

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, July 12, 2010

Administrative Center – County Board Room

7:10 p.m. – 7:49 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dave Eilertson (Vice-Chair), Terry Houlihan
MEMBERS EXCUSED: None
MEMBERS ABSENT: Howard Raymer, Jr.
OTHERS PRESENT: Nate Sampson, Chad VandenLangenberg (minutes)

CALL TO ORDER

Dave Eilertson., Committee Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. Let the record show that this meeting is called in full compliance with the requirements of Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

APPEAL NO. 2010-31 Ronald E & Sue M Remus, W8356 Northshore Dr, Onalaska, WI 54650, on behalf of Alan Dutton, 1054 Canary Ln, Onalaska, WI 54650. Permit denied to construct a 16-ft X 8-ft sign 14-ft tall that will lie within the required 83-ft setback from the centerline of County Road ZN. Property described as: Part of the NE-NE, Section 25, T17N, R8W. Tax parcel 10-2030-3. Property Address is W7367 County Road ZN. Town of Onalaska.

Appearing in favor: Sue Remus, W8356 Northshore Dr, Onalaska, WI 54650.

We want to put up a new sign that is 8-ft by 16-ft and 14-feet high. It is in the corner of Alan Dutton's property and will be within the required setback.

QUESTION Eilertson: What is the sign going to say? What will it be for?

ANSWER Remus: This is the sign that was located at the corner of County Z and ZN. Fish and Wildlife made us take it down as it was on their land now. It is a sign for advertising different businesses, a realtor, Remus Battery and others.

QUESTION Eilertson: So, there will be multiple tenants.

ANSWER Remus: Yes, there will be four. Four, four by eight signs.

QUESTION Eilertson: When we toured the property, it appeared that it was staked inside the fence, is that correct?

ANSWER Remus: Yes.

QUESTION Houlihan: Could this sign be moved to meet the setback? Is there somewhere that you can put it where it will comply?

ANSWER Remus: No, not really because of the building that is there. It is a little deceiving from the picture and he has overhead doors on that end.

Appearing in favor: Ron Remus, W8356 Northshore Dr, Onalaska, WI 54650.

There is an overhead door right in here and they have to drive out. Where his lot line is it is 35 feet. The fence is not in the right area and is off. There is a driveway easement through here and the fence is off-center.

REMARKS Sue Remus: We would have to move it an additional 20 feet or so to meet the required setback.

REMARKS Sampson: The required setback would be 83 feet from centerline.

REMARKS Sue Remus: And it is at 56 feet as proposed.

QUESTION Houlihan: Is the darker area an open field?

ANSWER Ron Remus: Yes.

QUESTION Houlihan: Would it be possible to put it in that field?

ANSWER Ron Remus: Probably. But, not as good of a vision.

QUESTION Eilertson: So, the reason that it is offset into the corner is for the traffic that will be going in and out of there? And the fence will come down then?

ANSWER Ron Remus: Yes. The fence will be moved over to keep his property fenced. The other black mark in the other spot is designated for a future road into there. At the entrance to the road there is good vision both ways. The building is vacant. Along the road you can't see to the left.

Appearing in opposition: None

Correspondence: None. The Town of Onalaska Plan Commission meets tonight.

REMARKS Sue Remus: We did get a letter from the town and I contacted them. I asked if they wanted to split up and they said no. They have a meeting scheduled for us on the 27th.

REMARKS Sampson: I believe that is the board meeting, they were on the agenda for tonight's plan commission meeting.

Motion Houlihan/Eilertson to approve with the condition that the town has to approve the variance with any stipulations that the town may have.

2 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.

APPEAL NO. 2010-32 Mark Koller, 123 10th Ave S, Onalaska, WI 54650; on behalf of Dawson Park, LLC, 1821 Acorn Ct, Onalaska, WI 54650. Permit denied to construct a 10-ft X 15-ft four (4) inch sign that will lie within the required 50-ft setback from the right-of-way of Dawson Ave. (County Road B). Property described as: Lot 2 of Certified Survey Map No. 101 in Volume 14. Property Address is 1900 Bainbridge St. Town of Campbell.

Appearing in favor: Mark Koller, 123 10th Ave. S, Onalaska, WI 54650.

