

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

1

1 The Meeting of the Plan Commission of the City of Onalaska was called to order at 7:08 p.m. on  
2 Tuesday, October 26, 2021. 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 (either in person or remotely): Mayor  
6 Kim Smith, Ald. Tom Smith, City Engineer Jarrod Holter, Jan Brock, Skip Temte, Craig  
7 Breitsprecher, Gargi Chaudhuri.

8  
9 Also Present: Planning Manager Katie Aspenson, Deputy City Clerk Stacy Wilk, City Attorney  
10 Amanda Jackson, Planning Associate Erin Duffer, Ald. Diane Wulf.

11  
12 **Item 2 – Consideration and action on minutes from the previous meeting**

13  
14 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to approve the minutes from the previous meeting as  
15 printed and on file in the City Clerk’s Office.

16  
17 On voice vote, motion carried.

18  
19 **Item 3 – Public Input (limited to 3 minutes per individual)**

20  
21 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to provide public input and closed that  
22 portion of the meeting.

23  
24 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

25  
26 **Item 4 – Public Hearing for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application to remove three**  
27 **(3) antennas and replace with six (6) antennas and six (6) remote radio units (RRUs) on the**  
28 **existing telecommunications tower located at 2520 Midwest Drive, Onalaska, WI 54650,**  
29 **Tax Parcel #18-3568-43, formerly 384 Theater Road. Tax Parcel #18-3570-70. Applicants:**  
30 **SBA Communication Corporation, T-Mobile and Chase 2010, LLC.**

- 31  
32 1. Owner/developer shall pay all fees and have all plans reviewed and approved by the City  
33 prior to obtaining applicable building permits. Owner/developer must have all conditions  
34 satisfied and improvements installed per approved plans prior to issuance of occupancy  
35 permits.  
36  
37 2. Applicant to perform necessary modifications indicated in the structural analysis packet  
38 provided to ensure public safety.  
39  
40 3. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,  
41 successors and assigns so long as the conditional use is being actively used.  
42

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

2

- 43           4. Owner/developer shall abide by the City’s Ordinances, Unified Development Code and  
44           Building Code requirements, as amended.  
45  
46           5. The Conditional Use Permit shall be reviewed every five (5) years to ensure continued  
47           use.  
48

49 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the  
50 Conditional Use Permit application.

51  
52 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in favor of the Conditional Use  
53 Permit application and closed that portion of the public hearing.  
54

55 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the Conditional  
56 Use Permit application and closed the public hearing.  
57

58 Katie told commission members this CUP request is related to an existing telecommunications  
59 structure that is 120 feet in height. All of the antennas and Tower Mounted Amplifiers are  
60 currently held within a stealth concealment canister. T-Mobile is proposing to remove the stealth  
61 concealment canister and replace with six antennae and six Remote Radio Unites (RRUs) that  
62 would be traditionally mounted directly on the pole, thus making the equipment visible. The  
63 proposed equipment cannot fit inside the stealth concealment canister, and T-Mobile is  
64 proposing to replace the canister traditional monopole section. The proposed design will not  
65 result in changes to the tower height or increased size of the overall compound. The applicant  
66 states that adding the additional equipment is necessary to meet increased demand and will  
67 improve the range and quality of service for the area served by the tower.  
68

69 Katie noted the applicant had provided a Structural Analysis Report that shows the existing  
70 canister would be inadequate to safely support both the existing and the proposed equipment.  
71 The applicant has provided modifications, including replacement of the concealment section with  
72 a new monopole section, going from 84 feet in height (where all the material is) to 120 feet.  
73 Both the anchor and the base plate also will be reinforced.  
74

