



PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that there will be a City of Lodi Plan Commission meeting held on Tuesday, January 12th, 2021 at 6:30 pm in the Council Room, City Hall, 130 South Main Street, Lodi, WI.

In-person attendance is limited due to social distancing protocols and masks are encourage. Virtual attendees interested in speaking must register on the City's website 24 hours prior to the meeting start time.

Plan Commission Minutes

1. Call To Order

Rich Stevenson called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

2. Virtual Etiquette Announcement

3. Roll Call

Commission members present: Peter Tonn, Ted Lee, Ann Groves Lloyd, Rich Stevenson, Jennie Larson, Nick Strasser, Ken Detmer (late).

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

4. The Pledge Of Allegiance

5. Public Input
None.

6. Approve Minutes from December 8th, 2020.

Motion by Groves Lee, seconded by Lee, to approve the minutes. Motion passed 6-0.

7. Public Hearing

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

Tremlett read the staff report outlining the request for a GDP approval for Planned Unit Development zoning. Per this report, Tremlett recommended conditionally approving the GDP with the addition of a trip generation analysis and, at the City's discretion, a full Traffic Impact Analysis. Stevenson asked the applicants if they wished to speak, and Duane Steinhauer reserve his comments until after the public has a chance to speak.

Mike Goethel (227 Palmer Parkway) requested Steinhauer read his letter submitted with their application. Stevenson noted this is Mr. Goethel's chance to talk. Goethel stated the letter refutes their application, and is a battle of the business plans. Goethel read aloud portions of Mr. Steinhauer letter. He noted the applicant has been consistent on their intentions for the property from day one. Goethel said Plan Commissioners should vote on the contents of the letter, not the proposal. He ended with stating he would like them to vote "no".

Susan Goethel (227 Palmer Parkway) noted she sat in this room over two years ago when a young couple wanted to start a business out of their garage and Plan Commission denied it. Now this application does nothing with the building. She stated this plan is just smoke and mirrors.

Susie Wimmer (230 Palmer Parkway) stated she is sorry we are in this position, and feels for the owners of the building. She noted her son lived in a renovated former school building and it was a nice facility. Wimmer implored Plan Commission not allow industrial uses. She stated it would be bad for the neighborhood.

Michele Breunig (407 Sunset Drive) mentioned that no one should be shocked that we are against this. She stated that Plan Commission action had been delayed a month and the building rendering just appeared, but she does not believe this plan will come to fruition. Breunig referred to previous discussion on a couple being denied a business to run out of their home, and that the City has been going at this for two years. Additional statements were made regarding the taxpayers paying for the demolition of the school with those funds being used for other projects instead, and the district selling the property for nothing. She didn't understand why it took so long to get a plan for improving the exterior of the building and that there should be much more to the plan. Breunig read aloud her email sent previously, noting how ugly this property is as gateway to the downtown and how the applicant's other properties are not being maintained either. She hopes they do not approve the GDP, and she would be crushed if they did.

Jim Duffy (applicant) noted he is 100% behind the statements made in the letter. Duffy noted they received interest in the property, but they have had to say "no" without zoning that allows for the use. He noted young entrepreneurs [such as the young couple noted this evening] would be a great fit for the building as they only need a roof, small space and floor outlots. This can be provided right now in the building. Duffy also noted the rendering provided will make the building nice and that it will happen.

Stevenson closed the public hearing at 7:02pm.

8. Discussion and potential recommendation to Council regarding the 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 made a motion, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to recommend the GDP with the conditions of approval from the staff report.

Larsen states the GDP is just another way to turn this into a commercial complex, and this use does not fit into a residential neighborhood. She noted this type of use/building would be a better fit on the edge of the community. Larsen stated if this were a residential reuse that it would be suitable for the neighborhood. Larsen does not believe this GDP is in the public interest. Referencing back to the applicant's letter, she states, "it is not a good business strategy and it says it all." She is also concerned that the City will need to keep checking on the building to verify the business using the building are permitted uses.

Stevenson noted prior to the applicant's purchasing the property, the TIF committee identified this property for fringe commercial. Larsen said, "okay, but the public has spoken [against it]."

Stevenson noted what is presented is safeguarding the City by identifying the potential uses and requiring a future SIP submittal.

Detmer referenced the staff report resembles the same staff report from two years ago, noting specifically the statement regarding no specific users being identified and that it is not necessary as a condition of approval. He stated nothing has changed since this initial staff report two years ago. Detmer stated he voted to approve at Council last time, but there are issues noted by the neighborhood that have not been dealt with. He is also concerned about the constant monitoring that likely will be needed; referencing the deed for Parcel 323 never was recorded, and the use of the building for uses not allowed under the current zoning for the property (remote control car association). Detmer feels separating the GDP and SIP is a mistake to allow the application to move forward with a lack of substance in it. He is not in favor of the GDP.

