

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 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, September 24, 2019. It was noted that the meeting had been announced and a notice  
3 posted at City Hall.

4

5 Roll call was taken, with the following members present: Mayor Joe Chilsen, City Engineer  
6 Jarrod Holter, Jan Brock, Skip Temte, Craig Breitsprecher, Steven Nott

7

8 Also Present: City Administrator Eric Rindfleisch, City Clerk Cari Burmaster, City Attorney  
9 Amanda Jackson, Planning Technician Zach Peterson, Ald. Diane Wulf, Ald. Boondi Iyer

10

11 Excused Absence: Ald. Tom Smith

12

13 **Item 2 – Approval of minutes from previous meetings (August 27<sup>th</sup> & August 29<sup>th</sup>)**

14

15 Motion by Craig, second by Steven, to approve the minutes from the August 27 regular Plan  
16 Commission meeting and the August 29 Special Plan Commission meeting as printed and on file  
17 in the City Clerk’s Office.

18

19 On voice vote, motion carried.

20

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

22

23 Mayor Chilsen called for anyone wishing to provide public input.

24

25 **Matt Lewis**

26 **1985 Sandalwood Drive**

27 **Onalaska**

28

29 “I wanted to talk about the conversion of the R-160 zoning to the Planned Unit Development.  
30 I’m a little unclear on this, and I’m a little late to the party with the Comprehensive Plan, but it  
31 looks to me like the R-160 zoning is pretty unique in Onalaska. In fact, I think our neighborhood  
32 may be the only one that has it. And if I look at it correctly, it looks like it’s basically R-1  
33 zoning, but it allowed a smaller plot than the typical ‘R’ zoning, which I think was a 70-foot  
34 width versus a 60-foot [width]. And I think there is a different backyard setback as well. The  
35 thing I didn’t understand with the Planned Unit Development application is it doesn’t list  
36 conforming uses or conditional uses. I’m assuming the intent is that this is no longer an R1  
37 zoning in this neighborhood. If that’s the case – if that’s the way the Comprehensive Plan is  
38 moving, to move all the residential R-1s to a Planned Unit Development – wouldn’t it all occur  
39 at once? Or is it just our particular neighborhood that we’re going to do that with? That’s my  
40 question. My concern is if the intent is to allow a more dense residential occupancy in that  
41 neighborhood versus an R-1, then I’m going to register my objection to that at this point.”

42

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

2

43 **Ryan Root**  
44 **2011 Sandalwood Drive**  
45 **Onalaska**

46  
47 “I want to know if there was a little more to this. I don’t know all the zoning codes in Onalaska.  
48 Even though I do work at the County of La Crosse, I don’t work in the Zoning Department. [I  
49 want to know] if there was something more that’s spurring this on. Is there a developer who has  
50 come in, because I thought the timing on this was a little interesting that we have these car lots  
51 that are going in. Then, just within days we get this notice in the mail. I just was just curious if  
52 there was any more to this. Is there an actual developer who is coming in and looking at putting  
53 things on this property behind our neighborhood?”

54  
55 Mayor Chilsen told Ryan the Plan Commission is unable to answer his question as this is the  
56 Public Input portion of the meeting. However, Mayor Chilsen also assured Ryan the Plan  
57 Commission will answer his question when the item to which it pertains is addressed.

58  
59 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone else wishing to provide public input and closed that  
60 portion of the meeting.

61  
62 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

63  
64 **Item 4 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:00 P.M. (or immediately following Public Input)**  
65 **– Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit application filed by Chris McGuire of Kwik**  
66 **Trip, Inc., 1626 Oak Street, La Crosse, WI 54601 on behalf of KT Real Estate Holdings,**  
67 **LLC, PO Box 2107, La Crosse, WI 54601 to allow construction of a 2,000 square foot**  
68 **attached car wash at the property located at 2800 Abbey Road, Onalaska, WI 54650 (Tax**  
69 **Parcel #18-6423-0)**

70  
71 Zach said the applicant is requesting a CUP to construct a 2,000 square foot addition of a car  
72 wash facility located at 2800 Abbey Road in Onalaska. The proposed development is currently  
73 zoned as B-1, which is compatible and consistent with businesses surrounding the development.  
74 The applicant states that the Kwik Trip location will be well-lit and staffed 24 hours a day, seven  
75 days a week. Zach said the washing of vehicles on a parcel in the Neighborhood Business (B-1)  
76 District is permitted only by CUP per Section 13-5-17(e), and pursuant to standards set forth in  
77 Sections 13-8-11. While the city has no basis for denial of the CUP, it has found a basis to  
78 impose the following conditions:

79  
80 1. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City  
81 prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied  
82 and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

83 **Substantial Evidence:** This condition provides notice to the owner/developer that they  
84 are to follow procedure for orderly development in the City of Onalaska in order to

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

3

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

109 Zach noted a public hearing will be held this evening and said only where no reasonable  
110 conditions could exist to allow the Conditional Use, may a CUP be denied.