75 Katie noted telecommunication structures and towers are permitted only by Conditional Use  
76 Permit per the Principal Uses Table 13.02.22-1, and pursuant to standards set forth in Sections  
77 13.02.68.T. & 13.05.22. Katie said that while the city has no basis for denial of the CUP, it has  
78 found a basis to 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  
85 promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.  
86
- 87 2. Applicant to perform necessary modifications indicated in the structural analysis packet  
88 provided to ensure public safety. **Substantial Evidence:** This condition acknowledges  
89 the documentation provided by the applicant that the tower in its current capacity cannot  
90 manage the proposed modifications without completing required modifications to the  
91 tower. In order to allow the proposed project to move forward, the applicant shall  
92 complete the required modifications noted in the structural analysis packet.  
93
- 94 3. All conditions run with the land and are binding upon the original developer and all heirs,  
95 successors and assigns so long as the conditional use is being actively used. **Substantial**  
96 **Evidence:** This condition acknowledges and provides public notice of the term and  
97 puts the owner/developer and future owners on notice that they are bound by the  
98 conditions and that they can continue the use as long as they follow the conditions and  
99 actively use the conditional use.  
100
- 101 4. Owner/developer shall abide by the City's Ordinances, Unified Development Code and  
102 Building Code requirements, as amended. **Substantial Evidence:** This condition assures  
103 that the owner/developer understands they must follow the City's Unified Development  
104 Code and Building Code, which they are required to follow in every way and that as they  
105 are receiving the benefit of being allowed to have a use that is not within the standards of  
106 the City's zoning code, failure to follow City ordinances may result in loss of their  
107 conditional use permit.  
108
- 109 5. The Conditional Use Permit shall be reviewed every five (5) years to ensure continued  
110 use. **Substantial Evidence:** This shifts the burden to the owner of the property to  
111 provide proof that the use is active and continuing. Ensuring that existing permits are still  
112 valid and being properly used ensures compliance with the City's procedures and  
113 ordinances and promotes interaction and communication with the City which further  
114 orderly development and the health, safety and welfare of the City.  
115

116 Katie noted the public hearing already had been held and said only where no reasonable  
117 conditions could exist to allow the Conditional Use, may a Conditional Use Permit be denied.  
118

119 Motion by Craig, second by Skip, to approve with the five stated conditions a Conditional Use  
120 Permit (CUP) application to remove three (3) antennas and replace with six (6) antennas and six  
121 (6) remote radio units (RRUs) on the existing telecommunications tower located at 2520  
122 Midwest Drive, Onalaska, WI 54650. Tax Parcel #18-3568-43, formerly 384 Theater Road. Tax  
123 Parcel #18-3570-70. Applicants: SBA Communication Corporation, T-Mobile and Chase 2010,  
124 LLC.  
125

126 On voice vote, motion carried.

127

128 **Item 5 – Public Hearing for a rezoning application to rezone a parcel of land from**  
129 **Community Business District (B-2) to Mixed Use Neighborhood District (MU-N) to**  
130 **facilitate a redevelopment project to convert the mixed-use structure to an apartment**  
131 **dwelling located at 544 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North, Onalaska, WI 54650. Tax Parcel #18-668-0.**  
132 **Applicant: Tom Coleman, CT Real Estate Investments, LLC.**

133

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

135

136 2. Any future improvements to this property will be subject to additional City permits (Site  
137 Plan, Building Permits, etc.).

138

139 3. As per UDC Section 13.02.54.F. & 13.02.51.C., common open space shall comprise a  
140 minimum of twenty-five (25%) of the gross land area for the development as it only  
141 contains residential uses (currently 35.6% in place today).

142

143 4. As per UDC Section 13.03.51, buffer/screening shall be provided along side and rear  
144 parcel boundaries of mixed-use districts abutting residential uses with a minimum buffer  
145 width of ten (10) feet. The buffer area must contain either a solid wall/ commercial-grade  
146 fence (six to eight (6'-8') feet in height), or a hedge with year-round foliage.

147

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

151

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

156

157 7. Any omissions of any conditions not listed in committee minutes shall not release the  
158 property owner/developer from abiding by the City's Unified Development Code  
159 requirements.

160

161 Mayor K. Smith opened the public hearing and called for anyone wishing to speak in favor of a  
162 rezoning application to rezone a parcel of land from Community Business District (B-2) to  
163 Mixed Use Neighborhood District (MU-N).

164

165 **Tom Coleman**  
166 **W5864 State Road 33**  
167 **La Crosse**

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

5

168  
169 “I’m here representing CT Real Estate Investments, and just to field any questions that you have  
170 once Katie goes through the list of changes that we’re looking for.”

171  
172 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone else wishing to speak in favor of a rezoning  
173 application to rezone a parcel of land from Community Business District (B-2) to Mixed Use  
174 Neighborhood District (MU-N) and closed that portion of the public hearing.

175  
176 Mayor K. Smith called three times for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to a rezoning  
177 application to rezone a parcel of land from Community Business District (B-2) to Mixed Use  
178 Neighborhood District (MU-N) and closed the public hearing.

