

**Minutes
Plan Commission Meeting
January 11, 2016
7:00pm**

Chair Busse called the meeting of the City of Monona Plan Commission to order at 7:00pm.

Present: Chair Aldm. Jim Busse, Mr. Grif Dorschel, Mr. Robert Stein, Mr. Dale Ganser, Aldm. Brian Holmquist, Mr. Chris Homburg
Excused: Mr. Dennis Kugle
Also present: City Planner Sonja Reichertz

Approval of Minutes

A motion by Mr. Dorschel, seconded by Mr. Stein, to approve the minutes of December 14, 2015 carried with no corrections.

Appearances

There were no appearances.

Unfinished Business

A. Public Hearing on Request by Mary Lou Reinwand, Rosy Cheeks and Co., for Approval of a Zoning Permit for a Change in Use for a Salon and Retail Clothing Store at 6045 Monona Drive.

Mary Lou Reinwand, business owner, restated her request for approval of a zoning permit to allow two new uses in the building at 6045 Monona Drive. There were no other appearances and the public hearing was declared closed.

B. Consideration of Action on Request by Mary Lou Reinwand, Rosy Cheeks and Co., for Approval of a Zoning Permit for a Change in Use for a Salon and Retail Clothing Store at 6045 Monona Drive.

City Planner Sonja Reichertz reviewed the staff report which outlines a recommendation for approval. Mr. Homburg asked if the applicant was also purchasing the vacant parcel to the south. Ms. Reinwand replied yes. Mr. Homburg said he wanted to confirm that because some of the existing parking is located on the second parcel.

A motion was made by Mr. Homburg, seconded by Mr. Ganser to approve a zoning permit for a change in use for a salon and retail clothing store at 6045 Monona Drive, as proposed, according to Section 13-1-180 of the Monona Municipal Code of Ordinances, with the following findings of fact and conditions of approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. The available off-street parking is sufficient to accommodate all vehicles which are expected to use the premise in the normal course of events.

Conditions of Approval:

1. All required building, electrical, and plumbing permits required by the City of Monona and State Building Code shall be obtained.
2. Compliance with all City of Monona Fire Code regulations is required.
3. Future substantial exterior building alterations shall be submitted for Plan Commission review and approval.
4. Future signage for the salon and retail uses in this building shall be submitted for Plan Commission review and approval.

The motion carried.

C. Public Hearing on Request by Madan Shrestha, Swad Indian Restaurant, for Approval of a Zoning Permit for an Expansion of Use, to Expand the Existing Restaurant at 6007 A Monona Drive into the Adjacent Space at 6007 B Monona Drive and Add Seating at 8 Additional Tables.

Madan Shrestha, business owner, explained his request for a zoning permit to expand the Swad Indian Restaurant by an additional 8 tables, or 30-32 new seats. He said he received a letter written by the tenants of a neighboring property, Jeng's Asian Kitchen at 6001 Monona Drive. He explained that the property he occupies is separate from the Jeng's property. Customers will often park on either property, whether the customer is going to his restaurant or theirs. He does not have a big concern regarding this issue. The main reason he wants to expand is to provide space for more private business meetings and gatherings.

Planner Reichertz received a letter from Jamie Xiong and Jeng Tong Vu at Jeng's Asian Kitchen, 6001 Monona Drive, and read the letter aloud per their request. The letter explained that they are concerned about parking issues if Swad expands. They recently opened their restaurant and many customers have brought to their attention that parking spots are not available to them, especially on Thursday, Fridays and Saturdays. They observed that many of their parking spots would be filled, but their restaurant did not appear to be full, leaving them to assume that customers of the adjacent businesses are parking in their lot. They recommended a more strict policy for the other businesses to encourage their employees to park elsewhere to leave parking for customers.

There were no other appearances and the public hearing was declared closed.

D. Consideration of Action on Request by Madan Shrestha, Swad Indian Restaurant, for Approval of a Zoning Permit for an Expansion of Use, to Expand the Existing Restaurant at 6007 A Monona Drive into the Adjacent Space at 6007 B Monona Drive and Add Seating at 8 Additional Tables.

Planner Reichertz reviewed the staff report which recommends approval with conditions.

Mr. Ganser said that the applicants found that at any given time, there were 11 stalls available out of the 46, yet the letter from the neighbor indicates that there are customers overflowing onto their lot. He asked whether the Commission should require an agreement between the two property owners.