111  
112 Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the  
113 Conditional Use Permit application.

114  
115 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the Conditional Use  
116 Permit application and closed that portion of the public hearing.  
117

118 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the Conditional  
119 Use Permit application and closed the public hearing.  
120

121 Motion by Craig, second by Skip, to approve with the four stated conditions a Conditional Use  
122 Permit application filed by Chris McGuire of Kwik Trip, Inc., 1626 Oak Street, La Crosse, WI  
123 54601 on behalf of KT Real Estate Holdings, LLC, PO Box 2107, La Crosse, WI 54601 to allow  
124 construction of a 2,000 square foot attached car wash at the property located at 2800 Abbey  
125 Road, Onalaska, WI 54650 (Tax Parcel #18-6423-0).  
126

127 On voice vote, motion carried.  
Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson

128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168

**Item 5 – Public Hearing: Approximately 7:10 P.M. (or immediately following previous hearing at 7:00 P.M.) – Consideration of a General Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application filed by the City of Onalaska, 415 Main Street, Onalaska, WI 54650 to replace the R-160 Zoning District for the “Country Air Estates Subdivision” containing 57 (fifty-seven) lots for single-family dwellings**

1. Owners shall abide by all requirements and conditions of the County Air Estates Preliminary Plat and Final Plat approved by the Common Council on April 12, 1988 and June 14, 1988, respectively.
2. Any future improvement to these parcels will be subject to additional City permits (i.e., site plan approvals, building permits, zoning approvals). Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City prior to obtaining a building permit. Owner/developer must have all conditions satisfied and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
3. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs, successors and assigns. The sale or transfer of all or any portion of the property does not relieve the original developer from payment of any fees imposed or from meeting any other conditions.
4. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in minutes shall not release the property owner/developer from abiding by the City’s Unified Development Code requirements.

Amanda said the City of Onalaska is in the process of rewriting the Unified Development Ordinance/Zoning Ordinance. As part of this project, the city is reviewing all its zoning districts and making modifications, as needed. Amanda said all properties within the Country Air Estates Subdivision are currently zoned R-160, as approved in 1988. As part of the project, the city intends to eliminate the R-160 Zoning District as it only pertains to this one neighborhood and instead create a Planned Unit Development Overlay District that has the same special property development regulations as the subdivision currently has, but will be regulated by the city in a different way. Amanda said the PUD will ensure that the way residents in this subdivision have utilized their properties will continue in the future.

The special property development regulations for parcels within this area include:

- A minimum lot width of 60 feet
- A minimum lot area of 6,300 square feet
- A minimum building width of the principal structure to be 20 feet
- A maximum building of 35 feet

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

5

- 169       • A street yard minimum of 25 feet; a street yard maximum of 40 feet; and a street yard  
170       maximum of 60 feet on a cul-de-sac. Street yard may be averaged between two abutting  
171       property street yard setbacks as determined by the Inspection Department.  
172       • A rear yard minimum of 25 feet  
173       • A side yard minimum of 6 feet  
174

175 Amanda said the city is requesting approval of the General Development Plan for the PUD,  
176 which has four conditions of approval. Amanda also noted a public hearing will be held this  
177 evening.  
178

179 Mayor Chilsen opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the  
180 General Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development application.  
181

182 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the General  
183 Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development application and closed that portion of the  
184 public hearing.  
185

186 Mayor Chilsen called for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the General Development  
187 Plan for a Planned Unit Development application.  
188

189 **Patrick O'Rourke**  
190 **1964 Esther Drive**  
191 **Onalaska**  
192

193 "Most of the folks here, we're from the neighborhood. We just don't understand. What's the  
194 harm of leaving it in the current R-160 [zoning]?"  
195

196 Amanda said, "Essentially, the city is looking for uniformity within its zoning districts. You are  
197 unique in the sense that you exist and you're the only zoning district that exists with these  
198 standards. Rather than have an R-160, we're looking at rezoning you R-1, which would be the  
199 appropriate zoning district. But then, to keep your slightly changed standards as far as setbacks  
200 and not create nonconforming uses, we're giving you those setbacks in the form of a PUD as  
201 opposed to your own zoning district."  
202

