



PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that there will be a City of Lodi Plan Commission meeting held on Tuesday, December 8th, 2020 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 6:38pm.

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
Staff present: Stephen Tremlett - MSA, Zoning Administrator, Julie Ostrander - Director of Administration*

4. The Pledge Of Allegiance

5. Public Input
None.

6. Approve Minutes from November 10, 2020.

Motion by Groves Lee, seconded by Strasser, to approve the minutes. Motion passed 7-0.

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

Tremlett read the staff report outlining the request for a three-month extension by the applicant on the combined GDP/SIP for Planned Unit Development zoning. Per this report, Tremlett recommended approval of the extension, but deferred to Plan Commission for the length of the extension. Stevenson read aloud a letter submitted by resident Mike Goethel in opposition of the extension.

Stevenson stated COVID-19 has impacted the ability to find renters and for new businesses to establish, and hoped to allow an extension to give the developer a chance to find potential users.

Larsen asked, "how many extensions are we going to give?" She also asked Tremlett what this means should the extension not be granted this evening. Tremlett responded that if the extension is not granted, Plan Commission can act on the application next month, as public hearing is required prior to recommending to Council due to the lapse in time since the previous public hearing. Tonn requested clarification on the process, specifically when would the clock start prohibiting resubmittal should they deny the application. Tremlett responded that it would be from Council denying the application.

Stevenson asked the applicant to describe their process since the application was tabled back in July and what will be done if the extension is granted. Duffy stated he had been taking into consideration those items discussed at that previous meeting, as well as form discussions with Tonn, Larsen and Detmer since that meeting. He wants to focus on business development, specifically those users that want to grow their business and the City wants.

Stevenson followed up to ask if an extension would be helpful and why. Duffy responded that he would like to do more research and talk to other developers that have done similar redevelopments. He would also like to have further discussions with the City to better understand the desires and concerns for the site.

Tonn stated how over the last 18 months this development has been discussed he received just one call and that took place just three weeks ago. He does not believe COVID-19 is a reason for the request of an extension, and his concern with the development has never changed from 2019 with the need for investment into the exterior.

Duffy asked what Tonn's response was when he asked if putting \$20,000 into the outside would make the difference, noting his response was "no". Duffy also noted the last discussion he had with Tonn was about a need to improve the assessment, which had not been discussed at previous meetings.

Tonn said that (\$20,000) is not making enough of an improvement to the exterior and interior to get qualified tenants. He stated he is not looking for a slight improvement but a significant investment to lead to a successful project. Duffy stated he respected the time they have to discuss the project, and he would like to make the investment Tonn is after.

Larsen stated the applicant has had time to improve their application. She acknowledge the applicant did give her a call, but it came just a few days ago, and they did hold a neighborhood meeting to hear what they would like to

see. Larsen questioned if three months will improve the conditions we are in, referencing COVID-19 likely will still be affecting the country and the amount of vacancies that exist in downtown Lodi.

Tonn said the applicant could take a picture of the exterior and send to an architecture firm that could suggest improvements that could be made to the façade to improve the building. He mentioned how the developer that improved the old City Hall shared existing pictures and proposed improvements. Tonn stated this effort is not restricted by COVID-19, and is not the reason for no movement on improving their application.

Detmer mentioned how everyone he has talked to in the neighborhood are against this project. Tonn clarified if those who are against it were against commercial reuse for the site. Detmer stated that is what he has been hearing, and followed that response with asking if a rezone application could be presented if the property was sold to a new entity. Stevenson asked what if it were a new partner. Tremlett responded that he would need to look into the matter.

Mayor Groves Lloyd stated she concurs with the sentiment discussed and that it has been disappointing. She explained further that she remains uninspired with what has been presented thus far, but recognizes how the current market is difficult to plan around.

Stevenson noted that even if they took investors, there is not a lot of businesses looking to expand. He added that he wants to believe that three months will make a difference.

Strasser stated even though he has not been part of this entire process from the beginning, he is frustrated by this request for an extension beyond the one provided in July. He doesn't believe three more months will change things.

Tonn noted even with a denial of an extension the applicant will have a month to show an improved plan. Following this statement, Tonn made the following motion: "In the spirit of positivity and in the spirit of how it had been recommended in the staff report, I move to recommend a three-month extension." Stevenson seconded. Stevenson asked if there is any discussion. Lee clarified that it will come back before Plan Commission next month. Tremlett stated it would. Motion failed 2-5 with Mayor Groves Lloyd and Stevenson in support of the motion.

8. Discussion on Lodi Comprehensive Plan Update.

Tremlett read the staff report, which included several questions as it relates to the updated Future Land Use (FLU) Map – specifically, regarding identification of land uses outside the current City limits, proposed collector/arterial and new park locations. Detmer shared several points of concern based on an email provided prior to the meeting (to be shared in updated minutes).

Tonn sees lands on the north side Reynolds Road allowing residential or commercial under the Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) category. Detmer stated he will go along with the NMU as long as it's understood that a gas station may be restricted in this location next to an existing pump station. Larsen noted a convenience store next to the schools will likely interest students, but typically does not provide healthy food options. Tremlett noted the NMU Future Land Use category, as currently written, may allow gas stations if designed in a manner that does not impede or substantially distract from existing/planned development in the surrounding area. Stevenson noted it would be good to discourage [gas stations] based on concerns noted, but not tie the hands of future City officials [by prohibiting outright]. Mayor Groves Lloyd agrees with changing the NMU policy to discourage gas stations to not hamstringing future Plan Commissioners. All agreed to make this change.