179  
180 Katie told commission members the application before them is a piece of property within the  
181 city’s Downtown Mixed-Use District within its Future Land Use Plan. This plan is intended to  
182 have pedestrian-focused development with a mix of uses, including commercial, residential,  
183 personal service, institutional, and civic. There currently is a mixed-use structure on the site that  
184 is a combination of multifamily dwellings and commercial/retail space. The applicant is  
185 requesting to convert the structure to a multifamily apartment building. Apartment buildings are  
186 not a permitted use in the city’s B-2 District, which it currently is zoned. The property will need  
187 to be rezoned accordingly in order to accommodate the applicant’s request, which is to rezone to  
188 MU-N. The applicant would remodel the remaining commercial space into multifamily  
189 residential units. There currently are eight apartments in this structure, and the applicant wishes  
190 to add two to three apartments, depending on how the development continues.

191  
192 Katie said that with the proposed redevelopment project, the applicant will be required to adhere  
193 to UDC requirements pertaining to the MU-N District, including providing a minimum of 1.25  
194 parking stalls per dwelling unit, new buffering/screening along property lines that directly abut  
195 residences, and a minimum of 25 percent green space on the property. Currently, the parking  
196 requirement and the minimum green space requirements have been met. Katie said that as the  
197 owner intends to spend less than 50 percent of the structure’s assessed value to accommodate  
198 this project, the owner will not be required to adhere to the MU-N District design standards.  
199 Katie noted there are seven conditions of approval tied to this development.

200  
201 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to approve with the seven stated conditions a  
202 rezoning application to rezone a parcel of land from Community Business District (B-2) to  
203 Mixed Use Neighborhood District (MU-N) to facilitate a redevelopment project to convert the  
204 mixed-use structure to an apartment dwelling located at 544 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North, Onalaska, WI  
205 54650. Tax Parcel #18-668-0. Applicant: Tom Coleman, CT Real Estate Investments, LLC.

206  
207 Craig inquired about the current assessed value of the structure.

208  
209 Tom Coleman estimated the value to be between \$350,000 and \$400,000.

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

6

210

211 Katie said, “The most recent improvements assessment is \$306,000.”

212

213 Craig inquired about the anticipated expenses for the project.

214

215 Tom told Craig this is the first step in the process and said it will be minimal. Tom said he must  
216 speak to Lead Building Inspector Brad Neumeister about sprinklers, and he told Craig that  
217 potentially could be a substantial portion of the project. Tom estimated that expenses – including  
218 rewiring, plumbing, and sheetrock – will be between \$30,000 and \$40,000.

219

220 Craig asked, “This will have a sprinkler system?”

221

222 Tom reiterated he must discuss the sprinkler system with Brad Neumeister and told Craig he is  
223 fairly certain a 13D system likely will be the minimum that will be required.

224

225 Ald. T. Smith asked Tom if the project will add a couple more units to the current structure.

226

227 Tom said yes.

228

229 Ald. T. Smith asked if any nearby residents have raised concerns.

230

231 Katie told Ald. T. Smith that individuals who reside within 250 feet of the structure had received  
232 letters, and she noted staff had not received any feedback. Katie noted the district will go from  
233 being zoned B-2 to an MU-N zoning district, and she said, “The overall number of any future  
234 commercial uses are substantially less than what they could do today. In terms of zoning, it’s a  
235 down-zone and it’s a reduction of uses. But it’s what needs to be done in order to allow [Tom]  
236 to have an apartment building.”

237

238 Mayor K. Smith asked Katie how many neighbors had been notified.

239

240 Katie said all neighbors within 250 feet had been notified.

241

242 Gargi inquired about the difference between Mixed Use-Neighborhood versus medium density,  
243 also asking if all the multifamily residences are in mixed use or other types of residential zoning.

244

245 Katie explained that city staff had considered examining other multifamily districts, noting the  
246 R-3 District only allows up to eight units. Katie noted an R-3 zoning designation would not be  
247 appropriate in this instance as there already are eight units in the structure. Katie further  
248 explained the R-4 District had additional standards that would not be able to be met. Katie said,  
249 “This is a meeting of the best of both worlds where we’re still allowing them the potential for  
250 future small-scale commercial if it ever needed to convert back. We’re not taking that away  
251 from the applicant in terms of a future use. Apartment building are outright permitted in both the

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

7

252 Mixed Use-Community and Mixed Use-Neighborhood [districts]. But when we were looking at  
253 the different zoning districts, this seemed to be the most palatable in terms of what would be best  
254 for the neighborhood, and also allow the developer to achieve their goal.”

