

Plan Commission Minutes
March 14, 2022
Approved March 28, 2022

Minutes
City of Monona
Plan Commission
Monday March 14, 2022

The meeting of the City of Monona Plan Commission was called to order (7:08 pm).

Present: Alder Nancy Moore (Chair), Mr. Robert Stein, Mr. Chris Homburg, Ms. Susan Fox, Mr. Patrick DePula, Ms. Coreen Fallat, Mr. Brian Holmquist

Excused: Alder Kristie Goforth

Also Present: Doug Plowman, City Planner, Elisa Guerrero, Planning Intern

Approval of Minutes

A motion by Ms. Fallat, seconded by Ms. Fox, to approve the minutes of February 28, 2022 carried with no corrections.

Appearances

Jerry Thompson (306 Owen Road), spoke in opposition to the Slinde Realty Company proposal, expressing concerns about increased traffic along Owen Road and neighborhood safety.

Felicia Wagner (302 Owen Road), spoke in opposition to the Slinde Realty Company proposal because of concerns about neighborhood safety and how a population increase from the new development would affect City services and schools. She also expressed concern that there would be no zoning buffer between the multi-family development and single-family homes, and that the Post Office would close because of the development.

John Etzler (5805 Anthony Place), spoke in opposition to the Slinde project, saying that traffic would significantly increase and expressing concern that the Traffic Impact Analysis conducted did not accurately reflect the real increase in traffic that would occur.

Unfinished Business

A. Public Hearing on Request by Dave Jones, Inc. for Approval of a Zoning Permit for Site Modifications to expand their Corporate Campus at 2101 Industrial Drive. (Case No. 2-002-2022)

Mr. Homburg recused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Blake Herbert and Mr. Dylan Douglas, representing Dave Jones Inc., described the campus expansion proposal, explaining that the plan was to convert the existing warehouse into a training facility for new employees to prepare them for careers in the trades. The building would house training classrooms and some office space for staff, along with space outside for equipment-related training. The parking lot would be reconfigured and resurfaced to have 60 parking stalls, which would be sufficient space for the classes of about 25 students that they expected to have in the building at a time. A shed would also be added to the site for storage.

B. Consideration of Action on Request by Dave Jones, Inc. for Approval of a Zoning Permit for Site Modifications to expand their Corporate Campus at 2101 Industrial Drive. (Case No. 2-002-2022)

Mr. Plowman shared the staff report, mentioning that the site was zoned CDD and that site landscaping and water quality had been discussed at the prehearing conference. There would be a maximum of 60 occupants daily, with no work vehicles parked on site, so parking was considered adequate. The landscaping and lighting plans met all requirements, although it was recommended that staff review plans for the proposed fence and storage shed. Other exterior improvements were also proposed, along with the possibility of a rooftop solar array.

Mr. Darrin Pope, the City's consulting engineer, joined the meeting to provide feedback on the stormwater plan that was submitted. There was some discussion about using the regional basin, which may alter their plans, although this can likely still be considered administratively.

The Commission members were generally supportive of the proposal and liked the proposed landscaping plan. The Commission members felt that changes to the stormwater plans could be reviewed and approved by staff, in consultation with Mr. Pope. There was some discussion of the location of the ADA parking stalls, whether they should be left as proposed or moved closer to the building entrance. The applicant explained that the location was chosen so that they were accessible to the new training building and adjacent Dave Jones corporate building. Alder Moore expressed support for rooftop solar on the building.

The Commission discussed the need for bike parking on the site, recognizing that there were not likely to be many people arriving by bike in such an industrial area. Ms. Fallat and Mr. Stein said they would prefer to see some bike parking, in case some employees biked and because of the site's proximity to the Capital City Trail.

