken to Margo
470 separately and attempted to answer her questions. Katie told Jan both she and Jarrod had invited
471 Margo to attend this evening's meeting, but she was unable to due to an illness in the family.
472 Katie said Margo has raised questions regarding access and drainage, as well as a significant
473 amount of information that likely would come forward during the site plan review process. Katie
474 also referred to Condition No. 4 and said the information pertaining to this condition likely
475 would be prepared during the development agreement process. Katie added it is too soon to
476 answer some of Margo's questions at this time.

477
478 Ald. T. Smith noted Margo Schuppel had contacted him before sending her email, and he told
479 her he had encouraged her to come to City Hall, but she had instead sent the email. Ald. T.
480 Smith said, "She has concerns, but I think it's premature. ... There are some concerns, but she
481 definitely will have an opportunity to speak that."

482
483 Jan asked if the Plan Commission may approve the annexation, but the remainder of her question
484 was inaudible on the recording.

485
486 Ald. Wulf told Jan she may make an amendment either to change or remove Condition No. 5.

487
488 Katie said if that is the Plan Commission's intent, her recommendation is to amend it to state the
489 preferred zoning district instead of deleting it in its entirety. Condition No. 5 would read:
490 *"Annexed land to be placed in the Single Family (R-1) Zoning District upon ordinance*
491 *adoption."*

492
493 Ald. T. Smith said, "With that, then we would be going back to our regular process – to approve
494 it as an R-1. Then it would go through the zoning process."

495
496 Katie told Ald. T. Smith he is correct and said, "They would have an opportunity to do it as
497 quickly as possible. We have another application period next Wednesday [July 31] that they
498 would have an opportunity to petition to go to R-4, and it would be a one-month delay beyond
499 the annexation request." Katie also encouraged commission members to speak to the applicant,
500 who is attending this evening's meeting, and ask him his thoughts regarding changing the request
501 to R-1.

502
503 Ald. Wulf said, "I personally appreciate the developers talking to your neighbors. That's
504 something that the City of Onalaska has taken a stand for as long as I've been here the last 20
505 years almost, and I very much appreciate that you are talking and communicating, because you

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

13

506 flesh out a lot of the apprehension and the fear and the questions that people have. Thank you
507 for doing that.” Ald. Wulf then invited the developer to address the Plan Commission.

508

509 **Aaron Wessel**
510 **W4551 County Road B**
511 **West Salem**

512

513 **Ryan Wessel**
514 **Address inaudible on the recording**

515

516 Aaron explained that one of the reasons he and Ryan are seeking R-4 zoning is to save the one-
517 month period, and he said they wish to proceed with the project “as quickly as possible.” Aaron
518 said an R-1 zoning would delay the project.

519

520 Ryan said he does not want his and Aaron’s project to compete with the Great River Residences,
521 noting Marvin Wanders of Three Sixty Real Estate Solutions has a larger budget than the two of
522 them do.

523

524 Ald. T. Smith asked Aaron and Ryan if their decision to begin construction also would be
525 dependent on the capital improvements timeline. Ald. T. Smith also noted the start of
526 construction might or might not occur in 2019, depending on if funding comes from the City of
527 Onalaska.

528

529 Jarrod said December is the earliest the Common Council will approve the Capital
530 Improvements Budget, noting there have been years the Council has not passed the CIB until
531 January.

532

533 Ald. T. Smith asked Aaron and Ryan if it is correct to assume the project will not proceed if the
534 CIB is not approved or they do not have a yes or a no.

535

536 Ryan said the project cannot proceed if that is the case.

537

538 Paul asked if the rezoning could be finalized in September if it goes through the normal
539 procedures.

540

541 Katie said, “It would be before the December meeting date.”

542

543 Paul said, “Well before the December meeting.”

544

545 Katie said, “It could be October or November, depending on it. But it would be before
546 December.”

547

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

14

548 Steven asked if the two actions would be the rezoning request and the Conditional Use Permit
549 request.

550

551 Katie said it goes back to which route the developers choose to take, noting they have different
552 options for development and stating it likely would occur subsequently. Katie added they would
553 need to have the zoning designation in place.

