

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Regular Meeting**

DATE: March 4, 2020

TIME: 5:00 p.m.

PLACE: City Council Chambers, City Hall

PRESENT: Buege, Breza, Conway, Kouba, Krofchalk, Murphy

ABSENT: Sanchez

Acting Chairman Kouba called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

The minutes from the February 5 & 19, 2020 minutes were approved by Tim Breza and seconded by Jon Krofchalk. All were in favor of approving the minutes.

Petition No. 20-10-V, Mario & Sheryl Einsman

Mario & Sheryl Einsman – City Code Section 43.02.24 Table 43-4 Site Dimension Standards which require a front yard setback of 25 feet (25') and side yard setbacks of 10 feet for two-family dwellings two and one-half stories in height. Applicant is proposing use of an existing structure which is approximately six feet (6') from the front property line and three feet (3') from the southerly side property line.

43.02.23 Table 43-3 Lot Dimension Standards which requires a lot frontage of 65 feet (65') and a lot area minimum of 8,000 square feet for two-family dwellings. Applicant is proposing use of a lot which is to be 60 feet by 100 feet (60'x100') totaling 6,000 square feet with a frontage along Grand Street of 60 feet (60').

43.03.22(A) Table 43-17, which requires two automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit. Applicant is proposing use of an existing structure which currently provides two automobile spaces in total. Property is described as R-2 zoning, Sect-22, Twp-107, Range-007, ORIGINAL PLAT, Lot-005, Block-120, ORIGINAL PLAT SLY 60', or at 360 Grand Street.

Mario Einsman, 307 West Sanborn, addressed the Board. Mr. Einsman said this is a rental property adjacent to another parcel that he owns. Currently, the property is certified for five unrelated persons and the property is very distressed. Mr. Einsman said he wants to convert the property to a two unit rental rather than

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

March 4, 2020

PAGE 2

A question was brought up about parking and there are currently two parking spaces with room in an existing garage to accommodate parking for a bicycle which is accordance with the ordinance.

Jim Murphy asked how many occupants Mr. Einsman said he was looking at three people in each unit being proposed.

There was some discussion about combining part of the adjacent lot that Mr. Einsman owns and the lot he is proposing and making it more conforming and possibly putting in more parking. There was also some discussion about the use of the properties.

Jim Murphy commented that his proposal for a two family dwelling is much more marketable and makes more sense to get them rented rather than trying to rent to five total people in one single family home.

There being no others who desired to speak, Acting Chairman Kouba closed the public hearing and opened it up for discussion.

Jon Krofchalk commented that the impact of keeping it at three unrelated in one and two in other is no different than having it at a total of five right now. The property is in distress and needs updating and the renovation of it will improve the aesthetics and make it more appealing.

The Board went through the variance finding questions and question number one asked if the variance was in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance? Yes, it is better and it is still R-2 zoning and there will be parking available. The application is much more conducive split up as a duplex instead of a single family dwelling.

Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, same use. Same amount of people. No change to the way the building is being used.

Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, it is still R-2 residential.

Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, lot size is a consideration.

Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality? Yes, it is residential. The number of people will not change.

Jon Krofchalk made a motion to approve the variance with the conditions that there is a maximum of 5 occupants split between the two units and sheltered bike parking according to the ordinance and it was seconded by Jim Murphy. All were in favor of approving the request with the conditions.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

March 4, 2020

PAGE 3

Petitioner was informed that there was a 10-day appeal period during which time no action could be taken on the petition.

Petition No. 20-11-V, Nick Newman/Kwik Trip

Nick Newwan/Kwik Trip – City Code Section 43.03.78(IA)(1), which is a use-specific standard that prohibits standalone parking lots located within 50 feet (50') of residential districts. The applicant is proposing a standalone, non-structural parking located at 262 High forest Street to provide employee parking for the existing business located at the adjacent 770 East 6th Street. Property is described as R-2 zoning, Sect-25, Twp-107, Range—007, HAMILTON ADDITION, Block-041, 50' ON HIGH FOREST ST BY 62½, or at 262 High Forest.

Nick Newman, Kwik Trip, 1626 Oak Street, Lacrosse, WI addressed the Board. Mr. Newman said that Kwik Trip would like to take the piece of property located at 262 High Forest in Winona and turn it into parking lot for employees for Kwik Trip. He said it would help with the congestion with the Kwik Trip parking lot located at 770 East Broadway.

It was clarified that the lot in question was a Lot of Record and something could be built on it.

Jim Murphy asked Staff about fencing around the lot and it was confirmed that some type of screening would be required around the perimeter.

Dave Kouba asked that if the variance were granted, would Kwik Trip maintain the alley adjacent to the property and Mr. Newman said they would continue to maintain it.

There being no others who desired to speak, Acting Chairman Kouba closed the public hearing and opened it up for discussion.

A question was brought up about the proposed parking lot and whether it needed to be blacktopped or concrete and Staff said; by City ordinance, it needed to be gravel, blacktop or concrete.

The Board went through the variance finding questions and question number one asked if the variance was in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance? Yes, it is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and in scope with the ordinance.

Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, it is consistent with future use in allowing for additional parking for commercial properties.

Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, It has very minimal impact on the neighborhood and it will improve the lot.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

March 4, 2020

PAGE 4

Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner?
Yes, the lot size, location of the lot and the alley adjacent to it.

Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality? Yes, it is adjacent to a commercial property which is Kwip Trip.

Tim Breza a motion to approve the variance as requested and it was seconded by Travis Buege. All were in favor of approving the variance request.

Petitioner was informed that there was a 10-day appeal period during which time no action could be taken on the petition.

Adjournment

Tim Breza made a motion to adjourn with a second by Dave Kouba. The vote of the Board was unanimous.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.



Greg Karow
Secretary