203 Patrick asked, "Was there anything that came up that prompted this?"  
204

205 Amanda said, "Just the rewriting of the Zoning Code."  
206

207 Patrick asked, "So there isn't any planned development or anything going on?"  
208

209 Amanda said, "No. We're reviewing all zoning districts across the city."  
210

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

6

211 Mayor Chilsen said, “At this time we’re rewriting all the zoning codes. We’re just cleaning them  
212 up.”

213

214 Craig said, “There are no secret goings-on here.”

215

216 Patrick told the commission there had been rumors as to what was happening.

217

218 Mayor Chilsen told Patrick, “There’s nothing nefarious going on here. We’re just cleaning up all  
219 the zoning codes.”

220

221 Amanda told Patrick additional rezonings are forthcoming and said, “You are the cleanest  
222 because you are an entire neighborhood. We thought we would do this one first because it’s all  
223 in one neighborhood as opposed to the other ones that will be more speckled throughout the  
224 city.”

225

226 Steven told Patrick, “You’re still zoned Residential. Ultimately, it’s just cleaning up the codes to  
227 where there’s not as much confusion. It’s clearing up [the codes] to where somebody from the  
228 outside can look at it and should be able to understand it.”

229

230 Patrick asked, “The zone you want to change it to, is it used elsewhere now?”

231

232 Amanda said yes and told Patrick it is one of the most common zoning districts.

233

234 **Matt Lewis**

235 **1985 Sandalwood Drive**

236 **Onalaska**

237

238 Matt thanked the Plan Commission for allowing residents to ask questions and said, “The one  
239 thing I see missing in the Planned Unit Development is in the R-160 [District] right now, it lists  
240 permitted uses: Single Family Dwelling, Community Living Arrangements, and Family Daycare  
241 Homes. That’s not listed with the information in the Planned Unit Development that was  
242 provided with the agenda, and on the website. Is that different? Is that not different?”

243

244 Amanda said, “The uses in every zoning district are being rewritten as part of the Zoning Code.  
245 I can tell you what the R-1 uses are that exist today. They should be relatively similar, but I  
246 don’t have the answer as to what they’re going to look like six months from now.”

247

248 Matt said, “To me, that’s the big question. If this goes to a Planned Unit Development, then  
249 basically any occupancy will be allowed as long as it goes through an approval process?”

250

251 Amanda said, “No. It would be any occupancy allowed in the Residential Zoning District. This  
252 is still zoned Residential, so your uses are going to be limited to single-family uses.”

Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

7

253

254 Matt asked, “Which residential district, because there’s R-1, R-2.”

255

256 Amanda said R-1.

257

258 Matt said, “It doesn’t say that anywhere in here.”

259

260 Mayor Chilsen assured Matt a smelting plant will not be constructed next to his house.

261

262 Matt noted the R-1 and R-160 districts are unique in those permitted uses, and he said, “If R-160  
263 is no longer ... If those aren’t going to be the permitted uses, if there’s going to be higher  
264 density, that is what it is. I guess I’d just like to know that, that’s all.”

265

266 **Joe Depoole**

267 **1917 Esther Drive**

268 **Onalaska**

269

270 “Basically what you’re saying is it’s going to stay Residential, but in R-1 there’s not going to be  
271 a limit to what people can have in their houses as far as people staying?”

272

273 Amanda said, “The difference between you guys and R-1 are just those things I read off – the  
274 setbacks, essentially. We’re moving you to R-1, and we’re creating a way for you to keep your  
275 setbacks. The reason we’re doing that is because if we don’t do that, you’re all considered  
276 nonconforming uses. If you wanted to remodel your house, you would have to come into  
277 conformance with the R-1 setbacks, which would be impossible. We kind of created a problem  
278 back in 1988 where it’s something that worked in 1988 that maybe doesn’t work in the Zoning  
279 Code today. This is the best way we can fix it and keep you with your same standards.”

280

281 Joe asked, “If we do make changes to our houses, it will be the R-1 [zoning] at that point instead  
282 of ...? It’s all based upon what you said with the setbacks.”

283

284 Amanda said, “It would be the same R-160 setbacks. That’s why we’re creating the PUD.”

285

286 Joe asked if the R-1 District currently exists in the City of Onalaska.

287

288 Amanda said yes.

289

290 Joe asked if the majority of the city is zoned R-1.

291

292 Joe was told it is.

293

294 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the General

Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

8

295 Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development application and closed the public hearing.

