

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

1

1 The Special Meeting of the Plan Commission of the City of Onalaska was called to order at 2:00  
2 p.m. on Tuesday, July 16, 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, Ald. Tom Smith,  
6 City Engineer Jarrod Holter, Jan Brock, Skip Temte, Paul Gleason, Craig Breitsprecher, Steven  
7 Nott

8  
9 Also Present: Planning Manager Katie Aspenson, City Legal Counsel Amanda Jackson, Rita  
10 Trapp and Jeff Miller of HKGi

11  
12 **Item 2 – Approval of minutes from the previous meeting**

13  
14 Motion by Ald. T. Smith, second by Skip, to approve the minutes from the May 29, 2019 Special  
15 Plan Commission meeting as printed and on file in the City Clerk’s Office.

16  
17 On voice vote, motion carried.

18  
19 (Note: The minutes from the May 29, 2019 Special Plan Commission meeting already were  
20 approved at the June 25, 2019 Plan Commission meeting. The Plan Commission did not vote on  
21 approving the minutes of the June 25, 2019 meeting).

22  
23 **Item 3 – Public Input (limited to 3 minutes per individual)**

24  
25 Mayor Chilsen called three times for anyone wishing to provide public input and closed that  
26 portion of the meeting.

27  
28 **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

29  
30 **Item 4 – Discussion & Consideration of the Onalaska Unified Development Code**  
31 **(UDC)/Zoning Rewrite Project**

32  
33 Jeff said this is the third of four work sessions with the Plan Commission to examine the entire  
34 current Unified Development Code and determine how it will be restructured.

35  
36 A. Principal & Accessory Use Tables

37  
38 Jeff referred to a copy of the draft Principal Uses Table included in commission members’  
39 packets and noted the following districts are new: R-3 (Middle Density Residential), B-3  
40 (Regional Business), Neighborhood Mixed Use, and Community Mixed Use. Jeff said the R-  
41 160, M-3/I-3, and Traditional Mixed Neighborhood will be eliminated. The M-1 and M-2  
42 (Industrial) districts will become I-1 and I-2. Transitional Commercial Business will merge with

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

2

43 the B-1 District. Jeff said he and Rita have worked with city staff since the May 29 work session  
44 on revising what is identified as permitted and what is identified as permitted, with standards, in  
45 the Residential District. Jeff said the Group Living category had been simplified as the number  
46 of uses has been reduced from six or seven to four (Adult Family Home, Community Living  
47 Arrangement for Adults, Community Living Arrangement for Children, Senior Care Facility).  
48 Senior Care Facility will be defined in the code as any type of housing that is designated for  
49 seniors, ranging from independent living to assisted living.

50

51 Paul addressed “Community Living Arrangement for Children” under the “Group Living”  
52 category, noting that while this type of use is permitted in the R-MMH District, “Community  
53 Living Arrangement for Adults” is not. Paul asked for an explanation behind the rationale of this  
54 decision.

55

56 Katie told Paul a “sober house” is an example of a Community Living Arrangement for Adults,  
57 noting such a structure has multiple rooms. By comparison, a Community Living Arrangement  
58 for Children could be a fostering situation. Katie said that while staff would not necessarily want  
59 to prevent a fostering situation in a mobile home community, mobile homes are not large enough  
60 to contain something such as a sober house, which requires more defined spaces. Katie also told  
61 Paul staff’s reasoning is there are smaller setbacks between the two.

62

63 Paul told Katie he still sees them as similar enough that, in his opinion, they either would be “in  
64 or out together and not separated.” However, Paul also said he “see[s] the logic a little bit.”

65

66 Jeff said he does not believe either “Community Living Arrangements for Adults” or  
67 “Community Living Arrangements for Children” is allowed in R-MMH. Jeff also said he  
68 believes allowing “Community Living Arrangements for Children” in the R-MMH would be  
69 new.

70

71 Paul said he believes both “Community Living Arrangements for Adults” and “Community  
72 Living Arrangements for Children” either should be included together or excluded together.  
73 Paul also asked if foster care should be specified somewhere with an explanation, adding he  
74 understands what city staff and HKGi are attempting to accomplish.

75

76 Katie said the intent is there will be a definition associated with everything and told Paul  
77 fostering will be listed out specifically.

78

79 Paul said he finds that rationale to be logical. Paul next addressed “Bed and Breakfast  
80 Establishment” under the “Lodging” category, noting it only is permitted, with standards, in the  
81 R-2 District.

82

83 Jeff said it is HKGi’s interpretation is that bed and breakfast establishments are currently  
84 conditionally allowed in the R-1 and R-2 districts.

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

3

85  
86 Katie said a Conditional Use Permit is currently required and noted there currently is only one  
87 active bed and breakfast establishment in the city. This establishment is located in the R-2  
88 District, and Katie said it would be grandfathered in. Katie said there is an effort to move away  
89 from CUPs for bed and breakfast establishments and told commission members there would be  
90 extra standards for bed and breakfast establishments that would open. Katie said the intent is not  
91 have such establishments in R-3 or R-4 because they are multifamily-related districts, and she  
92 asked if bed and breakfast establishments should be allowed in the R-1 District.

93  
94 Paul said he was seeking an explanation.

95  
96 Katie said the goal was to align it to what the current standards are.

97  
98 Jan asked if a “Tourist Home,” which also is listed under “Lodging,” is similar to a bed and  
99 breakfast.

100  
101 Katie said a tourist home is similar to Airbnb and told Jan they likely will be licensed separately.  
102 Katie said they would not be owner-occupied, and she told commission members tourist homes  
103 currently are allowed, with perhaps one currently being active in the city.

104  
105 Craig said Act 67 is influencing some of the decisions being made related to the city’s zoning,  
106 and he asked if there is any indication that Act 67 will cease to exist in the near future.

107  
108 Mayor Chilsen said the League of Municipalities is working to remove Act 67, and he told Craig  
109 that Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce wishes to keep Act 67 in place. Mayor Chilsen also  
110 said it is unlikely that Wisconsin State Senate Majority Leader Scott Fitzgerald and Wisconsin  
111 Assembly Speaker Robin Vos will take action to remove Act 67.

112  
113 Amanda said she believes that from an enforcement and uniformity standpoint the end result  
114 ultimately will be more uniform because it is not possible to ask for different standards. Further,  
115 Amanda said Act 67 establishes “an equal playing field for all development,” as well as an equal  
116 set of standards by which everyone is reviewed.