255

256 On voice vote, motion carried.

257

258 **Item 6 – 2022 Plan Commission meeting schedule**

259

260 Katie noted the November and December meetings will be held the third Tuesday of both  
261 months rather than the fourth Tuesday so as not to conflict with Thanksgiving and Christmas,  
262 respectively.

263

264 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. T. Smith, to approve the 2022 Plan Commission meeting  
265 schedule.

266

267 On voice vote, motion carried.

268

269 **Item 7 – Discussion related to downtown parking requirements**

270

271 Katie noted the Masonic Temple, located on the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Main Street, is  
272 for sale, and she told commission members several parties have expressed interest in the  
273 property. Katie said one of the most significant questions that had been asked regarding a  
274 potential inhibitor of development relates to parking, and she told commission members, “The  
275 way the city has operated in our downtown area is if you have a single use, like a restaurant, and  
276 you replace it with a new restaurant, we don’t make you come into conformance with parking.  
277 However, if you have a restaurant and you want to change that to retail, you’ve changed the use  
278 [and] you’ve essentially changed the pattern of how parking may work in that area, [so] we  
279 require parking. This is new more so toward the approval of the Unified Development Code. In  
280 the means to create an informal parking survey, Erin Duffer, our Planning Associate, has put  
281 together this document for you this evening.”

282

283 Katie said Erin will discuss the map commission members had received showing the current on-  
284 street parking locations, and also where there either are formal or informal off-street parking  
285 locations, which could mean someone has an agreement with a neighbor to utilize a lot, or  
286 perhaps someone has parking stalls located behind a building. These locations on the map are  
287 gray and have a red box around them. Katie noted commission members also had received a  
288 table that shows the different downtown businesses; the best estimate of the number of private  
289 stalls businesses should have, per the UDC; the number of private off-street parking stalls; where  
290 employees park; and whether or not patrons park on the street.

291

292 Erin told commission members she had introduced herself to businessowners the week of  
293 October 17-23, discussed where their employees and patrons park, and asked for their

Reviewed 10/28/2021 by Katie Aspenson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

8

294 perceptions regarding downtown parking. Erin directed commission members' attention to the  
295 map they had received and estimated that approximately 50 percent of the individuals employed  
296 by the businesses that encompass the first two blocks of Main Street coming off 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue  
297 (State Trunk Highway 35) park in the residential neighborhoods surrounding those areas (this  
298 excludes the first block perpendicular to Main Street). This is due to not having parking spaces  
299 available on a businessowner's lot, and also not having agreements in place with other  
300 businesses. Erin said some of the numbers outline how many are in the private spots. Some  
301 include tenant units located above businesses, and some are part of agreements. Erin cited  
302 Unwine'd as an example of an establishment that has an informal parking spot next to its refuse  
303 containers. Erin also noted Mary Cody's Restaurant has an agreement with the landlord of the  
304 strip mall located along STH 35 to utilize one parking spot in the strip mall lot. Erin referred to  
305 the blue dots on the map and noted they represent public parking spaces that are open to anyone,  
306 with time limits.

307  
308 Erin told commission members several businessowners believe the public parking lot located  
309 next to the Great River Landing is underutilized as patrons are seeking parking spots for a period  
310 of time before locating one in a residential neighborhood and having to walk a further distance  
311 than if they had parked next to the Great River Landing. Erin said this could be due to the  
312 inability to see some of the storefronts. There also could be safety concerns crossing STH 35,  
313 perhaps some perceived longer walks to businesses, and also perhaps personal preferences. Erin  
314 said city staff can continue looking into the survey, examine what is being done regarding  
315 parking minimums and maximums in comparable communities, and/or survey the individuals in  
316 residential neighborhoods that surround the downtown district and determine their perceptions  
317 regarding parking.

318  
319 Ald. T. Smith asked if the city had ever considered conducting a study regarding the time of day  
320 parking occurs, noting that is where he sees congestion. Ald. T. Smith cited David Reay's as an  
321 example, noting that while patrons can secure parking spaces during quiet times, they must drive  
322 for an extended period of time before they can secure a parking space when the establishment is  
323 busy. Ald. T. Smith said, "I could see these are the valid parking spots, but I don't think it shows  
324 the whole picture of how crazy it can get when it's a busy time of day."

325  
326 Craig stated he agrees with Ald. T. Smith and said, "When I look at David Reay's, I'm sure their  
327 response is, 'no,' or, 'if needed.' Is that the owner's response?"