296

297 Motion by Craig, second by Steven, to approve with the four stated conditions a General  
298 Development Plan for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application filed by the City of  
299 Onalaska, 415 Main Street, Onalaska, WI 54650 to replace the R-160 Zoning District for the  
300 “Country Air Estates Subdivision” containing 57 (fifty-seven) lots for single-family dwellings.

301

302 Jarrod noted staff members from both the Engineering Department and the Planning Department  
303 have been working with the City Attorney on rewriting the Zoning Code, and he said, “This is  
304 just the first of many different changes that are going to come in. As Attorney Jackson said, the  
305 changes tonight are to clean up one particular area that made the most sense because it’s not  
306 spread out throughout the city. This will still give you the same latitude you have with your  
307 current zoning, but you’ll be zoned R-1, which I would guess probably 20 percent of the city is  
308 zoned R-1. That is the most prominent single-family zoning district for your type of housing  
309 stock that you see in your neighborhoods. I just wanted to throw that out there as a vote of  
310 confidence for what we’re doing here from a staff level.”

311

312 Jan addressed Condition No. 2 and asked if the permits would be the same as any resident in any  
313 zoning district would have to have.

314

315 Amanda said yes.

316

317 Jan noted she had not been able to locate 1957 Esther Drive on her map and asked if it is a lot  
318 without a number.

319

320 Jarrod said he believes there is a typographical error on the map, noting a lot is present, but no  
321 address is shown.

322

323 Craig told the residents, “You’re not losing anything. The PUD status protects what you  
324 currently have in place. But the R-1 designation just brings the overall development in line with  
325 other single-family residential areas within the city. It just makes everything uniform and clean.  
326 But the PUD protects everything that you have now.”

327

328 On voice vote, motion carried.

329

330 **Item 6 – Discussion regarding proposed changes to the new Sign Ordinance in the**  
331 **Onalaska Code of Ordinances**

332

333 Zach presented the following summary of proposed changes to the new Sign Ordinance:

334

- 335 • Sign Permit (permanent and temporary) applications and insurance requirements  
336 provided to the Planning Department (in lieu of or in addition to Inspection Department).

Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

9

- 337 • If signs are installed inappropriately, the city will charge an administrative processing fee  
338 of \$100 to the property owner/applicant.
- 339 • Signs not requiring permits include:
  - 340 ○ Banners on utility poles (allow private properties to install double-sided  
341 banners on private utilities provided they are less than 10 square feet overall).
  - 342 ○ Removed content-based regulations for what can be shown on an onsite  
343 directional sign. Allow directional signs to be up to 15 square feet overall,  
344 maximum height of 6 feet, maximum of 2 sign faces, and a minimum of 20  
345 feet from another freestanding sign.
  - 346 ○ Removed duplicative language regarding the city’s ability to remove  
347 temporary signage in the boulevard.
- 348 • Removed references to Chapter 7: Mobility Standards for vision triangle requirements as  
349 the chapter will no longer exist post UDC Rewrite Project. Instead refer to Unified  
350 Development Code.
- 351 • Removed language allowing painting curbs/right-of-way as regulated elsewhere in Code  
352 of Ordinances.
- 353 • Sign Structure Area: Only count the square footage of the sign, no longer counting base  
354 as overall usable square footage. This was a change from the 2018 Sign Ordinance  
355 rewrite and it caused issues for new signage. Staff recommendation to return to previous  
356 regulation.
- 357 • Removed reference for a Conditional Use Permit for static billboards and digital  
358 billboards as the conditions we would have suggested are maintained through required  
359 standards for any new billboard moving forward. All setbacks remain unchanged.
- 360 • Removed requirement for Conditional Use Permit for roof signs.
- 361 • Updated Zoning District names to complement new Zoning District names in the UDC  
362 Rewrite Project. Added the new districts, removed the proposed removal districts as  
363 needed for new Zoning Ordinance.
- 364 • Added a new section called “Special Exceptions” to read as follows: “*Special exceptions*  
365 *to these sign regulations may be granted by the Plan Commission, with appeals of a Plan*  
366 *Commission determination made to the Common Council.*”

367  
368 Craig complimented the proposed changes, then referred to the second bullet point under “Signs  
369 Not Requiring Permits” and said he believes a maximum of two sign faces should instead read  
370 two signs. Craig noted two sign faces may be mounted back-to-back, while two signs may  
371 designate something such as an exit and an entrance. Craig said this is more logical if one  
372 utilizes directional signs.