554

555 Ryan asked if they could pull the annexation petition if the R-4 zoning wasn't approved.

556

557 Katie told Ryan he may pull the annexation petition at any time.

558

559 Motion by Steven, second by Paul, to amend the previous motion and amend Condition No. 5 to
560 read as follows: "*Annexed land to be placed in the Single Family (R-1) Zoning District upon*
561 *ordinance adoption.*"

562

563 Ald. T. Smith said he feels better going in that direction because even though it will be an extra
564 step for the developers, they likely can rezone to R-4 in the timeline before they begin
565 construction.

566

567 Steven said he does not believe there will be an additional delay based upon the discussions
568 pertaining to the CIB.

569

570 Ald. T. Smith asked if the zoning from R-1 to R-4 is independent of the CIB at this time.

571

572 Katie told Ald. T. Smith he is correct and said, "If they did choose to suspend the readings to
573 speed up the process, which may or may not occur, it's possible the annexation could be
574 finalized before capital improvement is made. They might have to request to suspend their
575 annexation application until after or do something interesting, but we would work with that as
576 staff and make sure we're following all of our zoning ordinances, with advice from legal counsel
577 on that end."

578

579 Steven addressed Ryan and Aaron and told them, "This doesn't necessarily indicate an
580 opposition to the project. It's just getting a public input period that we're interested in, is what
581 I'm hearing. I can't speak for everyone else, but that's my understanding."

582

583 Ald. T. Smith told Ryan and Aaron, "We welcome you to come into Onalaska. That's great for
584 us, and that's great for you. We just have to make it work. It has to be a win-win for both
585 sides."

586

587 Vote on the amendment:

588

589 On voice vote, motion carried.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, July 23, 2019
15

590
591 Original motion restated:
592

593 To approve with the 10 stated conditions – including amendments to Condition Nos. 3 and 5 – an
594 annexation application for a La Crosse County Parcel (Located North of Onalaska Dog Park)
595 (4.01 acres total) filed by Ryan Wessel of Broham Investments LLC, 9542 Frontage Road E.
596 Highway 16, Onalaska, WI 54650 (Tax Parcel #10-1151-0).

597
598 On voice vote, motion carried.
599

600 **Item 6 – Review and Consideration of Invoice No: 018-021-14 from Hoisington Koegler**
601 **Group, inc. for Onalaska Unified Development Code (UDC)/Zoning Rewrite Project**

602
603 Katie said the 14th invoice for this project totals \$2,526.25.

604
605 Motion by Steven, second by Ald. T. Smith, to approve Invoice No: 018-021-14 from Hoisington
606 Koegler Group, inc. for Onalaska Unified Development Code (UDC)/Zoning Rewrite Project.

607
608 On voice vote, motion carried.
609

610 **Item 7 – Discussion related to Onalaska Unified Development Code (UDC)/Zoning Rewrite**
611 **Project ~ Discussion about regulations for Accessory Structures**

612
613 Katie noted Plan Commission members had raised additional questions at the June 25 meeting
614 pertaining to accessory structures, and she also noted commission members’ packets include
615 highlights of a few items, including:

- 616
- 617 • A principal use structure has to be established prior to allowing an accessory structure.
 - 618 • Detached accessory structures shall not exceed 15 feet in height, nor shall they occupy
619 more than 25 percent of the rear yard.
- 620

621 Katie told commission members she had done additional research based on the municipalities
622 and maximum accessory structures in rear yards, with the research staff had performed in 2017.
623 Katie said a majority of them had their residential accessory structures, from yard sheds varying
624 from 10 feet of a maximum height up to 20 feet. Katie noted the commission also had discussed
625 four detached structures in non-residential districts and said it currently is 20 feet in overall
626 height. Katie asked if perhaps this height could be raised, noting the building code does not have
627 that particular rule. Katie noted the City of Onalaska does not specify a maximum overall square
628 footage of detached accessory structures; rather, the 25-percent value is applied overall to each
629 residential lot. Katie said she is seeking direction on the three points (maximum lot coverage,
630 height of accessory structures for residential properties, height of accessory structure for
631 commercial properties).

