



PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that there will be a City of Lodi Plan Commission meeting held on Tuesday, August 10th, 2021 at 6:30 pm in the Council Room, City Hall, 130 South Main Street, Lodi, WI.

Plan Commission Minutes

1. Call To Order

Rich Stevenson called the meeting to order at 6:48pm.

2. Virtual Etiquette Announcement

3. Roll Call

Commission members present: Peter Tonn, Rich Stevenson, Ann Groves Lloyd, Nick Strasser, Ted Lee, Ken Detmer

Commission member excused: Jennie Larson

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

4. The Pledge Of Allegiance

5. Public Input
None.

6. Approve Minutes from July 13th, 2021.

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

7. Consider recommendation to Council approving New Life Christian Church CSM to amend lot lines of Parcels 11246-66.02 and 11246-195.B.

Tremlett reviewed the staff memo, dated August 3, 2021. Stevenson asked if the rear setback is met in this design. Tremlett confirmed it does meet the rear setback on both lots. Motion by Tonn, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to recommend approval by Council. Motion passed 6-0.

8. Consider approving New Life Christian Church General Development and Architectural Design Review applications to build an addition to the Church and pave the on-site parking lot.

Tremlett reviewed the staff memo, dated August 5, 2021. Stevenson asked if the gravel parking lot existed in the current extents over the last 10+ years.

Mitchell Falk (president/pastor at New Life Christian Church) stated it had been in the current extents since the Church purchased the property in 2001, and the lot to the west had been the Church's property but was sold off. Falk noted the recent survey showed the parking lot is in fact over the property line, and if a variance is granted would correct this issue. He also mentioned that a reduction of the lot to meet the 15-foot setback will question if the improvement is worth the money (considering the reduced number of spaces that would result).

Tonn asked what the surface of the new lot would be. Falk stated it would be asphalt.

Detmer asked the zoning administrator if they do nothing would they be able to retain the full lot. Tremlett stated since they are now aware of the non-compliance, this expansion project would warrant meeting the current regulations.

Tonn asked if there are current issues with parking onsite. Falk stated there has not been an issue, noting everyone pulls in together and leave sporadically or wait their turn to leave.

Stevenson asked where parishioners park currently, and if any use the existing lot. Falk noted that attendance is down during the pandemic with 20-30 persons with 30-40 pre-pandemic, and roughly half use the parking lot with the others using street parking. He noted that some do not use the lot because its not accessible and dirties people's shoes. Falk also mentioned that there are future plans to build additional parking in the lot just south of the Church. Groves Llyod stated this would be a good addition.

Tonn asked if four disabled parking spaces would be beneficial, as the original design showed that many spaces. Falk stated at least one would use it with some others that utilize walkers that may also use the

spaces. Tonn asked zoning administrator if a variance can be granted to the applicant, which Tremlett responded that a variance is reviewed and granted through the Board of Appeals.

Groves Lloyd and Stevenson asked for clarification on the purpose of a fence in zoning administrator's report. Tremlett responded that the fence would mitigate the visual impact of a parking lot that would be close or at the property line (not meeting the setback requirement). Groves Lloyd did not believe a fence is necessary.

Tonn noted he favored allowing the parking lot closer than the 15 feet requirement because the Church was built at least 50 years ago and the parking lot existed, paving it would be a huge improvement, and increased accessibility is a good thing. Tonn also noted there are other properties in the City that are in similar situation [referring to parking up to or close to the property line].

Stevenson recommending the applicant request a variance for a reduced setback. Tonn agreed that some distance less than 15 feet should be considered in this case. Detmer stated as the Chair of Board of Appeals he would like to avoid it going to the Board of Appeals, noting the stringent conditions require to allow for a variance.

Stevenson asked the applicant if any delay in this process will hinder their plans to move forward. Falk stated he had held off on submitting any drawings for State permits but intends to move forward with the project this Fall; however, he also noted builders are quite busy at this time.

Tremlett asked if Plan Commissioners are looking for a potential zoning ordinance amendment that allows for a reduced setback (from residentially zoned property) for existing developed lots, but maintain this setback requirement for new lots. Groves Lloyd noted the nodding heads around the table suggest that is something Plan Commission would like the zoning administrator to look into.

Motion by Groves Lloyd, seconded by Detmer, to recommend approval by the zoning administrator should the design meet the requirements in the zoning code at the time of said approval. Motion passed 6-0.

Tonn added that is happy how this process worked with our third-party zoning administrator working with the applicant, identifying something that does not quite fit the code, brings it to Plan Commission, and through a conversation found a direction that is amenable to all involved. Stevenson asked the zoning administrator what the cost would have been if the applicant was required to request a variance. Tremlett stated it would have cost \$800 for a variance request at the Board of Appeals.

9. 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 highlighted items in the July zoning administrator report, dated August 2nd. Tonn asked the zoning administrator if the zoning ordinance includes the necessary language to allow for accessory dwelling units. Tremlett stated there is language that allows for accessory dwelling units if the zoning designation allows for it, specifically the zoning classification needs to allow for more than one unit. For example, R-1 would not allow for a two-unit structure so a parcel would need to be rezoned to R-2 to allow for the accessory dwelling unit.

10. Adjourn

Motion by Lee, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to adjourn. Motion passed 6-0, meeting adjourned at 7:58pm.

Drafted by:
Steve Tremlett, City Zoning Administrator