Detmer discussed a need to change the lands owned by the Golf Club to be Park & Rec (vs. low-density residential) on the FLU map, as they do not plan to sell the land even with some recent discussions. Thus, the long-term use is and will be for future golf course expansion and use by others (e.g. Ski club). See full description provided by Detmer in the updated meeting packet.

Tonn asked how much land the Golf Club owned outside the City limits. Per discussions, it was concluded roughly 120 acres was owned by the Golf Club outside of the City limits. Detmer also noted some of the lands could not be developed due to the ditch within the wooded section. Tonn described his vision for these lands, which included all the uses described by Detmer with the addition of 50 homes. In his vision, the golf club adds three holes to allow for 6- and 12-hole options with a developer purchasing the remaining lands with agreements that preserves the woodlands for the Ice Age Trail and maintains the ski trail. The influx of money to the golf club would allow them to improve the clubhouse and to cover building the additional golf holes. Also mentioned a potential agreement to host events at the clubhouse to benefit the entire community. Tonn mentioned this vision is a reason not to blanket the entire 120 acres as Park & Open Space and would rather see a cross hatch of parks and low-density residential. Tremlett discussed an alternative option that would show it as Park & Open Space, but include a map note stating the City is open to low-density residential in this area, as long as lands are preserved for the Ice Age Trail and ski trails (especially the woodlands). Tremlett also stated this map note could allow for development that meets these criteria without a need for a Comp Plan amendment. Larsen stated she liked this idea.

Detmer discussed concerns he has for the proposed collector/arterial shown connecting Reynolds Road and CTH J, noting the expense of such a road and the difficulties to build it with multiple owners impacted. Lee noted if a road could go through it would allow for a developer to build there (such as Grothman). Detmer stated the Board [of the Golf Club] has discussed that concept, but concluded that is not a direction they intend to go at this time. Tonn stated the City needs to be proactive to present locations for additional development in the City, noting the number of homes already built off of Ottowynn Terrace. Detmer stated it needs to be clear that the

cost is on the developer and not the City. Tonn agreed. Referring back to his email, Detmer noted that the road impacts several property owners and a piecemeal road development is not practical. He mentioned a need to discuss condemnation to build any such road. Stevenson stated this road is conceptual and does not require it to be built as shown, noting potential swampy areas adjacent to CTH J that may influence its final layout if built. Detmer stated the Board [of the Golf Club] does not want to see development, and even if it were developed the numbers wouldn't work for the developer to build the road. Detmer noted the cost should be on the developer and not the City. Stevenson said the cost would be on the developer and they have been discussing this north/south connection for over a year. He would like to keep it. Tonn stated the City should be proactive and plan for this connection. Lee stated it looks good. Detmer thinks it's a distraction and unlikely to be built because it's too costly. Larsen asked Detmer if he had any suggestions of another way to provide this access. Detmer suggested moving it further west, especially if the Golf Club lands are shown as Park & Open Space. Stevenson asked Tremlett why the proposed road is shown where it is on the map. Tremlett replied that it's a conceptual layout based on what is known in regards to steep slopes and woodlands. Detmer feels we are being rushed into a decision and requested to table the discussion. Stevenson stated based on what he has heard the majority are for a conceptual road extension between Reynolds Road and CTH J as currently depicted. Larsen asked if we could label it as "Conceptual Roadway" (vs. Proposed Road). Tonn stated he would like to see that changed. All agreed that changing the label would be good.

There was brief discussion on the identified park space behind the homes on Palmer Parkway. The consensus was to add a note on lands east of the neighborhood, identifying a need for a park space to support the neighborhood (removing specific lands shown as park on the FLU map). Lee noted there might be an issue with a park in this area. Stevenson added that the Parks Commission amended the ordinance to prohibit lands over 5% grade to be dedicated as park space.

Tonn asked to see how all these changes will look. Tremlett stated these changes can be added to the full Comp Plan draft to be shared next month or possibly February dependent on the number of items next month.

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 reviewed the staff report dated December 1st, highlighting the required closure of the holiday pop-up shop at 121 Water Street because it not an allowable use in the R-2 zoning district. Tonn asked Tremlett if this enforcement was due to a complaint. Tremlett stated that was the case. Larsen stated we should shore this up next year to allow such a use in this location. During a brief discussion there appeared to be interest in finding a way to allow such as use near this location.

Tremlett also noted a potential conditional use permit request upcoming for a projecting sign; however, is interpretation of the ordinance is that if the existing sign arm will be used it would not require a CUP [as a legal non-conforming sign]. Tremlett asked if there had been a similar request since the sign ordinance has been amended. Stevenson said there has not been such a request. Tremlett asked opinions on allowing projecting signs under a certain size to be allowed without a conditional use permit. Stevenson said to bring back a recommended amendment and they would discuss it then.

Tonn asked if the discussions on Terra Vista is regarding the next phase. Tremlett stated it was for the already completed phase per conditions of approval that had not been met. Tremlett stated this concluded his highlights from the last month.

10. Adjourn

Motion by Lee, seconded by Strasser, to adjourn. Motion passed 7-0, meeting adjourned at 8:32pm.