Reviewed 7/26/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

16

632

633 Ald. Wulf asked if the rear yard percentage was 20 percent prior to being changed.

634

635 Katie said it was 20 percent.

636

637 Ald. Wulf noted it was increased to 25 percent.

638

639 Katie said yes, and she also noted Commercial increased from 15 feet to 20 feet. Residential
640 accessory structures remained at 15 feet.

641

642 Steven asked if the city has encountered any unforeseen consequences due to the rear yard
643 percentage being increased to 25 percent.

644

645 Katie said citizens are happy they are allowed to construct a larger detached accessory structure
646 because they have more use of their land.

647

648 Steven asked, "But no unintended consequences that we see?"

649

650 Katie said, "Not in the last two years."

651

652 Ald. T. Smith asked Steven if he wishes to leave the rear yard percentage at 25 percent.

653

654 Steven said, "I think so. If it isn't broken I don't know what we're trying to fix."

655

656 Ald. T. Smith asked if there has been negative feedback.

657

658 Katie said no and told Ald. T. Smith, "The only situation is if you reduce it, city staff would have
659 to go back and look at the permits issued in the last two years. If anyone went above the 20
660 percent [and] if you brought it back down, they would have to be notified [and told] they
661 couldn't do anything additional if they hit the 25 percent. If they were, they would be considered
662 legal nonconforming status. And if in the future they removed anything, they couldn't go back
663 up to 25 [percent]. They would be re-limited at 20 percent. That's the main output of going
664 backwards to 20 percent. That would be the main change that we would see."

665

666 Steven noted the discussions pertaining to this topic "were very in-depth" and said the Plan
667 Commission had decided to approve the 25 percent. Steven said, "I don't know what has
668 changed that we would want to go back on it."

669

670 Katie told Steven the Plan Commission had selected to keep the rear yard percentage at 20
671 percent and noted the Common Council voted to increase it to 25 percent.

672

673 Ald. Wulf, who was not serving on the Common Council at the time, said she remembers this

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

17

674 topic as being contentious, noting the Plan Commission had voted to keep the rear yard
675 percentage at 20 percent; the Common Council sent the matter back to the Plan Commission,
676 which then again voted to keep the rear yard percentage at 20 percent; and then the Common
677 Council voted to override the Plan Commission's decision and increased the percentage to 25
678 percent. Ald. Wulf said that while she understands there have not been any problems associated
679 with the increase the last two years, "I didn't think there was anything wrong with it at the time,
680 either."

681
682 Steven referred to the table showing maximum accessory structures in rear yards for
683 municipalities around the state and noted the percentages range from five percent to 35 percent.
684

685 Katie noted the percentages shown on the table are the same as last time and said some of them
686 have greater allotments in terms of percentages, while some of them also have caps. Katie cited
687 the City of La Crosse as an example, noting one may have 35 percent of his/her rear yard or
688 1,000 square feet, whichever is less. Katie noted the City of Onalaska does not have a maximum
689 cap.

690
691 Paul said he does not "have a great issue" either with 20 percent or 25 percent.
692

693 Ald. T. Smith and Jan both stated they do not want to go back to 20 percent.
694

695 Katie asked how many commission members wish to keep the rear yard percentage at 25 percent.
696

697 Ald. T. Smith, Steven, Jan, and Paul all raised their hands.
698

699 Katie asked how many commission members wish to reduce the rear yard percentage to 20
700 percent.
701

702 Ald. Wulf raised her hand.
703

704 Katie asked for feedback regarding the maximum roof height of 15 feet for residential accessory
705 structures, noting that citizens consistently ask the Inspection Department if they may increase
706 the overall height to accommodate the objects they own. Katie also commission members
707 citizens have argued if they have an attached garage, it may be as tall as the residential structure,
708 meaning they would be allowed another 20 feet. Someone who owns a detached structure would
709 not be allowed to do this. Katie noted researched performed by city staff showed 10 to 20 feet is
710 the average of residential detached accessory structures.
711