Mr. Homburg said there are parking issues along many properties on Monona Drive, especially where there are connected driveways. He said he feels the issue is more that there are three different uses (restaurant, office, and apartment) in the 6001 Monona Drive building, but that the Commission did determine that the parking would be sufficient when they approved a zoning permit. He feels very comfortable that 46 stalls at the Swad building are adequate to handle the tenants

using that building including the expansion of the restaurant. He encouraged Mr. Shrestha to have employees park away from the main doors. Mr. Homburg added that we do not have the legal authority as a Commission to require an agreement between the two property owners especially if we feel the 46 stalls on site are adequate for the request.

Mr. Dorschel said he feels the 46 stalls on site are adequate for the request to expand the restaurant. He would be reluctant to condition this approval upon further agreement between the property owners but would certainly be pleased if it were discussed.

Mr. Stein said he feels the site has sufficient parking for the expansion and he would encourage discussion between the property owners.

A motion was made by Mr. Homburg, seconded by Mr. Stein, to approve a zoning permit for an expansion of use to expand the existing restaurant at 6007 A Monona Drive into the adjacent space at 6007 B Monona Drive and add seating at 8 Additional Tables, according to Section 13-1-180 of the Monona Municipal Zoning Code, with the following findings of fact and conditions of approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. A shared parking agreement for the tenants in the shopping center at 6005-6013 is documented.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant shall obtain all required alcohol licenses for the expansion of the licensed premises.
2. All required building permits shall be obtained.
3. The existing shared parking agreement shall remain in effect.

Mr. Homburg said that clearly parking is a contentious issue and the Commission would really appreciate communication between the businesses and property owners, because success of each business will be better for all.

The motion carried.

New Business

A. Consideration of Action on Sign Permit Request by Jackson Hewitt Tax Service for a Special Exception to the Colors Required by the South Towne II Signage Plan, Represented by Finishing Touch Signs.

Tara Teske, Finishing Touch Signs, represented the property owner and tenant and explained that blue is the corporate brand standard for signage for Jackson Hewitt and they are requesting a variance from the signage plan that requires red faces for one of the tenant spaces at 2401 W Broadway.

Mr. Ganser said he has no problem with the color but is uncomfortable with the scale of the sign, and the mix of sign types, specifically the box cabinet sign that reads "tax service."

Chair Busse said that some of the exceptions at the South Towne Mall building were made were for large tenants considered to be anchor tenants. He said this is a much smaller space that is consistent in size with other tenant spaces in the building, and it is not an anchor tenant. He added that he found examples of Jackson Hewitt signs in other colors. Tara Teske replied that those were older signs and Jackson Hewitt is replacing them with their updated brand standard color of blue. Chair Busse said he thinks it would be more appropriate for the owner to request a change to the signage plan instead of granting a variance for one tenant.

Mr. Dorschel said he is more concerned about the form of the sign than the blue. He would like to see a better application before voting on this.

Ald. Holmquist said the tenants in this building are uniform in size, and there is one identified anchor space currently occupied by Subway who is allowed to use their corporate colors. He would like the building owner to put together a new plan. He is also concerned with the proportionality of the sign.

Mr. Homburg said he would prefer the owner to come in and have the Signage Plan revised.

Ald. Holmquist said the second line is really out of proportion and is a different type of sign (cabinet). He questioned if it was a tagline or part of the brand standards.

Tara Teske said she will approach the business about removal of the cabinet sign and enlargement of the main business identification.

A motion was made by Mr. Homburg, seconded by Mr. Dorschel to table this request. The motion carried.

B. Consideration of Action on Sign Permit Request by James Andrews, Property Owner, and Alvin Huddleston AH Graphic Arts and Signs, for a Landscape Ground Sign for the building at 6203 Monona Drive.

Alvin Huddleston, AH Graphic Arts and Signs, explained the request. He said it is a double-sided non-illuminated ground sign.

The Commission discussed the location of the proposed location in the parking lot island in relation to the property lines and ROW and asked staff to verify that the location is in ROW approved for this use, or on private property owned by the applicant.

Mr. Ganser expressed concern with the proposed materials. He said he does not consider plywood to be a permanent sign structure, and the diabond material is intended for interior use. Alvin Huddleston explained that there is a plywood core between the tenant panels for stability, which is faced with the aluminum laminated diabond material which many sign installers are now using outdoors.