373  
374 Skip noted everything has two sides to it.

375  
376 Craig told Skip that is not necessarily the case.

377

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

10

378 Amanda told Craig she will research his question and said she believes the proposed rule is  
379 intended to capture the arrow that might be a two-sided sign pointing someone to a drive-through  
380 entrance or exit or a sign that says 'entrance' on both sides. Amanda said she believes the intent  
381 was two sign faces, but she reiterated she will examine that.

382  
383 Craig noted the faces are mounted back-to-back.

384  
385 Amanda told Craig he is correct.

386  
387 Craig asked, "What if you have two accesses? We've run into this several times with some of  
388 the new developments. I don't know what Dahl's situation is, but they may have the same thing.  
389 I know we ran into this out at Kenworth, where all of a sudden they could not put ... and trying  
390 to get semis maneuvered around is problematic. If they have two accesses, one may be an exit  
391 and one may be an entrance?"

392  
393 Amanda told Craig this does not limit the number of signs; rather, it limits the number of sign  
394 faces on one sign.

395  
396 City Administrator Rindfleisch noted the bullet point is which signs do not require permits, and  
397 he said, "We're eliminating the content based on what is on the sign for a directional sign. ... It's  
398 not restricting the number of signs on a lot. It's simply saying this particular sign has these  
399 particular standards."

400  
401 Craig said he misunderstood that as it was unclear to him, and he suggested perhaps editing the  
402 rule so that it is clearer.

403  
404 Amanda noted this is a general discussion on the proposed changes and said an ordinance will be  
405 forthcoming.

406  
407 Skip noted the CUP requirement for a roof sign is being removed and asked if the roof sign still  
408 must be within the height of the building.

409  
410 Amanda told Skip there still would be standards for roof signs and said the need for the CUP is  
411 being eliminated.

412  
413 Skip asked if a sign may be placed on top of a structure with a maximum height of 35 feet.

414  
415 Steven said the city's ordinances will have permitted uses with standards, as opposed to  
416 conditional uses, and he noted there still will be standards to the signs.

417  
418 Craig addressed Ald. Wulf, who chairs the Board of Zoning Appeals, and noted this moves any  
419 variances out of the realm of BOZA. Craig said he sees this as being positive as it allows more

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

11

420 of a broader cross section of opinions, and also perhaps more latitude the Plan Commission is  
421 able to bring. Craig noted BOZA is tied to the five criteria for evaluation purposes.

422

423 Steven said, “We don’t want that conditional use piece because by having that in there, it means  
424 they can pretty much do it.”

425

426 Amanda noted the city limits the allowable sign height for roofs under the Roof Sign Section. A  
427 roof sign may not exceed 15 feet in height above the parapet line, or higher than 30 feet above  
428 the mean grade of the center line of the street.

429

430 **Item 7 – Review and Consideration of the new Sign Ordinance in the Onalaska Code of**  
431 **Ordinances pertaining to Special Exceptions Requests**

432

433 Zach said that as the Sign Ordinance will no longer be part of the Zoning Ordinance/Unified  
434 Development Code, exceptions/allowances to the ordinance will not be reviewed by the Board of  
435 Zoning Appeals. Rather, Special Exceptions to the Sign Ordinance will be reviewed and may be  
436 granted by the Plan Commission, with appeals of Plan Commission determinations made by the  
437 Common Council. Zach noted commission members’ packets include copies of a “Request for  
438 Special Exception Application.” This application specifies what is to be considered for granting  
439 Special Exceptions. Zach said he is seeking a recommendation of approval from the Plan  
440 Commission to the Common Council.

441

442 Amanda said, “Because it’s no longer going to be in the Zoning Code, that did open it up for a  
443 different review mechanism. Katie [Planning Manager Katie Aspenson] and I did look at  
444 different alternatives that other cities do. We felt this kind of gave us the same latitude that we  
445 previously had, and then we incorporated that into that information we thought would be  
446 appropriate for you to review. It does require that it not create an unnecessary burden, so there  
447 are different criteria to consider with that. That’s what those questions walk through.”

448

449 Motion by Craig, second by Steven, to recommend to the Common Council approval of the new  
450 Sign Ordinance in the Onalaska Code of Ordinances pertaining to Special Exceptions Requests.