712 Jan asked how this is being measured.
713

714 Katie told Jan the code notes it is from the average grade of the foundation to the peak of the
715 roof.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

18

716

717 Ald. Wulf asked if a homeowner should be allowed to have a structure that is possibly 20 feet
718 tall where he/she may store his/her items, or if the city should keep 15 feet, which means
719 homeowners' yards will be littered with objects. Ald. Wulf said, "It's weighing that balance for
720 property maintenance."

721

722 Steven said there is the assumption homeowners will clean their yards if they construct a larger
723 structure.

724

725 Paul asked if the city allows two-story accessory structures.

726

727 Katie said a detached accessory structure may only be 15 feet in height.

728

729 Paul said if someone wants to architecturally match his/her house and they have a taller roof
730 pitch, it is possible a typical two-car garage could exceed 15 feet at the peak. Paul said, "You're
731 not allowing bigger buildings by going from 15 to 20 [feet]. You might just allow a little more
732 design flexibility."

733

734 Ald. T. Smith inquired about the citizens who request to exceed the 15-foot maximum.

735

736 Katie told Ald. T. Smith it is one of the most common questions asked by the public and said this
737 is the time to make a change if the Plan Commission chooses to do so.

738

739 Ald. T. Smith asked what city staff recommends.

740

741 Katie told Ald. T. Smith city staff recommends somewhere between 15 and 20 feet and said this
742 is very similar to the accessory dwelling maximum coverage in that staff has declined requests
743 from many citizens for many years. Katie said, "Now saying 'yes' is good for anyone coming
744 forward or anyone who re-asks, but we don't necessarily have a way of notifying everyone
745 we've said 'no' to over the years." Katie said that while there could be public hearing notices,
746 and citizens could find out about the change by reading it in the paper, "On a case-by-case basis,
747 that we wouldn't be able to do."

748

749 Paul asked what complications would be caused for staff if the Plan Commission states 20 feet
750 will be allowed, but in no case may an accessory structure be taller than the primary structure.

751

752 Katie said staff would be required to do some additional thinking when permits are issued, and
753 she asked if it is common for a house to be less than 20 feet tall.

754

755 Paul said he believes there are older houses, including the Raymond homes, that have shallow
756 roof slopes and are less than 20 feet tall.

757

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

19

758 Ald. Wulf asked if a 20-foot structure would be out of character.

759

760 Paul said it would not be aesthetically pleasing if the accessory structure were taller than the
761 house.

762

763 Katie said, “The only caveat I would add is they still get the 15 feet. They basically get an extra
764 five-foot allowance with that as long as it doesn’t exceed it, because then we’re being more
765 restrictive than we are today.”

766

767 Paul said, “Allow 15 feet in any case, but up to 20 feet as long as the primary structure was at
768 least 20 feet tall.”

769

770 Jan asked if someone could get two stories in 20 feet on a low-pitch or a flat roof.

771

772 Paul said it is his understanding the code does not allow a two-story accessory structure.

773

774 Katie told Jan it is only the overall height and said, “It’s not that it can’t be two stories. Right
775 now, 15 feet is your maximum height.”

776

777 Paul said it is conceivable a structure could be two stories.

778

779 Katie said, “We don’t not allow two stories. We just have a maximum height.”

780

781 Katie asked commission members who support the proposal to raise their hands.

782

783 Ald. Wulf, Ald. T. Smith, Steven, Jan, and Paul raised their hands.

784

785 Katie next addressed the maximum roof height of 20 feet for commercial accessory structures,
786 noting she had not had the opportunity to perform an in-depth examination of how other
787 communities address these types of structures. Katie said the commercial height was increased
788 because commercial properties tend to have larger pieces of equipment and thus require taller
789 garage doors. Katie told commission members an individual had requested a 24-foot high
790 structure because he had purchased a piece of equipment and then had to go down to 20 feet,
791 which she said caused “intriguing” construction issues. Katie noted the previous maximum was
792 15 feet and said the building code allows for greater than 50 feet. Katie said it is the city’s rule
793 that is holding commercial structures at 20 feet, and she asked commission members if they see a
794 need to increase the current 20-foot maximum height.