A motion was made by Ms. Fallat, seconded by Mr. DePula, to approve a Zoning Permit for a new use and construction at 2101 Industrial Drive, as proposed and according to Chapter 480-55 of the Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances with the following conditions of approval:

Conditions of Approval:

1. All required state and local building permits shall be obtained.
2. A City of Monona standard stormwater facilities maintenance agreement ("Declaration of Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions for Maintenance of Stormwater Management Measures") modified specifically for this site shall be submitted for approval by the city's consulting engineer prior to approval of stormwater and erosion control permits.
3. Erosion control and stormwater management permit applications shall be submitted to the city's consulting engineer for review and approval prior to the granting of building permits.
4. The applicant shall respond to the comments from the review letter dated 03.07.2022 prior to building permits being issued. These revisions shall be reviewed by the city's consulting engineer, with final approval by City Staff.
5. The applicant shall coordinate with the City's Public Works Department to obtain a right of way permit for proposed driveway improvements beyond the property line.
6. Separate sign permits shall be obtained from the Plan Commission for any new signage at the site.

7. Details on the storage shed and fencing shall be submitted to City Staff for approval prior to the issuance of building permits.
8. The planned condensers shall be appropriately screened with final approval by City Staff.
9. Final stormwater approvals shall be managed by City Staff.

A friendly amendment was proposed by Mr. Holmquist and agreed to by Ms. Fallat and Mr. DePula, to add condition number ten:

10. The applicant shall include electrical conduit for electric vehicles, with final approval by City Staff.

The motion carried 6-0. (Mr. Homburg abstained)

C. Public Hearing for the Slinde Realty Company on Request for Approval of a General Development Plan (GDP) for the site located at approximately 112-208 Owen Road, for a Mixed-Use Development. (Case No. 2-027-2021)

Mr. Burrow presented the plans, noting that they had reduced the overall unit count by 3 units, since the Commission had previously asked for a reduction in density. With the revised count, the project met City parking requirements and could incorporate more community gathering space and rooftop common areas. Energy efficiency and clean energy improvements included adding electric vehicle charging stalls to phase 1 (with more likely in phase 2), bike parking and e-bike charging stations, and roughing out for rooftop solar.

The site circulation plans showed how the post office would be able to stay open throughout construction of phase 1, so that there would be no gap in service. The landscaping plan had been updated to include more canopy trees. Mr. Slinde emphasized that the TIA had been conducted by a separate firm, meaning that Slinde Realty had no influence over the findings included in the analysis.

D. Consideration of Action for the Slinde Realty Company on Request for Approval of a General Development Plan (GDP) for the site located at approximately 112-208 Owen Road, for a Mixed-Use Development. (Case No. 2-027-2021)

Mr. Plowman shared the staff report, mentioning that the site had been rezoned from Retail Business to Community Design District to allow for a phased development. The plans presented were for a GDP, and a PIP for phase 1 would be submitted later. At previous prehearings, the Commission had decided that the green space proposed was appropriate given the additional landscaping included. The Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted in February and showed limited impact on the existing intersections. Phase 1 would include 50% units restricted to tenants making 50-80% of area median income. with the slight reduction in density, parking requirements were now met, and landscaping points had been increased.

Mr. Homburg addressed some of the concerns posed by residents, explaining that the site was better suited for mixed-use development than retail or single-family, because it is setback from Monona Drive and surrounded by other commercial or multi-family uses. The zoning in the area is stepped from multi-family to two-family to single-family, to buffer single-family homes from multi-family buildings. Additionally, Mr. Homburg, Mr. DePula, and Mr. Holmquist commented that adding more apartments would not necessarily equate with more safety concerns in the neighborhood. Mr. Homburg, Mr. Holmquist and Ms. Fox said property

management and providing good amenities would help foster a good community in the development, which would be more important for reducing any concerns over neighborhood safety.

Mr. Stein, Mr. Homburg and Alder Moore said they would like to see more articulation in the building's architecture, so that the buildings did not feel so massive next to the adjacent two-story buildings. Alder Moore expressed support for the bike parking, and e-bike and EV charging, in addition to roughing out for rooftop solar.