Mr. Holmquist spoke about the legibility of the Martial Arts logo. He suggested removal of the red lettering to leave just the graphic.

Mr. Dorschel said he was concerned with all the different colors and font types on the sign. The yellow text on the Booth 121 sign is especially difficult to read.

Mr. Stein said the landscaping plan is weak and requested a new drawing in plan view and suggested plantings such as grasses (prairie drop seed, Karl Forester Reed Grass), daylilies, chokeberry, and spirea.

Mr. Ganser said working with a wider sign would help. Mr. Homburg added that if the sign is widened, to make sure it does not go all the way back to the edge of the island curbs. The width and location are restricted by the required 15' setback, and a few feet off the curb edges on all sides.

Mr. Homburg added that the sign needs to be constructed of quality materials that will continue to be durable for years from now and we need a reasonable landscaping plan.

A motion was made by Mr. Homburg, seconded by Mr. Ganser to table this item. The motion carried.

C. First Review of Draft “City of Monona Comprehensive Plan: 2016-2036” and Plan Commission Adoption Schedule.

Planner Reichertz explained the purpose of this first review. She outlined the process for Plan Adoption which includes three future meetings: 1) A formal presentation and public hearing at the January 25, 2016 Plan Commission meeting at which the Commission will be asked to vote on a Resolution which recommends adoption to the City Council, 2) A formal presentation and public hearing at the March 7, 2016 City Council meeting, and 3) a second reading and vote on an ordinance to adopt the Plan at the March 21, 2016 City Council meeting. Class I notices will be published in accordance with the State Statutes for the public hearings. She added that tonight, she is requesting any last revisions, questions and comments before a final draft is prepared, and asked for input on what the final presentation should include. She provided a memo with highlights of the new plan including the new future land use maps, discussions stemming from new housing data, sustainability considerations, and a new implementation element.

Chair Busse said important items to discuss with the City Council include the land use maps, sustainability, and implementation components.

Mr. Homburg shared revisions including on page 1-1 where language should be clarified regarding population projections. On page 1-9 an issue should be added regarding aging facilities. On page 6-4, construction industry data regarding Monona specifically and the County average should be clarified. On page 6-10, the Monona Grove Businessman’s Association should be added as a long standing economic development partner. On page 7-4, Dane County Regional Plan Commission should be corrected to its current name, CARPC. On page 8-3, Mr. Homburg discussed the continuance of the trend of multi-family housing. He requested the language be softened, and add that the issue is being researched as to whether this is a trend that will be good to continue for Monona. There is an error on table 8.3.

Mr. Homburg also discussed the objectives in Goal 8.1 of the Land Use Element. He said objective 8.1.2 currently reads: “encourage redevelopment projects that will have a positive impact on the city’s tax base and character.” He suggested adding a policy to clarify which projects have a truly positive impact on the tax base, noting that multi-family often uses more in services compared with other uses like commercial. He suggested adding a policy to encourage specifically commercial redevelopment projects.

Mr. Ganser said he disagrees with adding that policy. He said we need residents to support additional commercial development, so singling out only commercial would not express the true, whole picture. He said we need high density multi-family residential to support the commercial property owner’s higher property taxes. Additionally, given Monona’s landlocked challenges, he said new single-family is not possible and therefore multi-family is almost as important as commercial.

Chair Busse said multi-family can be a tax burden but it depends on the type of multi-family. If there are no children, it does not impact the school district. If there is a sprinkler system, less fire service

is needed. If it is senior housing, more paramedic service may be needed. Multi-family properties contract for their own trash service. So, in some cases it has a positive tax impact and in others it does not.

Ald. Holmquist said there are other regulatory components that guide development, probably more so than this one objective, and therefore he is okay with the way it is currently listed.

Mr. Homburg pointed out a revision on the future land use map to reduce the amount of multi-family shown around Falcon Circle.

Planner Reichertz will incorporate these changes into a final draft.

Reports of Staff and Commission Members

A. Staff Report Regarding Status of Development Project Proposals.

Planner Reichertz reported that the next meeting is January 25, 2016. The primary agenda item will be a presentation on the Comprehensive Plan and a vote will be scheduled on the resolution to recommend adoption to the City Council.

B. Plan Commission Requests for Information Concerning Development Projects.

There were no questions.

Adjournment

A motion by Mr. Dorschel, seconded by Mr. Stein, to adjourn was carried. (8:45 pm)

Respectfully submitted by:
Sonja Reichertz, City Planner