

City of Monroe  
Joint Meeting  
Plan Commission and Common Council Minutes  
February 7, 2017

A. ROLL CALL

Mayor Armstrong called both meetings to order.

Plan Commission Members present at roll call were Mayor/Chairperson Louis Armstrong, Vice-Chairperson Nate Klassy, Ronald Spielman, William Bethke, Chuck Schuringa, and Alderperson Chuck Koch. Keith Ingwell was absent.

Common Council Members present at roll call were Mayor Armstrong, Alderpersons Miller, Bauman, Boyce, Newcomer, Koch, Marsh, and Thoman. Alderpersons Beer and Stangel were absent.

B. ZONING CODE RE-WRITE PROJECT

a. Presentation and Updates from Vandewalle

Representatives from Vandewalle went over what came out of the public meetings. They said because of these things they wanted to discuss the recommendations with both groups to go over the new code and get a sense of the City's comfort level with these things. The new code will include some form-based elements, address building design standards, site design standards will include landscaping requirements, mixed use development, higher density multi-family in certain locations. She said many of our peer communities are already doing these things. She provided more information on how these changes will help the City of Monroe.

b. Policy Decisions regarding Zoning Code Re-Write Project

Jackie provided everyone with a Policy Decision Guide to go over.

- Which body should review conditional use permits? They are currently reviewed by the Plan Commission. The Council currently does not review them. Questions and discussion took place. Both Council and Plan Commission came to the consensus that the Plan Commission should still be the ones to review and grant conditional use permits.
- Should we relax site plan requirements? Site plans will be required for the new code, but for smaller projects they suggest allowing this to be at the discretion of the City staff. Discussion took place. Both groups agreed with the Vandewalle suggestion.
- What body should review site plans? Currently staff reviews site plans. The Plan Commission only reviews site plans associated with M-3 design review or PUDs. In order to expedite the development process, they suggest having staff review site plans and the Plan Commission review only when conditional use. Both Plan Commission and Council agreed with the recommendation.
- Which land uses should be conditional uses? Vandewalle says this is a question of control versus expediency. Following are the items that they have listed for conditional use and it is up to the two groups to decide on conditional use or keep by right; Outdoor Display- keep by right, Indoor Commercial Entertainment-change to conditional use, Outdoor Commercial Entertainment-change to conditional use, Drive-through Sales and service-by right, Commercial Animal Boarding-by right, Outdoor Maintenance Service-conditional use, Commercial Greenhouse/Garden Center-by right, Personal Storage Facility-conditional use, Outdoor Storage-conditional use.

- If a principal building is removed, should the City require the accessory building to be removed as well? The current code prohibits the construction of an accessory building prior to the construction of a principal building. This recommendation is not currently in the code. They recommend adding it but it could go either way. Discussion took place. The Planning Commission and Council agreed they wanted conditions about the upkeep of the property grounds and buildings and go from there.
- Should the City limit new attached garages to 40% of the home's front façade with? This would avoid houses with facades that are dominated by a garage. This would affect new homes not current homes. Discussion took place. This is not a concern of the groups, they do not want to do this. More discussion took place.
- Should the City require attached garages to be set back two feet from the front façade of the house? Should side-loaded garages be exempted? This was discussed with the above and both groups did not want to add this either.
- Should the City allow single family or two family uses within the multi-family districts? Existing code does not allow single family uses in the R-3 Multiple-Family Residence District. Vandewalle suggests keeping the current policy. The Plan Commission and Council want to keep with the current policy of not allowing lower density uses in areas reserved for multi-family development.
- Should the City require new single and two family dwelling units to provide garages in order to meet parking requirements? This would apply to new development only. Both committees would like to see this added to the new zoning code.
- For new single family and two family dwelling units, should the City prohibit uncovered parking spaces in backyards? What about for new multi-family buildings? This would apply to new development only and prohibit uncovered parking spaces in backyards, but would not impact driveways. The committees decided to not prohibit uncovered parking spaces in back yards. Discussion took place about backyard versus side yard.
- For new single family and two family dwelling units, should one stacked parking space in the driveway count toward meeting the parking requirements? Generally, the new code requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit. The two groups said yes to allowing one stacked parking space in driveway.
- In what instance, should gravel be permitted as a paving surface? In the current code, gravel and paved are used interchangeably. The Vandewalle representative said this is unusual as most communities only allow gravel for equipment storage but not on areas where vehicles are moving frequently. Vandewalle will show us what this change will look like on the draft.
- Are you comfortable with the proposed mix of zoning districts? Would include business park district, new smaller scale multi-family districts, diving R-2 district into Duplex, Two flat, and single family districts. New single family districts scaled to existing lot size and setbacks. The groups are comfortable with this.
- Are you comfortable with our approach to land use categories? These would-be land use general categories such as: personal and professional services, outdoor commercial entertainment, indoor sales, or services, light industrial. This is a flexible approach. Discussion took place. Many peer communities are zoning this way. The groups are comfortable with this.

c. Procedural Checklist  
Not discussed

d. Sample Code

Clerk Stamm has some questions. She wanted to make sure they will follow our current numbering and formatting system. She also noticed there is a lot of reiterating what is already in the State Statutes and outlining detailed procedures. The City is trying to get away from outlining State Statutes in our code instead we are just referencing them. If the State Statute changes, we don't have to go back and change the wording in our ordinance. Her suggestion would be rather than outlining procedures in the code itself, she would rather see a clause in the ordinance that says the procedure manual shall be adopted and revised from time to time by resolution of the Council. This way if a change is made in the procedures it is done by resolution and the change made to the manual rather than having to go through the whole process of an ordinance change. The Vandewalle representatives said they can do all of these things. They will also provide checklists to make sure applications are complete. More discussion took place. Clerk Stamm said when looking at the code online, if the code is referencing a form or a manual there can be a link right there for them to click on and it will take them to that form or manual.

The Vandewalle representatives said they would have the draft code done in about a month for the groups to review.

#### C. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Alder Boyce to Adjourn. The motion was seconded by Alder Koch. The motion was carried on voice vote by both the Common Council and Plan Commission.

Transcribed by:  
Nicole Cummings, Deputy Clerk