



**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that there will be a City of Lodi Plan Commission meeting held on Tuesday, July 14, 2020 at 6:30 pm in the Council Room, City Hall, 130 South Main Street, Lodi, WI.

### Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

1. Call To Order

*Rich Stevenson called the meeting to order at 6:39pm.*

2. Roll Call

*Commission members present: Peter Tonn, Tedd Lee, Ann Groves Lloyd, Rich Stevenson, Jennie Larson, Nick Strasser, Ken Detmer*

*Staff present: Stephen Tremlett - MSA, Zoning Administrator, Julie Ostrander - Director of Administration, Brenda Ayers – City Clerk.*

*Other: Susan Miller - Council Member, Terry Wetter – Director of Operations*

3. The Pledge Of Allegiance

4. Public Input

*None.*

5. Approve Minutes from June 9, 2020.

*Motion by Groves Lloyd, seconded by Lee, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed 7-0.*

6. Public Hearing

To consider a General Development Plan for the Top of Lodi Business Center Planned Unit Development for Parcels 11246-321 and 11246-322 (collectively 103 Pleasant Street).

*Stevenson opened the public hearing. Tremlett provided an overview of the application.*

*Mike Geothel (227 Palmer Parkway) noted the improved collaborative approach between the Mayor, applicant and the neighborhood; however, identified several issues that in his opinion were not so good. For example, no commitment to improve the exterior, no specific users for the building, impact with filling the downtown with businesses, the cost necessary to repair the building (based on school facility plan), and lack of overall vision/theme for the property. Geothel suggests denying the application.*

*Monica Johnston (508 Madison Avenue) agrees with the bulk of Mike's statements. She lives two houses down and has a "bowling alley view" of the school. She noted she can see the parking lot very easily and the amount of lights requested is more than Piggly Wiggly has around their lot. Johnston also noted that the neighborhood is mostly homeowners (vs. renters who can just not renew their lease), and most of the homes existed prior to the school being built there. For these reasons, Johnston is against the application.*

*Roger Klopp (607 Conner Street) spoke about traffic issues in the past with the school (which required one-way travel and police enforcement), lack of plan for users to occupy the building, and that the homeowners bought their property thinking it would remain a school. Klopp stated that the property owners bought the property for \$1,000 under R-1 and it should remain R-1, suggesting the owners have not lost anything in the deal. An additional comment was made regarding potential noise issues, noting similar issues around another commercial business in town.*

*Michael Miller (202 Prospect) stated he did not support the rezone because the property has been and should continue to fulfill educational and history of the City. Miller does not recognize such a small survey, noting this property is important to more than just the neighborhood. Susan Miller, himself and others want the library to use this building, which could allow the existing library facility to become the police station. He is asking for a new agreement with the property owners to support the rebirth of the City.*

*Michele Breunig (407 Sunset Drive) spoke about more than just that neighborhood cares about this property. She noted that the school district made mistakes (in this process to sell the property), resulting in the property owners and the City being stuck in this situation. Breunig feels that there has been no solidified plan created over the year since the rezone failed, and Plan Commission would not be able to revoke the rezone if not the right uses are put in the building. For these reasons, she does not support the rezone.*

*Susan Goethel (227 Palmer Parkway) discussed a past Plan Commission item for a conditional use for a young couple to run an auto repair business out of their garage that had been denied. She asked how they would approve this in her neighborhood. Goethel stated the current owners are not maintaining the property as well as the school district had. She stated this is not the answer.*

*Stevenson asked if there were any further public comment. No other attendee from the public had a statement to make. Stevenson closed the public hearing at 7:29pm.*

7. Discussion and potential recommendation to Council regarding approval of Combined General Development Plan and Specific Implementation Plan for Parcels 11246-321 and 11246-322 (collectively 103 Pleasant Street).

*Top of Lodi, LLC owners (Duane Steinhauer and Jim Duffy) stated they are available to answer questions. Stevenson asked to explain the reason for not identifying specific users. Steinhauer is reluctant to market because they only have rights to building single-family homes on the lots. He added that the users they will market can support the businesses in the downtown and the likely 30-40 people employed at the building will need to place to live. Speaking to prior comments, he stated they have maintained the building, maintained the yard, plowed snow, and cleared the hillside to maintain the retaining walls. In his opinion, the building is sound and there would need to be some updates in an 80-year-old building.*

*Steinhauer stated there have been requests for office/manufacturing, including two that day; however, he did not know if he could get them to consider Lodi over Madison property. If they saw the property (in Lodi), that would be advantageous. When told they do not have the zoning to occupy the space, they state they need it in the next few months. This has been an issue with marketing building.*