328  
329 Erin told Craig, "These are just business employees."

330  
331 Craig noted David Reay's utilizes a significant amount of on-street parking on a consistent basis,  
332 and he said, "That really should be, 'yes, as needed.' One of the concerns I have when I cross  
333 Main Street, whether it's on 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> [Avenue] often, one of the things I've noticed is there is a  
334 tremendous visibility issue at those corners. Trying to see oncoming traffic is very problematic  
335 as you're trying to cross Main Street, especially heading from south to north. I don't know if



**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

9

336 there's an answer for that, but it's very, very dangerous. I agree with your assessment [that] the  
337 parking that is provided over by the Great River Landing is normally terribly underutilized. I  
338 don't think you're going to change that because human nature is, 'How close can I get, and how  
339 little distance can I walk?' – especially in inclement weather.”

340  
341 Ald. T. Smith said he agrees that crossing STH 35 can be intimidating and stated he believes that  
342 has an impact on the underutilization of the parking lot located next to the Great River Landing.  
343

344 Jan asked if the Great River Residences' tenants utilize the parking lot located next to the Great  
345 River Landing, noting she has seen automobiles parked there late in the evening. Jan also asked  
346 if there is a two-hour parking limit on the street.  
347

348 Jarrod first addressed parking time limits, noting there is a two-hour limit covering most of the  
349 downtown area, with parking limited to one hour in some locations. Jarrod said enforcement  
350 also is a challenge, noting it is difficult to take a police officer off the street so that he or she can  
351 enforce parking. Jarrod said parking enforcement in the downtown district is complaint-based,  
352 and he told commission members the Police Department does an exceptional job of responding  
353 when they are contacted regarding parking issues.  
354

355 Jarrod next addressed pedestrians attempting to cross STH 35 at the signal light located at 2<sup>nd</sup>  
356 Avenue and Main Street, noting the signal light has been set at approximately 6 seconds of all  
357 red. This gives individuals who Jarrod described as having average mobility enough time to  
358 cross halfway, and he said motorists must yield to pedestrians who are in the crosswalk. Jarrod  
359 said the goal is to get pedestrians into the crosswalk and crossing so that motorists may see them,  
360 and he told commission members, “If we lock down the whole intersection for, let's say 15  
361 seconds, it ends up slowing things down drastically if you have a lot of people constantly hitting  
362 the button. We looked at Irvin Street and putting rapid-flashing beacons like you see in various  
363 spots around the city. But it's so close to the signal light that it really defeats the purpose of the  
364 signal light. It's causing too many things for a motorist to visualize and keep track of. We really  
365 want people crossing at the signal light.”  
366

367 Jarrod noted the city had invested in putting 27 new parking stalls along Irvin Street, and he said  
368 he had not been in that area on a Friday or a Saturday in some time to determine what the busy  
369 time would be. However, Jarrod also said, “I would say there's definitely parking on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
370 on the first two blocks in, on both sides of the first two blocks of Main Street. You usually don't  
371 see much overflow parking into 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. You'll see a lot of employees parking on 3<sup>rd</sup>  
372 Avenue south of Irvin, or on Irvin. There's a lot of staff from either David Reay's or Sue  
373 Kolve's that park in that area consistently. ... There's a variety of things. This issue isn't new. I  
374 remember we looked at budgeting for a downtown parking lot 25 years ago when I started. It's  
375 an evil that comes with people doing well. We want to see our businesses thrive, but it's a  
376 double-edged sword at the same time.”  
377

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

10

378 Jarrod next addressed crossing Main Street to go from the south side to the north side, stating he  
379 believes the visibility is good. Jarrod noted there are bump-outs present and said pedestrians  
380 who reach the edge of the pavement where the crosswalk is located are beyond the parked cars  
381 and have the ability to see both left and right. Jarrod acknowledged that pedestrians must cross  
382 two very wide lanes of traffic, and he estimated that pedestrians must travel approximately 32  
383 feet before reaching the other bump-out. Jarrod said he believes the east-west leg is worse than  
384 the north-south leg as motorists who are attempting to execute a turn are not looking for  
385 pedestrians. Jarrod said, "That is probably more problematic movement than actually crossing  
386 Main Street if people are making a turning movement and not paying attention. Any time you  
387 have a pedestrian area that is pedestrian-rich with people trying to make movements as a  
388 pedestrian and you have vehicles, you're going to have interaction and it's going to be difficult."