451

452 Craig said he believes the application is “fairly comprehensive, but not unduly so.” Craig also  
453 said he believes it provides all the information that staff needs to bring to the Plan Commission  
454 so that its members may make an intelligent decision.

455

456 On voice vote, motion carried.

457

458 **Item 8 – Review and Consideration of Invoice No. 018-021-16 from Hoisington Koegler**  
459 **Group inc. for UDC/Zoning Rewrite Project**

460

461 Amanda noted commission members’ packets include copies of the 16<sup>th</sup> invoice for the  
Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

12

462 UDC/Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Project. The invoice totals \$12,826.02. The original contract  
463 amount is \$90,000, and \$89,999.25 has been billed to date.

464

465 Motion by Steven, second by Skip, to approve Invoice No. 018-021-16 from Hoisington Koegler  
466 Group inc. for UDC/Zoning Rewrite Project in the amount of \$12,826.02.

467

468 Skip noted the original contract is for \$90,000, and also that there is nothing in the agenda item  
469 stating the Plan Commission has any authority over the \$90,000.

470

471 Amanda stated for clarification a payment of \$12,826.02 would bring the billed to date amount  
472 to \$89,999.25.

473

474 On voice vote, motion carried.

475

476 **Item 9 – Discussion related to Onalaska Unified Development Code (UDC)/Zoning Rewrite**  
477 **Project ~ Discussion about regulations for:**

478

479 A. Home Occupations

480

481 Steven referred to Item No. 3 under “Minor Home Occupations,” which reads, “*The home*  
482 *occupation shall not have outside employees. The home occupation shall not have more than*  
483 *one customer at a time, and no customer shall be allowed between the hours of 8 p.m. and 8*  
484 *a.m.*” Steven said based upon the input given at the August 27 Plan Commission meeting, he  
485 asked if perhaps this item should be changed to read, “*The home occupation shall not have*  
486 *outside employees that work on the premises.*” Steven noted the Plan Commission had discussed  
487 circumstances in which employees work for someone via an internet connection in other  
488 municipalities, and he asked, “Are we really concerned about that? Or is it that we don’t want  
489 them as full-time employees inside that house?”

490

491 Amanda referred to the “Major Home Occupations” section and noted the employees are referred  
492 to as onsite employees. Amanda said a change could be made under “Minor Home Occupations”  
493 so that the item reads, “*The home occupation shall not have onsite outside employees.*” Amanda  
494 said, “The idea of outside means you’re not related.”

495

496 Craig said the Plan Commission must keep in mind that “these are things that are developing.”  
497 Craig also noted items may be modified if the Plan Commission sees they are not working as  
498 intended. Craig told Steven he agrees with his point and said, “I believe we should do that.”

499

500 Jan addressed Item No. 1 under “Minor Home Occupations,” which reads, “*The home*  
501 *occupation is conducted entirely within the enclosed portion of the residence and does not*  
502 *exceed 25 percent of the area of any floor,*” and she asked if a home occupation could occupy 25  
503 percent of every floor in a three-story structure.

Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

13

504

505 Amanda told Jan, “No, one floor.”

506

507 Jan noted Item No. 1 states “of any floor.”

508

509 Amanda said, “But not total floor. [It’s] not cumulative.”

510

511 Steven asked if perhaps Item No. 1 could be clarified and said he understands how it might cause  
512 confusion.

513

514 City Administrator Rindfleisch said, “It’s of any one floor. You only get one floor, and no more  
515 than one floor can be more than the percentage.”

516

517 Amanda said Item No. 1 can be clarified.

518

519 B. Landscaping, Screening, Fencing, & Tree Preservation

520

521 Amanda noted commission members’ packets include copies of a memorandum from Jeff Miller  
522 and Rita Trapp of HKGi regarding proposed landscaping standards.

523

524 Steven addressed Paragraph I under “Landscaping,” which reads as follows:

525

526 *The minimum size of plantings shall be as follows:*

527 a. *Canopy trees – 2.5-inch caliper*

528 b. *Ornamental trees – 1.5-inch caliper*

529 c. *Evergreen trees – 6-foot height*

530 d. *Deciduous or evergreen shrub – 5-gallon pot*

531

532 Steven asked for a definition of a caliper.

533

534 Jarrod said it is trunk diameter.

535

536 Craig asked Amanda, “This is a general rule: Under a specific PUD, for lack of a better term, this  
537 can be altered, correct?”