795

796 Steven asked Katie if she has received several requests to increase the commercial height from
797 20 feet.

798

799 Katie said, “Not nearly to the extent of residential. Again, people typically tried to get around

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

20

800 that rule of height by requesting a Conditional Use Permit to have two principal structures on a
801 single parcel. They would get around that rule by going that direction, and that we did see fairly
802 common. That rule will not be in effect any longer. They won't have that opportunity because
803 we'll likely be taking that Conditional Use Permit option out of the new code. They will have to
804 stay at 20 feet, and there likely wouldn't be a variance opportunity available to them for that."

805
806 Ald. Wulf inquired about a possible downside associated with increasing the height.

807
808 Katie said it could be the look of a pole structure, and she said the reason a 15-foot maximum
809 was established for residential structures is because the city did not want large pole structures to
810 occur. Katie said it is something that could be considered and stated, "Some people need that for
811 their equipment. It depends on the business."

812
813 Steven said, "Since this is the Commercial district, this goes straight to the development and
814 growth of the city as well. I don't know that I'm convinced yet that 20 feet is overly restrictive if
815 you're not receiving a lot of requests to exceed that. But if it is restrictive for growth of business
816 in a Commercial area, then maybe it is something we should consider."

817
818 City Administrator Rindfleisch told Steven this traditionally has not been an issue as people will
819 obtain CUPs to create two principal structures. City Administrator Rindfleisch said a past
820 definition of a principal structure having water and sewer might have eliminated some instances
821 in the past. However, City Administrator Rindfleisch also said going forward the city is
822 eliminating the CUP that allow multiple principal structures on the property. City Administrator
823 Rindfleisch said it could become an issue, and if so, "how flexible is the Plan Commission to
824 review this in the future immediately after having a full rewrite done?" City Administrator
825 Rindfleisch said Commercial zoning includes other types of properties than retail, such as
826 construction companies that have taller equipment. City Administrator Rindfleisch said he is
827 attempting to identify something that would need more than 20 feet, but has come up with
828 nothing.

829
830 Katie noted this is non-residential and not just Commercial zoning, and it would include
831 Industrial.

832
833 City Administrator Rindfleisch inquired about the height of the city's salt sheds.

834
835 Jarrod said they are taller than 20 feet.

836
837 City Administrator Rindfleisch asked if there are other similar type businesses that could need
838 structures such as parking spans for equipment.

839
840 Jarrod said it is typical to see a Commercial Industrial use if someone is attempting to fit heavy
841 equipment, telling commission members there will be a 14- to 16-foot tall door. Jarrod said it

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

21

842 would be necessary to have a flat roof with a 20-foot height, and he said it would be “very tight”
843 with a joist system. Jarrod noted the city’s salt shed has a 16-foot tall door, an 18-foot tall wall,
844 and a 4-to-1 roof, and he estimated the five-year-old structure to be approximately 30 feet in
845 height.

846
847 Paul said he finds 20 feet to be “really restrictive” if Industrial zoning is being discussed.

848
849 Steven and Ald. T. Smith suggested increasing the height to 30 feet, and Steven asked if it would
850 be possible for city staff to research what surrounding areas do.

851
852 Katie said she intends to proceed with this direction and not have another agenda item as the
853 Plan Commission will be discussing different topics at its August 27 meeting. Katie said, “When
854 they do propose the language I can note and give you at least an average at that time and you can
855 pick whatever number you feel comfortable with.” Katie said she is able to do additional
856 research.