389

390 Craig stated he disagrees with Jarrod and said, "I drive that often enough in a sizeable SUV. I  
391 pull 10 feet out into that lane before I can clearly see far enough ..."

392

393 Jarrod told Craig he is talking as a vehicle and not a pedestrian.

394

395 Craig stated that is where concern lies and said, "From a pedestrian's point of view, I've  
396 walked that a number of times and I don't think there's an issue there. But vehicular traffic  
397 trying to cross Main Street, with the current parking situation, for me is problematic. You're into  
398 the congestion or you're contributing to the congestion by the time you know if it's safe to cross  
399 or not."

400

401 Jarrod cited the example of someone being on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, which is a collector street and has  
402 higher traffic volumes, and approaching Main Street, and he said motorists who adhere to the  
403 law must come to a full stop before the crosswalk at the stop sign before proceeding at a  
404 controlled pace until the motorist can visually see. Jarrod said the motorist will cover the  
405 crosswalk and wait for traffic to clear so he or she is able to see around the parked automobiles.

406

407 Craig noted a motorist already is into the lane of traffic before he or she stops, and he said he  
408 understands there is not much that can be done unless the city prohibits all parking along Main  
409 Street, which he described as being "ridiculous."

410

411 Amanda addressed parking enforcement at the parking lot located by the Great River Landing,  
412 noting there is no overnight parking allowed in that lot, and that the Police Department enforces  
413 this. Amanda told commission members that as a precursor to this survey, city staff had  
414 examined how late the businesses are open. Amanda noted that several businesses had stayed  
415 open later than they currently do prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, also noting the average  
416 closure time for David Reay's and Mary Cody's, even on weekends, is 8 p.m. to 9 p.m. Amanda  
417 said, "We're not looking at a lot of late-night, overnight type parking, [but] more so during the  
418 day parking."

419

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

11

420 When I look at the information that Erin presented, I think it's really helpful how she laid out ...  
421 What I see is not necessarily a parking problem, but quite frankly a UDC problem in that if you  
422 look at the number of stalls that these businesses should have per our UDC compared to the  
423 number of stalls that they have, in few situations do they align. These businesses that existed  
424 when we redid our UDC were grandfathered in under their use. But as downtown redeveloped  
425 and uses change and tenants and owners change, we're going to have to decide as a Plan  
426 Commission and a [Common] Council, what do we want? Are we going to enforce these  
427 parking requirements? And will that hinder development and growth in the downtown area? I  
428 would like to hear what people's thoughts are as far as that goes."

429  
430 Katie said, "When we were looking at the actual amount of what they should have via our UDC,  
431 four structures of everyone had less than 25 percent of the minimum parking. Three of them had  
432 between 25 to 50 percent, but seven of them had more than 50 percent – not quite 100. There's a  
433 question that comes into play of, do we want to treat our downtown parking district differently?  
434 Generally speaking, in other places within our community, people are able to either get shared  
435 parking agreements or they have enough space to have a lot. As Amanda stated, we're looking  
436 for feedback from the Plan Commission – is this something that you want staff to continue to  
437 look into; in particular, into next month? We can look at such things such as only requiring 25  
438 percent is what you have to give us. If you need 16 parking stalls, we'll only require four. Or  
439 maybe we look at, as Erin showed on here, how much parking is within your particular block  
440 that you could use as shared open parking for on-street parking? There are a number of  
441 communities that are moving towards this, some much larger than us. But then other  
442 communities that are more similar to us, like closer to Winona or Chaska, Minnesota, are doing  
443 parking credits or reduced parking in the downtown.

444  
445 Sometimes they're completely eliminating downtown parking, which I don't believe staff would  
446 be supportive of, especially if you have multifamily units within it. We want to make sure that if  
447 someone chooses to live downtown that they have a dedicated space. That's important to city  
448 staff, and that's something we would continue to look at. That's something that we might  
449 propose. Is there interest from the Plan Commission to continue to look forward into that? On  
450 the offhand chance that you were, because our Plan Commission is early in November  
451 [November 16], I did put out a notice for a public hearing to discuss this with a potential UDC.  
452 If you want us to continue to pursue, we will continue to act on that public hearing. If you're not  
453 interested, we can always cancel that public hearing. We're not trying to force the issue; we just  
454 wanted to be prepared. Normally our deadline is after the Plan Commission meeting; this month  
455 it was before."