538

539 Amanda said, “If you did a PUD, yes.”

540

541 Skip asked if a permit is required if he wishes to plant a tree in the boulevard, which is city  
542 property.

543

544 Jarrod told Skip, “Correct. Technically, you’re not allowed to plant anything in the city  
545 boulevard. Our Conditions of Approval do have, as part of some of the plats that come in, it says

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

14

546 you have to plant two boulevard trees when you [construct] the house. That would be part of the  
547 landscaping plan submitted with the home building permit.”

548

549 Skip asked if he needs permission from the city to expand his home sprinkler system into the  
550 boulevard.

551

552 Jarrod said there is a permit for such activity.

553

554 Jan addressed Item C under “Landscaping,” which reads, “*Landscape plans shall be prepared by*  
555 *a registered landscape architect for Planned Unit Developments or development where there is*  
556 *greater than one acre of site disturbance.*” Jan asked if all landscapers are registered landscape  
557 architects.

558

559 Jarrod told Jan some of the larger landscaping firms typically have registered landscape  
560 architects, and he said this rule has been included because the city wants to have a professional  
561 plan for developments that are greater than one acre. Jarrod suggested perhaps adding the  
562 verbiage, “*Other professional, as approved by the city.*”

563

564 C. Personal/Mini-Storage Facilities

565

566 Amanda noted she had distributed to commission members a document listing proposed new use  
567 specific standards. Amanda said staff is considering whether or not to establish a minimum  
568 acreage requirement for mini-storage. Amanda also noted that under the new Zoning Code,  
569 mini-storage facilities would only be permitted in the Industrial Zoning District. What is before  
570 the Plan Commission this evening would be the necessary standards.

571

572 Steven what the purpose would be for the minimum acreage.

573

574 Amanda said it would be to ensure that it is a well-designed site, and she told commission  
575 members there are instances in which individuals attempt to fill space. Thus, the mini-storage is  
576 a secondary use and there is leftover acreage. Amanda said mini-storage facilities are being  
577 constructed on properties for which they were not intended. Amanda said, “It’s a standard that’s  
578 out there, so we’re putting it forth to you to see if there is any interest.”

579

580 Jarrod said he believes it leads to orderly development, and he told commission members staff is  
581 seeing irregular-shaped lots. There also are instances in which someone is not utilizing the back  
582 of a structure and wishes to put in mini-storage for extra income. Jarrod said, “Typically, it’s not  
583 been the primary purpose of the parcel.”

584

585 Craig said, “Or people using existing lots that aren’t anywhere near this just to store things for  
586 other people. That really diminishes the quality of the neighborhood.”

587

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

15

588 Amanda asked Plan Commission members if they would be interested in minimum acreage.

589

590 Steven asked in which zones mini-storage would be allowed.

591

592 Amanda said Industrial.

593

594 Steven said he would think the acreage requirement would be determined by the market demand,  
595 and he asked if one acre is random. Steven said, "Maybe I could have an Industrial zoned plot of  
596 land with half an acre and I could make a reasonable profit off of that."

597

598 Craig asked why the city would not include B-1 zones, and he said, "I can almost understand not  
599 dumping a storage facility in the middle of a single-family residential area. That makes sense to  
600 me because of all the ins and outs and other goings-on. But I think allowing that in any  
601 Business, Commercial, Industrial-type zone might leave things open for development purposes."

602

603 Steven said Industrial zoning would have permitted uses in it and noted, "This would actually be  
604 changing the Commercial." Steven added this might not be a good fit for Commercial zoning.

605

606 Craig noted it already is established as a permitted use in Industrial zones, and he said, "To do  
607 anything different would be to change what currently exists. I guess I'm not anxious to do that,  
608 either."

609

610 Steven asked, "If it's only in Industrial, is there really a need for a one-acre ... Any designs they  
611 have, Jarrod, wouldn't they have to go through the city?"

612

613 Jarrod said it would be necessary for a developer to obtain a Site Plan Permit, and the developer  
614 would be required to show there is adequate drainage and facilitation of access and traffic.

615 Jarrod said, "They do get reviewed."

616

617 Steven said, "I'm not sold on the one-acre, especially if it's in Industrial."

618

619 Jan referred to both Item b, which reads in part, "*Individual storage units shall be used for dead  
620 storage only,*" and Item c, which reads, "*Storage of flammable, hazardous or perishable  
621 materials and keeping of animals is prohibited.*" Jan asked for a definition of "dead storage."