117  
118 Craig said that while he sees the benefit on one side, he “also sees the pitfalls on the other side.”  
119 Craig said he believes the City of Onalaska has done “a very reasonable, rational job” over time  
120 of not utilizing the regulatory authority that Act 67 seeks to eliminate.

121  
122 Steven said he does not believe bed and breakfast establishments should not be zoned R-1.  
123 Steven said a tourist home usually has a bedroom which will occasionally be rented out as extra  
124 income, and he compared it to an out-of-house business. By comparison, a bed and breakfast  
125 establishment is a business at which people typically reside, and Steven said it would be a

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

4

126 business located in an R-1 District as opposed to a home that has a tourist home business out of  
127 it. Steven said he believes the two are “distinctly different.”

128  
129 Paul said that while he understands Steven’s logic, “to me, that should exclude it from R-2 as  
130 well.”

131  
132 Katie told Steven and Paul their suggestions can be examined further.

133  
134 Rita said a bed and breakfast establishment “traditionally has a residential look and feel to it,”  
135 and she told commission members it is difficult to envision “a residential look and feel structure  
136 in a business district or a mixed-use district.”

137  
138 Steven said he believes the R-1 and R-2 districts that are created for families and stated families  
139 residing in those districts are important. Steven said a bed and breakfast establishment will have  
140 a significantly larger turnover and a greater amount of traffic. It also is a full-service facility as  
141 opposed to a tourist home, which occasionally provides a room for travelers and additional  
142 income for a homeowner in a residential area.

143  
144 Craig said zoning ultimately is about uses, “and I think the point that it is a business – whether it  
145 be in a residential zone or whatever – it is still a business of sorts.”

146  
147 Steven said it is first and foremost a business and not a home out of which there is a business.

148  
149 Skip said he believes the commission is losing sight of the philosophy behind the bed and  
150 breakfast establishment, noting it is an idea to have a place to stay that is like a residential area.  
151 Skip said, “If you treat it strictly as a business, you have defeated the whole philosophy behind a  
152 bed and breakfast, as I see it.”

153  
154 Steven said that while Skip has raised a valid point, he also believes there must be a location in  
155 the community where there are family-designated areas.

156  
157 Craig said he sees both sides of the argument, noting that currently “Bed and Breakfast  
158 Establishment” is currently designated permitted, with standards. Craig said perhaps that is the  
159 correct way to treat it as there are standards that go along with that when it is in a location zoned  
160 R-2. Craig asked city staff to contemplate the designation.

161  
162 Skip noted the philosophy behind Airbnb is to rent out a house located in a residential area to  
163 individuals who are on vacation. Skip said he believes restricting it from R-1 goes against the  
164 philosophy of the idea behind a bed and breakfast establishment.

165  
166 Steven said he has never seen an Airbnb where a house is rented out, and he asked if they exist.

167

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

5

168 Steven was told they do exist, and also that the entire house may be rented out.

169

170 Jeff said city staff and HKGi are considering permitting bed and breakfast establishments both in  
171 R-3 and R-4 districts if the structure is a single-family home, a two-family home, or a zero-lot  
172 line home. Jeff said they currently would be allowed if a single-family home was present. Jeff  
173 reminded commission members R-3 is a new district and said it is not applied anywhere. Jeff  
174 said, "It's likely it's going to be applied somewhere where there could be a single-family home  
175 that's there today."

176

177 Craig said he assumes they would be permitted, with standards.

178

179 Katie said no because it is an existing structure, and she told Craig the intent of allowing the  
180 existing structure within these districts is to not create nonconforming uses.

181

182 Steven said perhaps tourist homes and Airbnb homes should be permitted, with standards, in R-1  
183 and R-2 if entire houses can be rented out.

184

185 Katie said this can be a discussion point either at the Plan Commission's next work session or its  
186 next meeting. Katie also noted this is the lone business establishment the city currently has in  
187 these two districts.

188

189 Jeff addressed the B-1, B-2, and B-3 districts and told commission members he and Rita are  
190 seeking input on items in yellow that are permitted, with standards, but do not have standards  
191 identified in the current code.

192

193 Rita addressed the draft Accessory Uses table and told commission members it has been  
194 modified since the May 29 work session. Rita said there are three topics for which standards are  
195 needed: "Accessory Dwelling Unit," "Day Care Center, Licensed Family (Child or Adult)," and  
196 "Helipad or Helistop in Conjunction with a Medical Facility." Rita said accessory uses generally  
197 are permitted, with standards, or permitted. The lone exception is "Mobile Service Support  
198 Structure or Facility," for which a Conditional Use Permit is required, per State of Wisconsin  
199 Statute. Rita said it has very specific standards in place; thus, that is why it is different than the  
200 rest of them. Rita said she and staff had discussed removing "Refuse or Recycling Container"  
201 and placing it in the standards needed for when a multifamily or a business structure is created.

202

203 Paul noted "Day Care Center[s], Licensed Family (Child or Adult)" are not allowed in R-4, R-  
204 MMH, or any of the Commercial districts (B-1, B-2, B-3). Paul said he believes he has seen  
205 daycare centers in a variety of districts.

206

207 Rita noted the commission is discussing the Accessory Uses table and told Paul this refers to a  
208 home that has an in-home daycare. Rita said, "Day care center versus child care provider, the

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

6

209 state has very specific thresholds. Eight-and-under is why it becomes a day care center versus a  
210 child care provider.”

211

212 Paul asked if they are elsewhere in the permitted uses.

213

214 Rita said yes and noted it is shown on the Principal Uses table in the Business districts as “Day  
215 Care Center, Licensed Group (Child or Adult)” as permitted, with standards.

216

217 Katie said it may be an accessory use if someone has an in-home family daycare.

218

219 B. Use Specific Standards

220

221 Rita said she and Jeff wanted to identify which Use Specific Standards already exist in the code,  
222 and they have been placed in the same location. Rita noted there are five use types (Bed and  
223 Breakfast Establishment; Dwelling, Zero Lot Line; Dwelling, Apartment with Residential  
224 Support Services; Planned Residential Development; Senior Care Facility) under “Specific  
225 Residential Principal Uses” that have Use Specific Standards, and all five already existed. There  
226 are eight use types (Club, Lodge or Meeting Place of a Non-Commercial Nature; Day Care  
227 Center (Child or Adult); Funeral Home or Mortuary; Hospital; Nursery or Preschool; Place of  
228 Worship; School, College/University/Trade/Business; School, Elementary or Secondary) under  
229 “Specific Public and Institutional Uses.”

230

231 Steven asked if more restrictive times are being considered for bars and brewpubs under  
232 “Neighborhood Mixed – Permitted.”