*Tonn noted the Old City Hall building is one of his favorite renovated properties with new paint, cedar material, etc. utilizing the existing windows. He agrees with comments made during the public hearing that a year has gone by and the plans still lack any improvements to the exterior. Creativity would be good for the outside of the building. Tonn asked the property owners why they do not plan for any changes to exterior.*

*Steinhauer stated he had discussed color changes to the exterior, but the owners have not come to a decision. Until they have an idea of the interior (based user's needs), they could not change windows and door locations. In response to prior statements (in the public hearing), he noted the new parking lot lights would reduce to 10% intensity when there is inactivity; roughly 40 persons employed at the site would not increase traffic (as compared to the school with 10-15 teaches and administrative staff); and, and they have maintained the empty building which is expensive.*

*Tonn stated he is sensitive to their situation, and knows their business model works in many places; however, not in this location. He feels there should be more to the plan - more creativity with the exterior and more landscaping enhancements. There should be renderings and drawings produced showing these improvements.*

*Steinhauer stated they have been spending a chunk of money maintaining an empty building, noting over a year with the requirement to wait after the last rezone denial. He stated they would see changes once they have income coming in on the property.*

*Tonn feels there should be a comprehensive look at the property/landscaping even if the changes are done later.*

*Steinhauer questioned the thinking that the building is ugly. Historic brick buildings, in his opinion, should be preserved, and he hopes to remove the section of the building that is not brick in the future. His focus through this process has been to make sure the list of uses pleases the neighborhood.*

*Stevenson asked zoning administrator (Steve Tremlett) what happens if Top of Lodi, LLC puts in a use that is not a permitted use. Tremlett responded that it could lead to a loss of the PUD zoning, reverting to R-1 zoning. Larsen asked what happens to the businesses that are there when it reverts to back to R-1 zoning. Tremlett stated the property owner and tenant would receive a cease and desist letter due to their business no longer being a permitted use. Tonn stated this dialogue is good to have and understand, but calls into question the development (alluding to the fact we are asking about a failure on the developer to occupy the building with only permitted users).*

*Larsen stated commercial is not the right use for the area and the property should stay R-1. She feels there is no vision or direction for the property. In speaking with others in the community, she noted at least six people did not sign up in time to speak in opposition at tonight's public hearing.*

*Detmer noted there have been many good points brought up during the meeting, and he feels they should table the decision for a month to allow the developer time to improve their application. Some concerns he has include parking on the hill, lack of a requirement of park space in this process, and potential drainage/erosion issue along the hillside to HWY 113.*

*Larsen stated they should have come here tonight with this all figured out. Detmer says the current GDP/SIP kicks (the issues) down the road. He believes it is important to get this right now. Lee noted the developer will have to come back later to Plan Commission to get it approved. Tonn responded that as long as they adhere to the GDP/SIP, they would not need to come back to Plan Commission.*

*Mayor Groves Lloyd noted this property and situation is difficult one, and she has concerns if this building is turned over to the City (noting current City budget issues). Mayor Groves Lloyd acknowledges the empty storefronts on Main Street, and the importance to do what is best for the neighborhood. She feels there is a need for more planning and details provided in order to move it forward.*

*Strasser stated he is open to tabling it, but feels it will likely require more than a month to make improvements to the plan.*

*Stevenson has mixed viewpoints, and he agrees with the Mayor that the City cannot afford the \$500,000-\$700,000 to tear the building down. He would like to see a positive move forward; however, he realizes that the application would fail based on tonight's dialogue. Tabling action will allow time for the developer to work with the Mayor, Zoning Administrator and others to improve the application.*

*Tonn restated that any commercial on this site should provide the neighborhood and City a home run with a well-*

*thought-out plan. To give guidance to developers, Tonn stated a commercial reuse should make the exterior fresh, providing a comprehensive site plan, architectural, landscaping plans/renderings, or teardown the building and develop residential plat with a park space (probably up to 14 lots is possible) and/or include an opportunity for cottage complex (bungalow court).*

*Some discussion amongst Plan Commission members about the timeline to bring back the item if tabled. Lee motioned to table the item for up to five months, seconded by Detmer. Motion passed 6-1 with Larsen in dissent.*

8. Discussion on Lodi Comprehensive Plan Update.

*Tabled until August 11<sup>th</sup>.*

9. Zoning Administrator Report (discussion on zoning inquires or permits approved since the last meeting, on-going City project updates, and requests for future agenda items).

*Tremlett reviewed the staff report dated July 7, 2020. There was discussion amongst Plan Commission members about restrictions on recreational vehicles in residential neighborhoods, concluding that a special temporary permit may be issued by the Lodi Police Department for up to 30 days.*

10. Adjourn

*Motion by Lee, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to adjourn. Motion passed 7-0, meeting adjourned at 8:29pm.*

Minutes by Steve Tremlett, Zoning Administrator

DRAFT