Mr. Homburg, Ms. Fallat, Mr. Holmquist, Mr. Stein, Ms. Fox, and Alder Moore commented that the proposed density still felt too high for the site. Specifically, they worried that there was not sufficient parking to accommodate both residents and visitors. This was concerning since street parking in the area was already considered tight, and not having sufficient parking might deter people from wanting to live in the development long-term. Mr. Holmquist asked what the density of the adjacent senior living communities were, and Ms. Guerrero said that Heritage Senior living had a density of 48 units/acre and Frost Woods Senior Living had a density of 34 units/acre.

Mr. DePula said that while he thought density was still a little high, he was willing to consider a higher density because of the workforce housing component of the development. Ms. Fox noted that the target tenant for 50-80% area median income would be professionals like teachers, paramedics, bankers, etc. She also agreed that she might be willing to consider higher density because of the workforce housing included in the development.

The Commission discussed what a more appropriate density for the site would be with the developer and what would be appropriate to include in a recommendation to Council given area comparables. Mr. Homburg and Mr. Stein commented that if the Plan Commission set a density that they felt appropriate, then the applicant could come back with plans for that density or propose a slightly higher density for the commission to consider.

A motion was made by Mr. Homburg, seconded by Mr. Stein, to recommend that the Monona City Council approve a General Development Plan (GDP) Slinde Realty Company for a 161-unit mixed-use development with ground floor commercial space, as proposed and according to Chapter 480-37 of the Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances with the following findings of fact and conditions of approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed plans are submitted for review under Section VI of the Zoning Code for Planned Community Developments, which expects that the planned community development tool will be used to encourage more imaginative site planning, to assist in achieving more rational and economic development with relationship to public services, to permit optimum development of land.
2. The Plan Commission has determined that sufficient information has been submitted to determine acceptability of the proposed General Development Plan in terms of its character, its use pattern, its intensity of use, its economic, environmental, and service impact, and such other factors as would be pertinent to such basic decision prior to the preparation of detailed engineering, architectural and landscape architectural plans in accordance with standards listed in Section VI.

Conditions of Approval:

1. No construction under this General Development Plan may be permitted except in conformity with precise development plans approved under Article VI of the Zoning Code.
2. City Council approval the General Development Plan is required per Article VI of the Zoning Code.
3. The maximum density shall be 40 dwelling units/acre.
4. A second access point shall be added for a southern entrance to the northern building in the proposed phase 2 from the proposed common driveway.

The motion carried unanimously.

New Business

None

Reports of Staff and Commission Members

A. Staff Report Regarding Status of Development Project Proposals.

1. Economic Development Update

Mr. Plowman shared that the Neutral Project was working on a TIA for the Bloom project and would likely come back before the Commission in late April.

2. Potential Upcoming Plan Commission Items

Upcoming items included a possible sign and zoning permit for a new business, the zoning permit for GO Riteway and a possible prehearing for a development on one of the Whitehorse property lots.

3. Updates/Discussion on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Efforts

Mr. Plowman shared that the Dane County Planning office was launching a webpage for their equity and inclusion efforts, to educate people about some local planning history and their own efforts.

Alder Moore shared that City Council members and staff were attending the Nehemiah Black History for a New Day course and that residents were encouraged to take the course if they were able.

4. Updates/Discussion on Sustainability Efforts

Alder Moore said that the Sustainability Committee would be hosting their second annual Earth Day electronics recycling event on April 23rd at Ahuska Park and that all were invited.

5. Upcoming Meetings: March 28, 2022, April 11, 2022.

B. Plan Commission Requests for Information from City Staff.

Mr. Homburg and Mr. Holmquist asked about the buffer used when mailing notices and if the City could place stake signs at sites being considered for development. Mr. Plowman said that addresses in a 200' radius of a site were sent notices for a development proposal, and that the City might consider placing stake signs as another way of noticing a project.

Mr. Homburg asked about the progress being made on the Chipotle development at 6501 Monona Drive. Mr. Plowman said that construction was expected to proceed this spring when the weather improved.

Adjournment

A motion by Mr. Stein, seconded by Ms. Fox, to adjourn carried. (9:16pm)

Respectfully submitted by:
Elisa Guerrero, City Planning Intern