233

234 Steven was told yes.

235

236 Katie said the city also may request enhanced screening such as fencing or landscaping to  
237 mitigate noise. Katie said the city likely will ask that a fence be installed between an  
238 establishment with a drive-through and a residence. Katie said the city also could request  
239 additional or less parking, landscaping and/or screening, and increased setbacks.

240

241 Craig asked if the city can prohibit bands from performing in a neighborhood establishment such  
242 as a bar or a brewpub.

243

244 Amanda said the city can institute noise requirements in Mixed Use.

245

246 Steven said a broader noise restriction would be ideal because it would apply to noise not limited  
247 to musical performers.

248

249 Rita asked if it is more about outdoor patio space or bands performing inside the establishment.

250

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

7

251 Craig said, "I think overall, because that sound in a quiet neighborhood would tend to resonate."

252

253 Steven said, "More restrictive at the property line when you do measuring."

254

255 Paul addressed "Theater, Drive-in" under "Specific Commercial Uses," inquiring about the  
256 source for not allowing access to or within 1,000 feet of an arterial street. Paul also asked if  
257 there another use where 1,000 feet is required.

258

259 Katie said not from a street, but there are setback requirements for adult-oriented establishments.

260

261 Paul said a theater almost has to be located near a primary travel route, meaning an arterial.

262

263 Rita said she assumes the goal is to have the actual entrance to the drive-in be from a local road  
264 or a non-arterial road.

265

266 Paul said that while he does not understand the logic behind the rule, there likely will never be a  
267 drive-in theater in the City of Onalaska.

268

269 Amanda asked if commission members do not want to allow access from an arterial street, but  
270 not necessarily have the 1,000-foot rule.

271

272 Paul said there must be access from an arterial street, noting that all commercial uses do.

273

274 Rita suggested examining how other cities have addressed this issue.

275

276 Craig said he does not want traffic routed through a residential area.

277

278 Rita said perhaps "Theater, Drive-in" should not be a permitted use if there is no road on which  
279 it may go or there is no space for such an establishment in the city.

280

281 Paul said drive-in theaters no longer are financially viable due to land prices either in or near a  
282 metro area, and he told commission members a drive-in theater will not be proposed unless there  
283 is a radical change in the business model.

284

285 Steven said the city is attempting to create codes that are flexible enough not to be rewritten if  
286 technology or cost ever changes.

287

288 Paul asked if something that is proposed and is not addressed in the code is allowed.

289

290 Rita said an applicant may approach with the zoning, and the Plan Commission can determine at  
291 that time if something is allowed.

292

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

8

293 Paul said he is inclined to eliminate “Theater, Drive-in” and let it be addressed in the future.

294

295 Craig said that while he agrees with Paul, he is concerned about attempting to regulate after the  
296 fact.

297

298 Paul said an applicant would have to create a zone that would allow this business if he/she were  
299 not approved anywhere.

300

301 Amanda said an individual would have to apply for a text amendment, which then would allow  
302 it.

303

304 Katie noted the city has done this in the past.

305

306 Paul said he is certain there will be situations in which something has not been caught and  
307 individuals will ask if modifications may occur.

308

309 Katie told Paul the Zoning Code is meant to be a living document and no one is trying to guess at  
310 every type of business that will occur five to 10 years from today. Katie said, “The intent is to  
311 have a document that is mobile enough that we can find an appropriate district where we think it  
312 would work. We want it to be able to change, even though it is not fun to change the code after  
313 we just wrote it. We can’t regulate everything.”

314

315 Paul said he believes eliminating “Theater, Drive-in” is a reasonable option at this time.

316

317 Amanda asked if this is an Accessory Use or a Principal Use.

318

319 Katie told Amanda it is a Principal Use.

320

321 Amanda asked if the city has it as an Accessory Use.

322

323 Rita said no.

324

325 Amanda said it is possible Gundersen Health System could place a movie screen in its parking  
326 lot as an Accessory Use and told commission members she sees more examples of that occurring  
327 in the future as a temporary use.

328

329 Jeff noted it only would be permitted in the A-1 District.

330

331 Paul asked Amanda if the city is able to reject an adult-oriented entertainment business, which is  
332 listed under “Specific Arts, Entertainment or Recreation Uses.”

333

334 Amanda said no and said, “This is how we say ‘no.’”

Reviewed 7/23/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

9

335  
336 Paul noted the city has said ‘no’ to such establishments in the past and said, “To me, it’s  
337 blatantly obvious there is probably nowhere it can go in the City of Onalaska, given those  
338 dimensions.”

339  
340 Steven addressed “Brewery, Winery or Distillery” listed under “Specific Industrial Uses,” noting  
341 that there are individuals who find the smell of hops offensive and asking if odors can be  
342 addressed in the standards.

343  
344 Katie said it is more associated with the disposal of hops and the frequency in which it occurs.  
345 Katie referred to a brewpub that used to operate within the city and told Steven there were rules  
346 addressing how often the spent grains needed to be disposed of so the odor does not linger.  
347 Katie told Steven they could be standards.

348  
349 C. Potential Rezoning Areas on Zoning Map

350  
351 Jeff noted commission members had received an 11-by-17 map and said he believes the only  
352 change pertains to an area potentially being rezoned from R-160 to R-1.

353  
354 Skip referred to three lots zoned Commercial located at the corner of 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Wilson  
355 Street and noted these lots were developed as Residential and thus should be zoned Residential.

356  
357 Katie said city staff will be examining the entire map.

358  
359 Jeff said the general goals being utilized to update the Zoning Map include attempting to achieve  
360 consistency with the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map; to achieve consistency with  
361 the Downtown Redevelopment Study and the State Road 16 Redevelopment Study; and to  
362 restructure the zoning districts. Jeff said he and Rita are proposing the following:

- 363  
364 • **Mixed Use:** The new Community Mixed Use District should be applied to the  
365 downtown core area, the State Road 16 area across from Valley View Mall, and east of  
366 the Gundersen Health System medical campus. Community Mixed Use would not allow  
367 lower-density housing.

368  
369 Jarrod noted the Gundersen Health System is labeled R-1 zoning.

370  
371 Katie told Jarrod there was a portion of the Gundersen site that was intended to be residential;  
372 specifically, senior housing.

373  
374 Jeff said he does not believe that location should be labeled R-1.