Lee stated he heard from four neighbors and none were in favor of this plan.

Tonn, referencing the previous meeting minutes, noted we have a building rendering because he stated they could and should have done this a minimum effort to improve the application. He also felt separating the GDP from the SIP is just a way to approve a document with limited information, and this opens the door for the SIP to get approved based on GDP approval. Tonn stated PUD generally is for new development where there are no existing buildings; however, in this case no new development is taking place. Following up on Stevenson's comments, Tonn noted he was on the TIF Committee that identified the fringe commercial that could be commercial or residential and assumed redevelopment of the site.

Strasser agrees with the other comments made, specifically the notion that separating the GDP and SIP allows the applicant to "divide and conquer". He noted he cannot get past the overwhelming feelings from the neighborhood interest in residential and the amount of already open commercial space in the downtown. Strasser says he cannot find his way to a "yes" vote.

Larsen, reading the description for the Comp Plan's Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) description, questioned how that general land use fits the area, Tremlett clarified that the Comp Plan's NMU designated had been approved by Plan Commission and Council two years ago.

Mayor Groves Lloyd stated this is hard decision. She sees the Top of Lodi property and the downtown spaces a complementing each other, providing space for different users. Groves Lloyd also felt the downtown is just about out of office space, and this development could provide space for office. If office is brought to this property, there are opportunities for increased shopping in the downtown by its tenants. She empathizes with the property owners needing zoning to market and lease the building. Groves Lloyd also mentioned the property owners have kept the building heated without any revenue coming in. At the same time, Groves Lloyd empathizes with the neighborhood wanting residential and interest in more visionary plan.

Tonn noted that Mayor Groves Lloyd want the world to be awesome, and he understands and know she really does empathize with the applicant and the neighborhood. There is risk with being a developer and paying for utilities without zoning is a business cost. Tonn discussed another property in the City (rec center) that reused a building without all the users and now it is a successful development. He also mentioned that you can gain interest in the building without having zoning already approved.

Stevenson asked if the Top of Lodi partners (Jim/Duane) would like to speak. Duane Steinhauer stated he listened carefully at this and past meetings. Their business plan is to take buildings and make them useful and successful. He noted a specific business that is looking for space and that he would love to offer the space in Lodi. In reference to Tonn's comments, Steinhauer noted the rec center were given the necessary zoning, and in his experience marketing a building without zoning is a fool's errand. He does not want to waste the time of the potential user or his own time. Steinhauer also noted that Plan Commission created the C-3 zoning district with this property in mind prior to Top of Lodi even purchasing the properties. He is prepared to the possibility of a "no" vote tonight, and understands many don't want them in here. However, they have invested in the property and they would like to fill the building to be something positive. In reference to the renderings, he noted that the exterior improvements are possible but there are currently no resources to complete them until they have users.

Larsen clarified that the rec center was already zoned commercial, so it is not comparable. Tonn noted they did not have tenants, but remodeled it knowing they would fill the space over time.

Stevenson believes the GDP gives an opportunity for reuse of the property with a more limited uses (than C-3),

and outlines guidelines to follow, including requiring them to come back for an SIP.

Motion by Stevenson, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to recommend to Council conditional approval of the GDP per staff report failed 1-6.

Motion by Stevenson, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to recommend to Council disapproval of the GDP. Motion passed 7-0.

9. Public Hearing

To consider proposed amendment to Chapter 278 (Signs) of the City of Lodi Ordinances to allow projecting signs by right (0-12 square feet in size).

Public hearing opened at 7:50pm. Tremlett read the staff report. No one from the public wished to speak. Stevenson closed the public hearing at 7:55pm.

10. Discussion and potential recommendation to Council regarding amendment to Chapter 278 (Signs) of the City of Lodi Ordinances to allow projecting signs by right (0-12 square feet in size).

Tremlett answered a couple clarifying questions. Groves Lloyd likes the signs shown in the staff report to document projecting signs no greater than 12 square feet in size. Motion by Detmer, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to recommend to Council approval of the sign ordinance amendment. Motion passed 7-0.

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

Tremlett read the December zoning administrator report, dated January 4th, highlighting the two projecting signs approved in the downtown and discussion regarding a potential expansion of the Lodi Valley Dental building.

12. Adjourn

Motion by Lee, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to adjourn. Motion passed 7-0, meeting adjourned at 8:02pm.

APPROVED