857
858 **Item 8 – Discussion related to Onalaska Unified Development Code (UDC)/Zoning Rewrite**
859 **Project ~ Discussion about regulations for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)**

860
861 Katie noted that at its June 25 meeting, the Plan Commission had two to three pages of
862 guidelines related to accessory dwelling units that are located on the same lot as a primary home
863 and have their own entrance, kitchen, living area, and bathroom. Katie said ADUs are only
864 allowed in the Traditional Neighborhood Development District, which no longer will exist in the
865 new code. That district stated ADUs had to be, in addition to the number of dwelling units under
866 that section, no more than 10 percent of the total number of single-family attached and detached
867 units. In mixed residential areas, parking had to be on site, with one parking space for each
868 secondary dwelling unit. Guidelines for garages had to be placed within the principal structure
869 or an accessory structure, provided the second dwelling unit not exceed 800 square feet. Katie
870 said staff had listed potential standards that, based off the feedback received June 25, is what
871 staff is proposing. The standards include:

- 872
- 873 • The ADU must be a detached structure.
 - 874 • ADUs must meet all the required setbacks for detached accessory structures. The 25
875 percent would include this in the overall total.
 - 876 • The minimum size is 300 square feet, and the maximum size is 800 square feet.
 - 877 • The owner-occupied for the primary structure would have to be there.
 - 878 • There would be one parking space for the ADU, and two for the primary home.
 - 879 • Outside entrances serving an ADU either would be on the side or in the rear of the
880 building.
 - 881 • Regarding a water/sewer connection, some communities require said connection to be
882 connected to the existing home, while others require it to come from the street. One
883 reason for the standard to come from the house may be to prevent the units from being

- 884 separated.
- 885 • Only one ADU may be created with an existing single-family dwelling per parcel in the
 - 886 R-1 and R-2 districts. There are no limits for the R-3 or R-4 districts.
 - 887 • The deed restriction limiting independent sale and restrictions to the size limitations and
 - 888 other requirements.

889

890 Jarrod addressed the water/sewer connection and said he believes the city would want the same

891 connection from the house as complications would arise if it is subdivided. Jarrod told

892 commission members there have been instances in which older duplexes have been converted

893 into zero lot line twindos, and there is one service. Jarrod said the city faces challenges if there

894 are two different owners and one does not pay his/her bill as there is one service to two different

895 owners, adding, “As long as it’s going to stay with the property and not be subdivided, it would

896 be fine with one.” Jarrod addressed the setback requirements being the same as for a detached

897 structure, and he asked if the side yard should be the same as the principal structure.

898

899 Steven said he would feel more comfortable if the water/sewer connection was to the existing

900 home.

901

902 Katie said she likes the suggestion of a detached ADU following the six-foot minimum side yard

903 setback for the privacy of both the resident and the neighbor.

904

905 Amanda addressed the height of a garage and asked if the garage is set back the same as the

906 primary structure if a second story were added.

907

908 Katie asked, “So if it was an existing garage and you raised it up, would this prevent you from

909 doing that? That would have to be an exception that would have to be built into it.”

910

911 Steven said, “I have no problem with that being restricted because it is the privacy issue with the

912 setbacks. If there is a preexisting structure that is closer than that and you put an occupant in

913 there, the neighbor could potentially have privacy concerns. I have no problem with the

914 restriction remaining in place with the prior existing structure.”

915

916 Katie asked commission members if they would be open to allowing the three-foot setback, or no

917 one could convert a garage unless the existing accessory structure met the six-foot setback.

918

919 Steven said, “I like the six-foot [setback] myself.”

920

921 Paul noted it still is a dwelling unit and said the six-foot setback will restrict some from being

922 converted.

923

924 Katie told commission members they will discuss two to three new topics at the August 27 Plan

925 Commission meeting, and she said there also will be a Special Plan meeting in August.

**Plan Commission
of the City of Onalaska**
Tuesday, July 23, 2019
23

926

927 **Adjournment**

928

929 Motion by Steven, second by Paul, to adjourn at 8:21 p.m.

930

931 On voice vote, motion carried.

932

933

934 Recorded by:

935

936 Kirk Bey