375  
376 Katie said the area east of Gundersen includes single-family residential housing, EO Johnson, the  
Reviewed 7/23/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

10

377 Coulee Region Humane Society, and Springbrook Assisted Living.

378

- 379 • **Neighborhood Mixed Use:** This would be applied to smaller areas, including 2<sup>nd</sup>  
380 Avenue/State Trunk Highway 35 north of Quincy Street; Sand Lake Road north of Main  
381 Street; Main Street west of U.S. Highway 53; and Sand Lake Road north of U.S.  
382 Highway 53. Neighborhood Mixed Use would allow all housing types.

383

384 Jarrod asked if Neighborhood Mixed Use is more restrictive than Commercial Mixed Use.

385

386 Katie and Jeff said it is.

387

388 Jeff asked if the Altra Federal Credit Union site, which is shown as Mixed Use, and he asked if it  
389 should be rezoned to Mixed Use, or if it should be zoned B-2.

390

391 Paul said he believes it should be zoned B-2, and he asked if it is a business use.

392

393 Katie told Paul that Altra owns a sizeable portion of vacant land and said the intended future use  
394 for the land has not yet been revealed. Currently there is a path for employees to utilize, and  
395 Katie said possible uses that have been discussed include selling part of the land for residential  
396 use or another use, and keeping it for future expansion.

397

398 Paul said he does not want Altra to be prevented from expanding, if it chooses to do so.

399

400 Katie said it is the city's intent to notify everyone so that Altra's representatives may provide  
401 feedback.

402

403 Craig said he would let Altra's future plans drive how the city zones the property, adding he sees  
404 no reason to opening up the site to Neighborhood Mixed Use if Altra's representatives do not  
405 have an opinion regarding future development on the site.

406

407 Jeff pointed to an area on the map that is currently zoned Agricultural, noted it is guided toward  
408 a Mixed Use area in the Comprehensive Plan, and asked if now is an appropriate time to rezone  
409 it Mixed Use.

410

411 Paul told commission members he is speaking as representative to the owner when he says he  
412 and the owner would prefer to see this area retain its Agricultural zoning status for the time  
413 being. Paul said he and the owner see it as an expansion in the future of whatever occurs on the  
414 Mayo Health System property.

415

416 Craig said he agrees with Paul.

417

418 Jeff said the area in question could be rezoned Medical Campus District in the future.

Reviewed 7/23/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

11

419

420 Katie noted this area includes land owned by the City of Onalaska and the Onalaska School  
421 District, and she said staff will have to work on this area separately.

422

423 Jarrod noted the property Mayo Health System owns is the final large piece of developable  
424 property within the city limits, and he said he believes it should be left “as low as possible” to  
425 force it to come in with a plan. Doing so will allow the city to develop a division of that plan for  
426 the final sizeable piece of property.

427

428 Katie noted the Future Land Use Map designated the land currently owned by Mayo as Medical  
429 Campus District, and she said the intent is that people will rezone into that district because a plan  
430 must be provided. Katie said she is unsure if the city should force the Medical Campus District  
431 if Mayo does not have a plan in the books as the city has very specific requirements as to what  
432 must be done.

433

434 Paul said based on what he has heard, it is “highly questionable” as to whether Mayo ever  
435 develops anything on that site. Paul said he believes that area is “wide open” to virtually any use  
436 the city might permit. Paul also said he believes zoning both parcels A-1 gives the city the best  
437 opportunity when someone comes forward with a proposal.

438

439 Craig said he believes the city should keep this area available for someone who comes forward  
440 with a development plan.

441

442 Paul referred to land owned by Mississippi Valley Conservancy and asked if it is appropriate to  
443 leave it zoned R-1. Paul said he believes it should be zoned P-1.

444

445 Jeff next addressed Business zoning and said the number of business districts would expand from  
446 two to three. They would reflect neighborhood, regional, and community scales in terms of  
447 market range, size of the district (space-wise or area-wise), and size of the buildings and  
448 businesses. There would be regional business areas, community business areas, and  
449 neighborhood business areas. Jeff said the goal is to focus on zoning business areas rather than  
450 individual properties. Transitional Commercial (T-C) zoning is being eliminated, and Jeff said  
451 those properties could be rezoned B-1. The new B-3 District would be for the regional  
452 mall/State Road 16 corridor, and also Menards. The B-2 areas and corridors would be 2<sup>nd</sup>  
453 Avenue/STH 35, Oak Forest Drive, and some areas along East Main Street. An area zoned B-1  
454 would include East Main Street that are close to downtown. Jeff noted the Comprehensive Plan  
455 shows Mixed Use zoning along Main Street, and he asked commission members if they believe it  
456 is appropriate to start identifying mixed use areas along Main Street.

457

458 Craig said he believes there eventually needs to be a discussion regarding Main Street and Sand  
459 Lake Road/12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. Craig said he does not know where to begin such a discussion  
460 and stated, “No matter what you do, there is going to be a fair amount of pushback. But I think

Reviewed 7/23/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

12

461 unless we're willing to look at that and what can and can't be done with that, I think we're being  
462 shortsighted."

463

464 Jeff noted Sand Lake Road had been identified as a study area in the Comprehensive Plan and  
465 said he does not believe a plan for Sand Lake Road has been completed. Jeff pointed out an area  
466 he said HKGi believes should be Neighborhood Mixed Use, and another area that perhaps should  
467 be zoned Residential – possibly R-3.

468

469 Katie said the area to which Jeff had referred is south of Quincy Street and north of Well Street.

470

471 Mayor Chilsen said the owner of Center 90 is making a substantial financial investment in the  
472 facility.

473

474 Ald. T. Smith asked Craig to expand on his thoughts.

475

476 Craig said he is not sure it is wise to make it overly restrictive at this time as he is concerned  
477 about that. Craig further stated, "It's a corridor that certainly has significance in the future for  
478 development. I don't know what that means exactly, but I think it's certainly right for  
479 development – especially in some areas. And I think we need to leave that as flexible as  
480 possible, however we choose to do that. I don't have a quick and easy answer for you, but that's  
481 kind of my gut feel."

482

483 Amanda asked Craig if he would prefer Neighborhood Mixed Use in the proposed R-3 District.

484

485 Craig said, "I would go more that direction than R-3. I think we have to leave that door open; I  
486 think it's the smart thing to do. Not that it has to happen, but it allows it to happen should that  
487 develop."

488

489 Jeff said HKGi is proposing areas that could change and "it doesn't have to include all this, by  
490 any means. It should just include what is appropriate at this time."

491

492 Craig said he believes an R-3 designation limits the city "in the not-too-distant future," adding,  
493 "I'm not sure it's smart to do that."