We are in a contract to purchase this land with American Marine. We would immediately start to move some dirt around and we would like to get this sign started. All indications are that we can build a church on this land. It is zoned Agricultural District A. If you see where the sign is over there, we would like a 25 foot setback. Our parking lot will go just up to the setback. Our building will be here and the parking lot will be along here. The rest of this is holding and retention ponds. There are trees here and we would like to keep as many trees as possible. We would like to have a sign directing people into our parking lot. A 50 foot setback would be a hardship. We don't know any other place where a sign would be seen unless we put it in the parking lot. The rest of the lot will be parking lot and holding ponds and we would like to keep as much green space as possible. This will be an attractive sign, all brick on both sides with the name of the church.

QUESTION Eilertson: The size of your proposed building is around 6000 to 7000 square feet?

ANSWER Koller: Yes, approximately 6000.

QUESTION Eilertson: What is your opinion of your parking to building size ratio?

ANSWER Koller: I think that we have 81 parking stalls. Dawson Park received a variance for this fence here.

QUESTION Eilertson: Our research of the site plan, it appears that you have twice the designated parking, assuming we apply the commercial zoning parking requirements to this property. Those requirements are that for each square foot of building you would provide one square foot of parking. So, you would need 6000 to 7000 square feet of parking. Your site plan shows approximately 13,167 square feet devoted to parking or twice what would be required if this was zoned commercial. Why can't you take one parking space and devote it to the sign. Lots of other businesses do this.

ANSWER Koller: If we did that and cars were parked next to the sign, the sign would not be seen very well.

QUESTION Eilertson: When would people be attending services?

ANSWER Koller: Sunday mornings and Wednesday night.

QUESTION Eilertson: Other than that, the parking lot would be virtually empty, most of the time.

ANSWER Koller: Yes. The people that build these, from their perspective, this is the amount of parking spaces we need. They told us that 60 parking spaces were not enough.

QUESTION Eilertson: When you applied for the variance, did you receive one of these sheets.

ANSWER Koller: Yes.

REMARKS Eilertson: These are a set of standards that the state asks us to follow. The problem that we have is that in the truest sense, this is a self-imposed hardship. You have plenty of other room. The board is violating one of their standards by granting a variance for something that we have an alternative solution for.

REMARKS Koller: But, if it is in the parking lot, the sign won't be seen.

REMARKS Eilertson: There are only a few hours of time during a given week where it won't be seen. There are plenty of other businesses that devote parking spaces for their signs. This is a common practice.

REMARKS Koller: When people are most trying to find the church will be during our services, the same time when cars will be parked in the lot and covering up the sign.

REMARKS Eilertson: My business is located at 300 N. 2nd Street and right in the middle of our parking lot is our sign that they have elevated that advertises all of the professionals in the building. Another alternative would be to elevate the sign so that it is more visible. We aren't trying to be difficult, but we have these standards. If you were a homeowner and were requesting a variance to build a new house, you would be denied here about 99% of the time. I know that this is not a residence, but our standards need to be consistent.

REMARKS Houlihan: I would agree with that, Dave. We have the rules we live by and I have to agree that the sign could be put in the parking lot, raised if necessary.

REMARKS Koller: The Town of Campbell did not have a problem with it and they approved it. I know that it doesn't matter what others have done, but just in that section there, there are many others which are closer than 27 feet.

REMARKS Eilertson: I realize that a church has to have a sign. We are not trying to be difficult, but, we are held accountable. If you just follow the standards and read them, this isn't meeting several of the standards that we are supposed to adhere to.

REMARKS Koller: I do not believe that this is a self-imposed hardship. I think that we need the parking spaces. It would be best if we didn't put a sign in the parking lot and that it would be more visible as proposed.

Appearing in favor: James Naleid, 4815 Stanley Ct., LaCrosse WI, 54601.

I would like to speak in favor of the sign. A couple of things that are unique to this property. Along County Road B there is a culvert that dips approximately 3.5 feet and is 18 feet wide. When we looked at the trees on the south end of the property, it is our desire to leave as many as possible. Those trees could hinder the visibility of the sign, depending on its location. We looked at the measurements today. Across Dawson there is a sign that is 26 feet from the road. There is another sign within 13 feet from the corner. The sign at Olivet is at 18 feet and the other one is 30 feet. The Rivercrest Appartments sign is at 13 feet. We didn't think that this would be a problem for people that travel that road regularly. Quite frankly, this will be a nicer sign along that stretch of road than those I just mentioned.

REMARKS Koller: I think what Jim said is true, if we put the sign out closer into the variance, we may save some trees. If we can't, some of those trees may need to come down.

Appearing in Opposition: None.

Correspondence: No Correspondence.

**Motion Houlihan/Eilertson to deny the appeal.
2 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Motion by Frank/Eilertson to Adjourn at 7:49pm.
2 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**