



PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that there will be a City of Lodi Plan Commission meeting held on Tuesday, March 15th, 2022 at 5:00 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 5:00 pm.

2. Virtual Etiquette Announcement
3. Roll Call

*Commission members present: Ann Groves Lloyd, Peter Tonn, Rich Stevenson, Nick Strasser, Ted Lee
Commission members excused: Ken Detmer, Jennie Larsen
Staff present: Stephen Tremlett - MSA, Zoning Administrator, Brenda Ayers – City Clerk, Terry Weter – Director of Operations (remote)*

4. The Pledge Of Allegiance

5. Public Input

None.

6. Approve Minutes from February 8, 2022.

Motion by Lee, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to approve the minutes. Motion passed 5-0.

7. Public Hearing

To consider a conditional use permit for 108 Lodi Street (parcel #11246-45) to allow the construction of a mural to be installed on the side wall that faces the public library.

Tremlett reviewed the staff report, dated March 10, 2022. The applicant (Sarah Keyeski) added the design has changed moving to wand into wander reflecting trail. Keyeski noted the update concept shows two actual children in the graphic, but the final version will be less realistic – more artsy. However, they are still finalizing the design. She also noted the request for potential refund of the application fee as a non-profit needing as much money as possible to install the mural. Ayers noted this letter will need to go to Finance Committee and Common Council for review and consideration – not through Plan Commission. Strasser, seconded by Groves Lloyd, closing the public hearing on a 5-0 vote.

8. Discuss and consider recommending Common Council approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a mural to be installed on the side wall that faces the public library at 108 Lodi Street (parcel #11246-45).

Groves Lloyd motioned, seconded by Lee, to recommend Common Council approve the conditional use permit for a mural to be installed on the side wall facing the public library at 108 Lodi Street per the conditions of approval outlined in the staff report. Groves Lloyd added she thinks the mural is beautiful idea where people can purchase a square to paint that will be assembled into one community mural. Stevenson asked if each square will be painted prior to install. Keyeski verified that is the case. Lee stated it will improve the existing bare wall.

Tonn asked if they are working with the same vendor that did the mural on the other side of the building. Keyeski confirmed that same person will cut out the squares, put the design together and install it. Tonn asked if the wall will be painted prior to install as was done on the other wall. Keyeski stated the wall will be power washed, tuckpointed, and painted.

Tonn asked about the basis for the 200 square feet maximum on the permit. Keyeski noted that the application identified a 192 SF mural, as that is the amount of money they have at this time to complete the initial maintenance of the wall and mural install. Tremlett verified he took that intended size and bumped it up to the 200 square feet with no specific intent. Tonn wondered about not putting a maximum size on the permit. He further explained how the submitted images show a mural much larger than 200 square feet, and he would not want the City to not allow the full mural to be installed. Tonn agree with the zoning administrator's conditions minus the size restriction.

Stevenson asked about the size of the mural installed on the other side of the building. Ayers verified the other mural was 450 square feet in size. Strasser stated it would be nice to install the larger version. Keyeski noted it will cost around \$9,000 to fix the wall and another \$12,000 for the mural install. Stevenson asked what the timeline to begin. Keyeski stated May 14th. Stevenson asked if the design would allow for future expansion of the mural beyond current funds. Keyeski said there would be the potential to do so.

Groves Llyod made a motion, seconded by Lee, to amend (#1) the motion under consideration by removing the

restriction on size of the mural. Strasser said this is a wonderful amendment. Motion to amend passed 5-0.

Tonn made a motion, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to amend (#2) motion under consideration to all future expansion of the mural, up to the full building wall, with approval by the Zoning Administrator. Motion passed 5-0.

Stevenson repeated the motion under consideration to approve inclusive of amendments #1 and #2. Motion passed 5-0.

9. Discussion on potential zoning amendments to remove barriers to affordable housing.

Tremlett summarized the staff report, dated March 10, 2022. Tremlett also shared a table illustrating potential amendments to the zoning ordinance to remove barriers to affordable housing (attached to these minutes). Tremlett stated he will clearly discuss the changes shown in the table exhibit for others not having a copy. Ayers noted it will also be added to the packet.

Stevenson asked if there is difference between two-family units and in-law suite for extended family. Tremlett stated it depends on how its defined in the ordinance, noting that separate utilities and/or entrance may be the clarifying factor.

Tonn asked about how cottage courts can be allowed in the ordinance, and how to differentiate between different development densities. He also wants to know how the ordinance can allow for development in the Highlands of Ridgestone PUD and other smaller lot sizes. Thirdly, Tonn asked about how areas in the older section of the City can be allowed to expand their homes without a need for expense and uncertainty of the variance process. Stevenson stated he agreed with Tonn on amending the ordinance to allow for the development that occurred in the Highlands of Ridgestone PUD. Tonn added possibly the ordinance allows for lots as narrow as 60 feet. Groves Lloyd stated these are good suggestions.

Tremlett described in more detail the proposed amendments where the residential zoning districts allow for greater density as you go from R-1 to R-3. He gave the example that single-family is permitted in all three districts with the same minimum lot size and width. In the suggested amendment the size of the single-family lot reduces in both size and width as you go from R-1 to R-2 to R-3. Tremlett also discussed reductions in setbacks that correspond with higher density and narrower lots. Per the Comp Plan policies, additional recommendations included allowing as conditional use of two-family homes in R-1 and up to four unit buildings in R-2.

Tremlett pointed out a recommended change that would allow for additions and rebuilds to match the existing structure setbacks even if its below the minimum setback threshold. Tonn asked if this would have resolved the issue with variance request for a garage addition on a residential property near the downtown. Tremlett confirmed this was the issue with the variance request and this change would allow the older homes in legally nonconforming lots to make the necessary improvements and additions to continue living where they are. Tonn noted this would streamline the process and remove add costs for the applicant and the City. Groves Lloyd liked how this may reduce the hoops needed to approve such an addition.

Stevenson asked about rezoning impacts. Tremlett noted the recommended changes to lot sizes and widths will bring most of the residential lots into conformance – likely better than the existing Traditional Neighborhood Overlay. Strasser asked if the overlay would be eliminated. Tremlett stated it would be removed as the changes to R-2 would match those established in the overlay.

Tremlett described other use changes that would allow for residential in the commercially zoned districts, noting the several calls about putting residential on the south side of Main Street behind the commercial use or below the Main Street level (on the Creekside access from the surface lot). Tonn stated a need to keep residential as a conditional use in R-3 and prohibiting on street level to maintain what is roughly a few blocks of a downtown for commercia development/uses. Stevenson noted a similar concern about maintain a commercial Main Street through the downtown and added a concern about floodplain along the back surface lot area.

Tremlett asked about next steps in the process to continue the discussion. Stevenson stated more discussion is needed before we hold a public discussion on the matter. Groves Lloyd concurred. Tonn discussed interest in sharing the zoning amendment recommendations with developers to get additional feedback.

10. 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 March 10, noting the approval of the Lodi Canning Company Site Plan permit and the landscaping plan for the circle median in the Terrace Vista Phase 2 development.

11. Adjourn

Motion by Lee, seconded by Groves Lloyd, to adjourn. Motion passed 5-0, meeting adjourned at 5:57pm.