494

495 Steven said he agrees and stated, "It reinforces why the definition of the permitted, with  
496 standards is important, too, because Neighborhood Mixed Use is something new." Steven said  
497 he believes R-1, R-2, Neighborhood Mixed Use, and the Environmental/Agricultural areas are  
498 the most crucial regarding how the city defines permitted use, with standards.

499

500 Paul noted there is an area zoned B-1 near the end of Green Coulee that still is vacant and said he  
501 has a difficult time seeing any type of Commercial use at that location.

502

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

13

503 Craig said B-1 zoning would exacerbate any issues that already exist in Green Coulee.

504

505 Jeff next addressed Industrial and told commission members the State Road 16 regional business  
506 area would be rezoned B-3 from M-1. The number of industrial districts would be reduced from  
507 three to two (Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial). The majority of the city's Industrial zoning  
508 would be I-1 (Light Industrial), with only two areas being zoned I-2 (Heavy Industrial). Jeff  
509 addressed Residential and told commission members existing manufactured mobile home parks,  
510 none of which are currently zoned R-MMH, would be rezoned to that district. Jeff also said  
511 HKGi is proposing that R-160 be rezoned to R-1 and approved as a Planned Unit Development.

512

513 Amanda said the reason to do what HKGi is suggesting with rezoning R-160 to R-1 and  
514 approved as a PUD is someone had raised a concern at a past meeting about making those  
515 structures nonconforming uses. Amanda said a PUD would allow someone to remodel or rebuild  
516 under his/her existing R-160 standards.

517

518 Jeff said HKGi is suggesting establishing an R-3 District in the downtown area as part of the  
519 Downtown Redevelopment Study. Jeff said HKGi has identified the area along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, the  
520 area north of the downtown district along STH 35, and the Sand Lake Road area as R-3 zones.

521

522 Katie said city staff will examine potential areas within the city where R-3 zoning could exist in  
523 terms of redevelopment opportunities. However, Katie also cited the land owned by Mayo as an  
524 example of possibly remaining zoned R-2. Katie said individuals could come in and propose  
525 rezoning parcels from R-2 to R-3 based on where they believe the market is viable for R-3  
526 zoning. Staff then would consider those proposals on a case-by-case basis. Katie said, "We can  
527 try to be prescriptive. But on the same token, I don't necessarily want to paint people's property  
528 R-3 based on our opinion because we're not developers. We're not the ones who are taking out  
529 the loans and making that. The R-3 District may not be very extensive for the sole purpose that  
530 we now have a district that allows for this type of housing that may be more palatable for a  
531 neighborhood on a case-by-case basis. You might not see a lot of R-3 in general, but it would be  
532 that way for a reason."

533

534 Jeff addressed R-4 zoning and said HKGi has identified the waterfront area as R-4.

535

536 D. Lot & Size Dimensional Standards Tables

537

538 Rita said she and Jeff had performed an analysis to determine how many lots were conforming to  
539 the city's current standards. Rita referred to a map on display for commission members and  
540 pointed out the R-1 District. Areas colored green are the lots that conform with the city's current  
541 standards. Lots colored orange and red are lots that are 80 to 100 percent, or less than 80  
542 percent. Rita pointed out that most of the lots in the R-1 Districts are in conformance. Rita next  
543 showed commission members a map of the R-2 District and noted there are several more lots that  
544 are coming in as nonconforming. Rita noted the city has larger lot size standards for the R-2

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

14

545 District (7,700 square feet) than the R-1 District (7,200 square feet). Rita noted a majority of the  
546 lots currently zoned R-2 (nearly 3,000) are in conformance. Approximately 200 lots are between  
547 7,200 and 7,700; approximately 100 are just slightly less than that; and approximately 400 are  
548 what Rita described as being “small.”

549  
550 Rita next showed commission members a table showing lot dimensions and explained that what  
551 HKGi qualifies as lot dimensions are lot area and lot width. Rita pointed out the first column  
552 shows the city’s existing standards, and HKGi also has listed proposed standards. Rita said she  
553 does not believe there is a reason to change R-1, and she pointed out the use type column on the  
554 table that separates the actual single-family dwellings from other permitted or permitted, with  
555 standards uses. Rita said city staff will discuss whether 10,000 is an appropriate number, and she  
556 pointed out that while the code currently states the minimum lot size in R-1 is 7,200 square feet,  
557 it does not differentiate between uses and use types very well. Rita said she wishes to focus on  
558 the R-2 District, or “Low-Medium Density Residential District.” Rita noted the use types  
559 include single family, two family/duplex, zero lot line, and twindos, and she said the code  
560 currently states 7,700 square feet for everything. Rita said the zero lot line is not described in  
561 detail, and she said she and Jeff are suggesting reducing the 7,700-square foot minimum,  
562 especially given the fact 7,200 square feet is the minimum for R-1. Rita said it is her  
563 understanding the R-2 District “basically covered everybody,” and she told commission  
564 members that having use types makes it easier to differentiate between the different uses. Two-  
565 family structures still are at 7,700 square feet.

566  
567 Jarrod said someone would be zoned into a single-family situation if a platted subdivision is  
568 zoned R-2 and measures 6,500 square feet because the lot size would dictate that no one could  
569 construct an R-2 structure.

570  
571 Paul said a developer would utilize the R-2 zoning if the goal was maximum density and small,  
572 single-family units.

573  
574 Katie said reducing the single-family dwelling means more residences that are currently  
575 conforming would become nonconforming because they don’t meet city standards. Katie said,  
576 “We’re increasing conformity for existing by dropping that number.”

577  
578 Rita asked commission members if they believe reducing the 7,700-square foot minimum for R-2  
579 is a positive or a negative.

580  
581 Paul said if the purpose of R-2 is to encourage smaller single-family lots, what HKGi is  
582 proposing is a positive thing. However, Paul also said, “That’s not the way it’s been used in the  
583 past. That’s why there was the R-160 at one point in one subdivision: to allow for narrower  
584 lots.”

585  
586 Rita told Paul that is where the Plan Commission must provide the direction and said, “From the

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

15

587 outside coming in, it would seem like you use the R-1 for the certain size to get to the R-2 to  
588 have smaller lots and smaller density, and you're thoughtful about where it gets rezoned. And  
589 then you are going for smaller lots and different types of neighborhoods than you were. But  
590 that's what this discussion is about."

591  
592 Paul said he is confused as to whether that is the city's purpose.

593  
594 Steven said he approves what he has seen because "it takes into consideration the changes in the  
595 Residential zoning. ... I'm seeing flexibility being put into this. If I am a family that is going to  
596 move into Onalaska out of choice or financial means and I really need a smaller lot, this gives  
597 me the opportunity to do that. I don't see why this is a bad thing."