622

623 City Administrator Rindfleisch said dead storage is keeping of materials that do not need to be  
624 insulated, heated, lit, or dried. City Administrator Rindfleisch said it is not a question of if  
625 something is alive or dead; rather, dead storage is not expected to be maintained at a particular  
626 temperature or quality. City Administrator Rindfleisch also described dead storage as something  
627 that is not meant to be accessed on a regular basis.

628

629 D. Parking Facilities

Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

16

630  
631 Amanda said parking facilities will not be a use standard, but rather parking standards, and she  
632 told commission members the standards still are being developed.

633  
634 E. Animal Boarding/Day Care Facilities

635  
636 Amanda noted this is a popular use that has been seen in the city, and she said it was not  
637 previously addressed in the Zoning Code. The standards that have been brought forward for the  
638 Plan Commission include hours of operation, odor mitigation, and distance from residential  
639 property lines.

640  
641 Skip asked if the Coulee Region Humane Society is in compliance with the items on the handout  
642 Plan Commission members received, and he said he believes they should be tailored to what the  
643 CRHS is doing.

644  
645 Amanda told Skip she believes the CRHS would be in compliance with all the items, and she  
646 said the CRHS likely did not need an odor mitigation plan as it would not have been a  
647 requirement when they were created. Amanda said that while she believes the CRHS would be  
648 in compliance, it could be verified.

649  
650 Jan addressed Item b, which reads, "*All outdoor areas for animals shall be enclosed with a*  
651 *fence,*" and she noted children who reach in to pet dogs or cats could be bitten.

652  
653 Amanda asked Jan if she is seeking more direction regarding the type of fence.

654  
655 Jan said, "Maybe."

656  
657 Craig asked Jan if she is suggesting that the hole sizes in any fencing be reduced.

658  
659 Jan told Craig there are instances when children attempt to stick their fingers through a chain-  
660 link fence to touch animals."

661  
662 Craig noted that a finger is not very big.

663  
664 Jan told Craig she worries about safety concerns for small children.

665  
666 Craig said he believes it becomes very difficult for the city to police every situation, every  
667 individual, and every eventuality. Craig said, "I think all we can do is just take standard care,  
668 and fencing does that. What's done beyond that, I hate to start getting into too much of that."

669  
670 Skip said he believes there is not enough personal responsibility in society today, and he stated  
671 he believes children should be taught not to stick their fingers through a fence to touch animals

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

17

672 they do not know about. Skip added, “We can’t prevent everything. Otherwise you’re going to  
673 have a Draconian society.”

674

675 Steven said he believes the standards are applying to ensure that animal boarding, shelter, or  
676 daycare center facility is not allowing animals to interfere off property with others, and not  
677 necessarily to ensure they are addressing every possibility for people who are trespassing.

678

679 City Administrator Rindfleisch asked if the city in the Zoning Code rewrite is restricting the  
680 zones in which an animal boarding, shelter or daycare may operate.

681

682 Amanda said there will be specific zones in which they may operate.

683

684 City Administrator Rindfleisch addressed both Item e, which reads, “*All outdoor designated*  
685 *areas shall be located a minimum of 125 feet from a residential property line,*” and Item f, which  
686 reads, “*An indoor facility must be located at a minimum of 50 feet from a residential property*  
687 *line.*” City Administrator Rindfleisch said parts of a home and a property could be 200 feet  
688 away, but it might not be logical if the line is 125 feet from the outdoor area. City Administrator  
689 Rindfleisch also said it might be an issue if animal boarding, shelters or daycares are only  
690 allowed in certain areas that are not Residential zoning. City Administrator Rindfleisch noted  
691 there is a facility located on South Kinney Coulee Road that has an outdoor area adjacent to the  
692 property line. However, the residence is located 300 feet up.

693

694 Steven asked City Administrator Rindfleisch if he is suggesting that an outdoor facility be  
695 located a minimum of 125 feet from the property line or the structure, whichever is greater.

696

697 City Administrator Rindfleisch said he wanted to pose the question and noted there are three  
698 establishments in the city that would need to be monitored. City Administrator Rindfleisch said  
699 the establishment to which he had referred potentially could be in violation, as could Pet Me  
700 Scratch Me. City Administrator Rindfleisch said, “That would be my one concern. I’d look at  
701 rewriting to make sure it is the distance from where people would be habituating. That’s the  
702 issue – not where the property line is the issue.”

703

704 **Adjournment**

705

706 Motion by Craig, second by Skip, to adjourn.

707

708 On voice vote, motion carried.

709

710

711 Recorded by:

712

713 Kirk Bey

Reviewed 9/30/19 by Zach Peterson