456  
457 Craig said, "I don't know what the solution is. I'm worried about the safety factors. When  
458 vehicles can't see when they're crossing Main Street from side streets and they're trying to see  
459 when the next vehicle is coming, are they really watching for pedestrians? It gets to be kind of,  
460 where is your attention, and that concerns me. It's a safety thing. I don't think I see parking  
461 violations, [but] of course I don't really look for those. But what I'm after is, I want everybody

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

12

462 to be safe. Streets are primarily for vehicular traffic – first and foremost, that’s what they’re  
463 there for. I understand that you have to share those. I have a problem with people riding  
464 skateboards on the street, but that’s a different subject. But I think we need to make it safe for  
465 everybody. I hate the thought of eliminating a parking space at the corner to open up that  
466 visibility so the driver is crossing Main Street, and those first few blocks can actually take  
467 everything in appropriately. I don’t know; it’s just food for thought.”

468

469 Mayor K. Smith said she does not believe that was the point and stated, “I don’t think they’re  
470 proposing increasing the number of potential stalls on the streets. I think what their point is is  
471 that we have a Unified Development Code that outlines a certain amount of parking stalls. And  
472 in our downtown area, we already aren’t following our own UDC. They’re looking at trying to  
473 correct that or decide if we should correct or change it.”

474

475 Gargi said she would like to hear input from the businessowners and the residents who live near  
476 the downtown area regarding future growth and their need for parking. Gargi asked if perhaps  
477 there is a way to create a parking structure rather than on-street parking.

478

479 Mayor K. Smith noted there have been past discussions regarding that topic, and she said the  
480 partial solution has been to create additional parking in the Great River Landing area. Mayor K.  
481 Smith noted that while the city had added 37 downtown parking spots, she also pointed out those  
482 parking spots are on the west side of STH 35. Mayor K. Smith said, “It isn’t located specifically  
483 adjacent to the businesses that need the parking, or future businesses.”

484

485 Katie noted there are 36 parking spots in the lot adjacent to the Great River Landing, and another  
486 52 parking stalls in the lot located to the south. Katie said, “That alone in terms of public  
487 parking where generally anyone can go during those business hours, it’s almost another 90  
488 parking stalls that people can choose to use or not to use.”

489

490 Jarrod noted there are 27 parking stalls located along Irvin Street.

491

492 Katie noted the city had recently converted Irvin Street to a one-way street, and she said, “If you  
493 look at the actual amount of parking that we have available that isn’t included on here beyond ...  
494 There’s a lot of public parking available. It’s just, how do we tie what is available to what we’re  
495 requiring for off-street parking? Do you think that allowing a downtown business to not have to  
496 provide all of the parking is a good idea? Let’s just start there.”

497

498 Craig said, “It’s not a lack of parking, in my mind – it’s how it’s being used today. That could  
499 change in the future, but it’s just not being utilized the way I think anybody would have hoped  
500 with all of those parking spaces in the Great River Landing area.”

501

502 Jan noted that this had been a topic of discussion when the initial plans for the Great River  
503 Landing were created, and she also noted that proximity of the parking had been discussed. Jan

Reviewed 10/28/2021 by Katie Aspenson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

13

504 inquired about a potential overpass at Irvin Street.

505

506 Jarrod noted one of the original plans included an archway over STH 35, and he estimated that  
507 80 percent of the pedestrians would bypass it if it were ever to be constructed “because it would  
508 be shorter to walk it. Without having any second-floor reason for being on it, most of the people  
509 are just going to cross the road.”

510

511 Katie told commission members that city staff members are willing to reach out to the  
512 individuals who reside in the areas shaded in the pinker colors on the map to determine if they  
513 approve of city staff proceeding with seeing how other communities address parking. Katie told  
514 commission members that city staff can present different options to discuss at the November 16  
515 Plan Commission meeting. Katie also reminded commission members they have the option of  
516 not doing anything, and she said, “This is meant to prime the discussion, and then to see what  
517 sort of feedback we would receive if you want to continue.”

518

519 Mayor K. Smith asked what the public hearing was noticed for.

520

521 Katie said it was for a potential reduction or removal of downtown parking or requirements.  
522 Katie said staff could look into parking credits, examine what is available for on-street parking,  
523 reduce the amount of required parking, or if the city does not want to require any parking. Katie  
524 said, “It’s very general on purpose.”

525

526 Craig said he would like to hear the input.

527

528 Ald. T. Smith stated he also would like to hear the input, as well as discuss future plans. Ald. T.  
529 Smith said, “We don’t want to drive businesses out of downtown. ... It would be interesting to  
530 see what their plans are for the future with their expansion and get their feedback on, how can we  
531 increase parking for you and [also] be a win-win for the businesses and the city.”