598  
599 Jeff told commission members 6,500 square feet "is not a magic number."

600  
601 Paul addressed lot size and said he is not sure the city needs one at all, noting there already is a  
602 width as well as front yard, rear yard and side yard setbacks. Paul said the size of a house  
603 dictates the lot size that is needed because all the setbacks and the width requirement must be  
604 met. Paul further stated he has never found lot size to be a limiting factor as "all those other  
605 things control size. And the lot size restriction itself becomes kind of a moot point." Paul used  
606 as examples 6,500 square feet and 60-foot minimums and said it would dictate a minimum depth  
607 of 105 feet. This total would be reduced to 50 feet when the rear yard (30 feet) and front yard  
608 (25 feet) setbacks are subtracted. Paul said the garage likely would be "pushed out in front  
609 some" and, "As a practical matter, you're virtually never going to be under 6,500. And if the  
610 house is small enough that you could be on an odd parcel here and there, what's wrong with  
611 that? It's just never been a meaningful restriction, in my experience."

612  
613 Katie said there traditionally have been vacant lots in the city that are not developable because  
614 they do not have the overall lot area. Katie said they either were split off at one point and told  
615 commission members they will be discussing that as part of irregularities in terms of lots that do  
616 not meet city standards. Katie also noted the impact of the lot area is there is vacant land without  
617 homes on it.

618  
619 Paul asked why the city would not want homes on the scattered parcels as long as they meet the  
620 front, side and rear-yard setbacks.

621  
622 Jarrod said he believes there are instances where building setbacks override everything. Jarrod  
623 cited the example of a lot next to his mother's house that has an abandoned, dilapidated house on  
624 it, and he noted the lot is 50 feet wide. Jarrod said the lot will be almost unbuildable once the  
625 house is razed.

626  
627 Paul said he believes there always will be individuals who look at a situation such as the one  
628 Jarrod had described and believe they can construct on it. Paul added, "Those lots should be

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

16

629 useable.” Paul said that while he is not opposed to having the minimum lot areas, he also  
630 believes there are few cases where that comes into play. Rather, the widths and the setbacks  
631 come into play.

632  
633 Rita addressed setbacks and told commission members what is before them is what is followed  
634 today for R-1 and R-2. The city currently has 25-foot street yard setbacks, a minimum of 25 feet  
635 and a maximum of 40 feet, with cul-de-sacs being the exception. Rear yard setbacks are 30 feet,  
636 and side yard setbacks have a minimum of 6 feet. There is a 10-foot side yard setback when  
637 there is a two-family structure. Zero lot line and twindos have zero feet on the interior lot line,  
638 and 10 feet on the exterior lot line. The building width is 20 feet, and 35 feet is the maximum  
639 height. There also is a street yard averaging provision that allows the city to average the street  
640 yard setback. Rita said the city could make adjustments if it chooses to be supportive of the  
641 smaller lots. However, no adjustments have been made at this time.

642  
643 Paul noted the city has a building width minimum in its code.

644  
645 Katie said it is for mobile home purposes.

646  
647 Rita asked commission members if 20 feet is a number that concerns them.

648  
649 Paul said he is not sure why it is even there and noted it does not apply in the R-1 District.

650  
651 Rita said it applies, but the city does not have houses that do not qualify.

652  
653 Katie said everyone “checks that box” of 20 feet.

654  
655 Paul asked if 20 feet applies both in R-1 and R-2.

656  
657 Katie said 20 feet is the current minimum width for a house.

658  
659 Paul said he does not believe it will be an issue to leave it as is.

660  
661 Rita noted there is a substandard lot section and said activity may occur on it as long as there are  
662 certain requirements. This will be put into the code, and it refers to lots that were created prior to  
663 1969. However, certain setbacks still must be met. Rita next addressed irregular lots and said it  
664 is her understanding after speaking with Katie and Amanda that the city has a practice that  
665 allows the averaging of side yard or rear yard setbacks. This means if the lot is not rectangular in  
666 shape, the setbacks may be averaged so that they may be shorter on one side and longer on the  
667 other. Rita said there had been a discussion regarding the city memorializing this in the code as  
668 it is only practiced at the present time. Rita said work will begin on creating a definition, noting  
669 it is important to define what an irregular lot is so it is not something everyone can do. Rita  
670 recommended that whatever definition is created state city staff determines if a lot is irregular,

Reviewed 7/23/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

17

671 and which factors will be utilized to determine it. Rita said someone who disagrees with staff's  
672 decision may state his/her case before the Board of Zoning Appeals. Rita noted a majority of the  
673 lots in question are historical lots.

674  
675 Craig asked Amanda if the city would face legal jeopardy for rendering an arbitrary decision.

676  
677 Amanda said the city would utilize uniform factors and told Craig there might be "a strange,  
678 historical reason" the city cannot capture in those factors that it would allow Katie to factor into  
679 her decision. Amanda said there would be clear factors for staff to review.

680  
681 Skip believes it is necessary, noting the lot on which he lives should not be an irregular lot. Skip  
682 pointed out the lot lines along that street are not perpendicular to the street, and he also noted the  
683 rear corner of his neighbor's garage is located on his land because developers create layouts  
684 perpendicular to the street. Skip said he does not believe those lines should be considered  
685 irregular lots.

686  
687 Katie noted city staff has been utilizing a set of factors for years and said the intent is to put that  
688 set of factors in the code.

689  
690 Paul said he believes the city can continue utilizing its current practice, "and if it gets  
691 memorialized a little bit in the code, that's great. But I think staff has been doing a good job of  
692 it."

693  
694 Rita next addressed R-3 and R-4 and said she is asking for the Plan Commission's assistance on  
695 understanding the differences between R-3 and R-4. Rita noted some portions of the R-3 District  
696 could be applied before there is a project and said, "There may be some existing residences that  
697 are in that district, and we want to allow those. We're not going to have new single-family  
698 residences in the R-3." Rita noted R-3 is two families, zero lot line, attached townhouses, and  
699 rowhouses. Rita said R-4 is townhouses, rowhouses, and apartments.

700  
701 Jeff said there had been a discussion about removing single family, two family, and zero lot line  
702 from R-3.

703  
704 Rita said R-3 would consist of attached townhouses, and also possibly small apartments, and she  
705 posed the following questions:

- 706  
707
- 708 • How many townhouses or rowhouses should be in a particular unit?
  - 709 • How many units should be in a particular apartment building?
  - 710 • Could a small apartment building be allowed in R-3? And if so, what determines if  
711 something is small?

712 Rita asked for feedback regarding density.

Reviewed 7/23/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

18

713

714 Katie said R-4 zoning in the current code has different standards that go based on green space,  
715 and the city to a degree already regulates four-, six-, and eight-plexes as “different.” Anything  
716 larger than that could jump to a 66-unit apartment complex, and Katie said the intent with the R-  
717 3 District is to ask a developer if an eight-plex will be eight stories tall, or will it be two stories  
718 tall with four units on each floor. Katie said the intent of R-3 is to examine scale.

719

720 Craig asked if some of R-4 will shift more toward R-3, and vice-versa.

721

722 Katie said it potentially could happen based on what the city currently has. Katie noted there are  
723 smaller sites upon which there are four- and five-row townhomes, and they are zoned R-4 and  
724 located next to a 100-unit apartment complex, which also is zoned R-4. Katie said the intent is to  
725 divide up R-4 and make it more tangible. Katie said examining redevelopment is the other  
726 intent, pointing out R-1 and R-2 zoning typically is found in the center of the city, which is the  
727 older part of Onalaska, and where redevelopment is desired. Katie asked how many units would  
728 the city be comfortable with, and she said if R-4 is defined as eight units or less, a developer may  
729 break up a development however he/she chooses, meaning apartments or rowhouses, for  
730 example. Katie said properties neighboring such developments will know the density when a  
731 developer attempts to rezone.

732

733 Craig said he is thinking of R-3 and some of the potential areas where it could be applied. Craig  
734 told Katie he tends to gravitate toward a two-story structure, and he suggested perhaps that  
735 means eight apartments in two stories. Craig said he thinks of four units when he thinks about  
736 townhomes.

737

738 Jarrod told commission members he envisions eight units and said green space also would be a  
739 driving factor. Jarrod also said it would be possible to create two lots and construct two eight-  
740 plexes side-by-side with 20 feet between them. Jarrod said there still would be an opportunity to  
741 do more.

742

743 Rita said building height for R-3 would be 35 feet maximum, and 45 feet maximum for R-4.  
744 Rita said 45 feet has been the city’s maximum, but she noted that is to peak instead of to  
745 midpoint. Rita asked if there is any interest in modifying that, noting 45 feet has concerned  
746 individuals.

747

748 Paul said 45 feet can limit a structure to three stories, but a structure could be four stories if it has  
749 a flat roof.

750

751 Craig said he prefers to either stay with peak or eliminate it, and he asked Paul if five feet makes  
752 a difference.

753

754 Paul told Craig a competent architect “could squeeze more or less,” and he asked how many

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

19

755 stories should be allowed in the R-4 District. Paul noted it will be possible to construct a three-  
756 story structure in the R-3 District, and he asked if R-4 should be limited to four stories. Paul also  
757 stated he believes there needs to be a foot maximum and said he is looking at stories and  
758 proceeding from there.

759

760 Katie referred to the senior living facility that was constructed near Festival Foods and said the  
761 developers had applied for an amendment to allow them to go up from 45 feet. Katie said 45 feet  
762 was for a flat roof, and she noted the developer had three or four options that showed pitched  
763 roofs and higher roofs. This increased the height and made the structure look more residential in  
764 nature. Katie noted the developers' request was denied and said, "In theory, if you would have  
765 wanted a more residential character, allowing that extra height may be looking at the midpoint of  
766 the roofline instead of just saying 45 feet, no issue. We have seen this come forward, and it's a  
767 common thing with Abbey Road and the Great River Residences. This is a common theme that  
768 developers are coming in and asking for flexibility. It's because it's the peak height. Maybe if  
769 we looked more at the midpoint of the roof, we'd have some additional flexibility."

770

771 Craig told Katie he is not interested in going six stories, and he asked what is a fair midpoint the  
772 city can call out that allows that to occur.

773

774 Paul said he believes there is a trend in nicer apartments to utilize higher ceiling heights. This  
775 action increases the maximum height, and Paul said there are instances in which an apartment  
776 complex could be limited to three stories. Paul also said that while it appears there is no  
777 sentiment to allow more than four stories, 45 feet is not enough to accommodate design  
778 flexibility in four stories.

779

780 Amanda asked Paul if he would have a stories limit, perhaps allowing 55 feet and four stories.

781

782 Jeff suggested allowing whichever is greater.

783

784 Craig suggested having the 45 feet at a midpoint.

785

786 Rita told commission members HKGi works with cities that utilize midpoint, and some cities  
787 have three stories or 45 feet.

788

789 Craig said he recommends allowing four-story structures in R-4 and, "I think we need to look at  
790 whatever we use for a definition. If it's midpoint, that's fine and we do that in all categories."

791

792 Skip said he is hearing commission members discussing what they believe will fit in the present  
793 and not looking toward the future. Skip said the commission needs to look at how high they  
794 believe structures will be in 50 years, and he told commission members that when he was a child  
795 no structures in the City of La Crosse were larger than two stories – perhaps some with a peak on  
796 top and an attic for another story. Skip noted there currently are a number of large apartment

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

20

797 buildings that have multiple stories, and he pointed out this has occurred approximately over the  
798 last 50 years. Skip said, “We need to look at not only what is good today and what looks  
799 beautiful today in our city, but what we want the future to look like. Do we want to restrict it so  
800 that there are apartment buildings in La Crosse and there are apartment buildings in Holmen, and  
801 we have this old, flat-looking in Onalaska? Don’t just limit yourself to what looks good today.  
802 Think about what we might need in the future as well. I think that maybe six stories, with an  
803 architectural building of another 20 feet on top of that. [Perhaps] you need 11 feet for a story if  
804 you have nine-foot ceilings. It’s things like this you have to take into consideration. I’m not  
805 recommending any particular level. I’m saying, think.”

806  
807 Mayor Chilsen said the city would need to purchase new fire apparatus if structures exceed four  
808 stories, and he noted it would be costly to do so. Mayor Chilsen said, “We certainly don’t want  
809 to do it for one building.”

810  
811 Katie noted 100-foot buildings are allowed in the Industrial District and pointed out multifamily  
812 structures are limited to 45 feet.

813  
814 Paul said it depends, to an extent, where the apartments were constructed and stated he believes  
815 there are locations where 80- to 100-foot structures would be out of place. Paul said, “If we’re  
816 looking at getting higher density in our downtown area, more than four stories would maybe not  
817 be inappropriate there. That gets into a whole different thing if we start setting different  
818 standards for different locations.”