532

533 Katie said, “Not necessarily increasing parking. [Rather], do we want to require all the parking  
534 today? That’s a decision that we can make that one would argue could assist in a development  
535 and a redevelopment.” Katie cited the Masonic Lodge and said if someone wanted to convert the  
536 building into retail development, a developer would need to provide a minimum of 15 parking  
537 stalls. Katie asked where a developer could find those stalls, and if a developer cannot find  
538 them, is the end result that the city has a structure on Main Street that remains vacant because no  
539 one can obtain it and provide the necessary parking. Katie also asked if the city’s goal is to fill  
540 that and tell a developer he or she must find 25 percent, in which case only five parking stalls  
541 would need to be found.

542

543 Craig said, “How existing parking is utilized is key for me. It’s not being utilized as I maybe  
544 would have hoped right now, and it’s creating challenges in other areas. But I’d like to hear  
545 what other people think about that.”

Reviewed 10/28/2021 by Katie Aspenson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

14

546  
547 Katie asked commission members if they would like city staff members to bring back different  
548 parking options to consider at the November 16 Plan Commission meeting.

549  
550 Ald. T. Smith said he believes it will be helpful if there are options that the Plan Commission can  
551 discuss, noting there could be options that commission members might not be thinking of. Ald.  
552 T. Smith noted “Main Street, USA” is something that is receiving attention across the nation, and  
553 he said many of the municipalities must be facing challenges regarding redevelopment on their  
554 respective Main Streets.

555  
556 Katie noted this is an informal study and said some of the questions that had been raised  
557 regarding times of day and different day, “there are people who pay consultants to establish foot  
558 traffic and where they’re parking and how long they’re parking.” Katie told commission  
559 members that while city staff will attempt to obtain as much information as possible, she also  
560 asked them to be aware that city staff is completing this and the city is not hiring a consultant to  
561 try to answer those questions. Katie cautioned that the level of detail might not be what  
562 commission members would expect from a formal parking study.

563  
564 Mayor K. Smith asked Gargi if she has any suggestions for any other information that she would  
565 like to see regarding downtown parking.

566  
567 Gargi told Mayor K. Smith she would like to learn how municipalities of similar size and the  
568 same number of businesses address the issue. Gargi said she also would like to hear the input of  
569 downtown businessowners; specifically, if, for example, 25 percent is sufficient.

570  
571 Craig thanked Erin for her work.

572  
573 Ald. T. Smith said he believes it is a good starting point.

574  
575 Craig described it as being an “eye-opener” and said, “As we go through these individual  
576 developments or businesses coming in, you understand about that at the time. But seeing the  
577 overview? Nice.”

578  
579 Katie asked commission members if they would like the downtown businessowners to be invited  
580 to the November 16 Plan Commission meeting.

581  
582 Ald. T. Smith said he would like to hear their input.

583  
584 **Closed Session**

585  
586 To consider a motion to convene in Closed Session under Section 19.85(1)(g) of the Wisconsin  
587 Statutes for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is

Reviewed 10/28/2021 by Katie Aspenson

**Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**  
Tuesday, October 26, 2021  
15

588 rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to  
589 litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved:

590

- 591 • Development Agreement for 1104 Well Street

592

593 If any action is required in Open Session, as the result of the Closed Session, the Plan  
594 Commission will reconvene in Open Session to take the necessary action and/or continue on with  
595 the printed agenda.

596

597 Motion by Craig, second by Ald. T. Smith, to convene in Closed Session.

598

599 On roll call vote: Ald. Tom Smith – aye, City Engineer Jarrod Holter – aye, Jan Brock – aye,  
600 Skip Temte – aye, Craig Breitsprecher – aye, Gargi Chaudhuri – aye. In Closed Session at 8:00  
601 p.m.

602

603 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to reconvene in Open Session.

604

605 On roll call vote: Ald. Tom Smith – aye, City Engineer Jarrod Holter – aye, Jan Brock – aye,  
606 Skip Temte – aye, Craig Breitsprecher – aye, Gargi Chaudhuri – aye. In Open Session at 8:14  
607 p.m.

608

609 **Adjournment**

610

611 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Craig, to adjourn at 8:15 p.m.

612

613 On voice vote, motion carried.

614

615

616 Recorded by:

617

618 Kirk Bey