819  
820 Steven noted the proposed R-3 Districts and one of the R-4 Districts are located along the river,  
821 and he said, “When it comes to height standards there, I’d be looking at effect. I don’t care what  
822 the height is as long as we’re not overly restricting the view of the river. That’s my number one  
823 concern along there, because that is part of who Onalaska is. We sell ourselves as that with  
824 tourism. I don’t know what that would be; I’d leave that up to the engineers. I know that was a  
825 lot of the conversation with the more recent development down in that R-4 area: What will  
826 restrict and what won’t restrict these views? Does that mean there will be different restrictions  
827 on an R-4 there versus an R-4 out on the east side? Then probably, yes, there would be different  
828 heights that would be allowed.”

829  
830 Rita noted there currently is a green space requirement in the R-4 District. It is 35 percent for  
831 four-plexes, 40 percent for six-plexes, and 45 percent for eight-plexes. Rita said this has been a  
832 source of concern for developers because they believe a majority of their lot is devoted to green  
833 space. Rita noted the city does not use green space in its PUDs, but rather common open space.  
834 The apartment complexes that are bigger than five acres may take advantage of the PUD, and  
835 they only need 15 percent of open space. That does not include setbacks, but it includes all the  
836 other green space. Rita suggested having only one term and not two.

837  
838 Steven inquired about the impact of runoff if they were decreased.

Reviewed 7/23/19 by Katie Aspenson

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

21

839

840 Jarrod said that is partially held accountable through the Stormwater Code, and he told Steven  
841 the City Engineer may dictate there must be onsite storage or accommodate runoff if the  
842 stormwater facilities cannot handle it. Jarrod said that while some green space will be required,  
843 he believes 45 percent is a significant amount of land and that amount is not needed for  
844 stormwater retention.

845

846 Amanda said it is her understanding the city does not dictate what is done with the 45 percent –  
847 only that it be green space. Amanda said it is possible for that space to simply be mowed, and  
848 installing a playground or beautifying that space is not required.

849

850 Craig noted he had strong feelings regarding accessory structures and the amount of square  
851 footage they may consume on an existing property. Craig said he believes the direction the city  
852 is heading in is appropriate and told commission members he believes they must be conscious of  
853 this. Craig also said he agrees that 45 percent seems like a significant amount of space to be  
854 devoted to green space on a major development. Craig suggested reducing that amount “at least  
855 modestly” on the three mentioned on the screen, and he also said he does not favor going down  
856 to 15 percent.

857

858 Steven said there might be different standards for a different R-4 and told commission members  
859 perhaps 45 percent of green space might be ideal along the river. By comparison, perhaps it is  
860 not as important for the larger R-4 area in the east.

861

862 Paul questioned the 35, 40 and 45 percent green space requirements and said it does not make  
863 sense to him that the city would have a different percentage for different building sizes. Paul  
864 noted the land required gets bigger as the size of buildings increases, also noting the 35 percent  
865 gets bigger and stating, “We’re already compensating for that. I would think that one number is  
866 sufficient for all sites. I do see the benefit in areas along the river where it would be nice to have  
867 more, but I’m not sure we’re really complicating the situation. Are we going to create a 4-D for  
868 downtown? Or an R4R that will have different standards than R-4? We’re trying to simplify.”

869

870 Steven said that while there is no doubt complications would arise, he is not sure that would be a  
871 bad thing. Steven described the river area as being a sensitive area for the entire community, and  
872 he said he believes the large green space would improve the visual, and it probably would create  
873 a better visual of the river. Steven said he is not sure it would be bad to have more complexity to  
874 ensure the river views are managed properly.

875

876 Jarrod told Steven he sees it from the opposite side, noting the 45 percent green space is  
877 unnecessary if someone is within two blocks of Dash-Park and the waterfront as the goal is to get  
878 someone to walk to those facilities and utilize the green space rather than on the developable site.

879

880 Paul said if he were to develop an apartment building along the river, he would want to put all

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

22

881 his green space along the river where his tenants would receive primary benefit for it, “and then  
882 it doesn’t do any good for the public, anyway.”

883

884 Craig asked if there is a percentage city staff believes has been requested in several instances, or  
885 a percentage that seems logical.

886

887 Katie referred to the Downtown PUD and said anyone who wishes to create a development and  
888 has more than a quarter acre may propose to do none due to the close proximity of Dash-Park.  
889 Katie said staff has allowed greater flexibility only in the downtown district if a developer  
890 chooses to apply the overlay district. Katie said, “If we’re looking at doing additional standards,  
891 maybe it’s not in our base code lot side dimensions. Maybe it belongs in the overlay district and  
892 we can play with that.”

893

894 Rita showed commission members a slide showing lot and site dimensions for the city’s other  
895 districts, and she said she and Jeff are not proposing any changes. Rita said Mixed Use was not  
896 included because she and Jeff will be coming up with some differentiation between Residential  
897 and Non-Residential.

898

899 Craig asked if having the table serves a purpose.

900

901 Rita said she believes it clearly tells people they do not have something.

902

903 Rita showed commission members site dimensions and noted there currently is no street yard  
904 setback unless, due to the building material, the Building Code requires additional separation  
905 between buildings. Rita noted she and Jeff had discovered when putting together the table that  
906 45 feet is the maximum height in the Business Districts, and 100 feet is the maximum height in  
907 the Industrial Districts. Rita asked if 45 feet works in the Business Districts, and she also asked  
908 if the commission wishes to have the 100-foot maximum in the Industrial Districts.

909

910 Paul asked what the tallest building in the city currently is.

911

912 Jarrod said it likely is Gundersen Health System. Jarrod also noted individuals who develop  
913 four- and five-story hotels typically wish to stack them.

914

915 Amanda noted hotels would be in the B-3 District.

916

917 Rita showed commission members a slide of the topics that will be discussed at the next meeting,  
918 including revisiting the Specific Use and District Standards, as needed, discussing topics that  
919 have not yet been addressed, and asking the Plan Commission for direction on the areas for  
920 which she and Jeff have questions. Rita said the next Special Plan Commission meeting will be  
921 at 2 p.m. on Thursday, August 29.

922

**Special Plan Commission  
of the City of Onalaska**

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

23

923 Katie said the Plan Commission likely will address parking, home occupations, and daycares at  
924 its regular August meeting, which is Tuesday, August 27.

925

926 **Adjournment**

927

928 Motion by Craig, second by Skip, to adjourn at 4:17 p.m.

929

930 On voice vote, motion carried.

931

932

933 Recorded by:

934

935 Kirk Bey