

# VILLAGE OF OSCEOLA PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

**Date:** December 3, 2024  
**Time:** 6:00 p.m.  
**Place:** Large Conference Room (Rm 205), 310 Chieftain Street, Osceola WI 54020

## AGENDA

1. Call the meeting to order
2. Approval of agenda
3. Approval of minutes
  - a. November 6, 2024
4. Public input and ideas (Limit 3 minutes per speaker)
5. Discussion and possible action re:
  - a. Discussion on Village Code Chapter 219: Zoning, §219-13 Residential Districts.
6. Future agenda items and updates
7. Adjourn

**NOTE:** It is possible that members of other governmental bodies of the municipality may be present at the above scheduled meeting to gather information about a subject over which they have decision-making responsibility. No action will be taken by any governmental body at the above-stated meeting other than the governmental body specifically referred to above in this notice.

Please note that, upon reasonable notice, efforts will be made to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals through appropriate aids and services. For additional information or to request this service, contact Village Hall at (715) 294-3498.

## **PLAN COMMISSION MEETING PROCEEDINGS**

### **November 6, 2024**

The Plan Commission of the Village of Osceola met on November 6, 2024, to hold a regular monthly meeting. Rob Bullard called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present: Brad Lutz, Kim O'Connell, Chelsea Kruse, Dennis Tomfohrde, Rob Bullard, Bill Chantelois V.

Absent: Mike Sine

Others present: Devin Swanberg, Tanya Batchelor, and Brian Wiedenfeld

Motion to approve the agenda was made by Bullard, second by O'Connell.

Motion passed 6-0

Motion to approve the minutes of the previous meetings, September 3, 2024, and September 12, 2024, with the correction to September 12 changing the vote to 5-1, was made by Chantelois, second by Bullard.

Motion passed 6-0

#### **Public Input and Ideas**

None

#### **Public Hearing**

Lutz declared the Public Hearing open to accept public written and oral testimony to consider the final update to the 2009 Village of Osceola Comprehensive Plan. Tyler Norenberg thanked the commission for their hard work on the Comprehensive Plan. He hopes it will be referenced in decision making by the Village Board. Lutz declared the Public Hearing Closed.

#### **Discussion and possible action re:**

##### **Comprehensive Plan – MSA Professional Services**

Brian Wiedenfeld, from MSA, appeared virtually and gave a quick review of the Comprehensive Plan and process. The next step is to approve the resolution and recommend Board approval on November 12, 2024. Swanberg was working on intergovernmental agreements with the surrounding townships. Page 50 of the Comp Plan includes 1.5-mile extra-territorial buffer. O'Connell stated that more should have been done with the surrounding townships regarding this buffer. The townships were notified about the Comprehensive Plan. Bullard stated this is an excellent plan, the best in his 25 years on the Commission. O'Connell made some edits to the resolution. Bullard moved to approve the Resolution with the edits, recommending Board approval of the Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Kruse. O'Connell voted no.

Motion passed 5-1

##### **Eighth Avenue Easement**

Swanberg explained Twohy requested to improve his access easement on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and laid out options. The easement is transferable in the event of a sale of the property. Questions included whether to fix lot lines, is the existing shed moveable since it is on the lot line. The question the Commission needs to decide is whether to allow Twohy to improve the access easement. The Village will not maintain it. Swanberg recommended allowing Twohy to improve it, but it has to be engineered for property drainage. An agreement would be needed so the property owner would be responsible for all on-going upkeep. Considerable discussion followed. Lutz moved to approve continuing with this project in addition to providing a plan for the Plan Commission to review, all improvements must be designed

by a qualified engineer, approval from Village staff and Village engineer, and all costs associated with this process are to be paid by Twohy. Motion seconded by Kruse.

Motion passed 6-0

**Future Agenda Items**

Swanberg will provide updates on the Twohy project as needed. O'Connell requested additional updates on projects that will be coming to the Planning Commission such as a timeline.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Minutes Respectfully submitted by Tanya Batchelor, Village Treasurer

Village of Osceola, WI  
Monday, November 25, 2024

## Chapter 219. Zoning

### Article II. Zoning Districts

#### § 219-13. Residential districts.

##### A. R-1 Single-Family Residential District.

- (1) Permitted uses and structures: single-family dwellings and their accessory structures or uses.
- (2) Conditional uses and structures: parks, greenways and open spaces, playgrounds, public and private schools, hospitals, cemeteries, governmental and community service buildings and functions, utility lines, pumping stations, golf courses, churches, libraries, single-family planned residential development, home occupations, agricultural uses and accessory structures in excess of 400 square feet and additional accessory structures.  
[Amended 7-10-2007 by Ord. No. 07-19]
- (3) Lot size.
  - (a) Width: 90 feet minimum.
  - (b) Area: 12,000 square feet minimum.
- (4) Building height: 35 feet maximum.
- (5) Yards.
  - (a) Street: 30 feet minimum.
  - (b) Rear: 10 feet minimum, except in the event that a utility easement is in existence, then 15 feet minimum from the edge of such easement.
  - (c) Side: 10 feet minimum.
- (6) Parking: off-street parking on approved surfaces for two cars.

##### B. R-2 Duplex Residential District.

- (1) Permitted uses and structures: two-family attached dwellings and their accessory structures or uses or any use permitted in the R-1 District.
- (2) Conditional uses and structures: parks, greenways and open spaces, playgrounds, public and private schools, hospitals, cemeteries, governmental and community service buildings and functions, utility lines, pumping stations, golf courses, churches, libraries, single-family planned residential development, home occupations, agricultural uses and accessory structures in excess of 400 square feet and additional accessory structures.  
[Amended 7-10-2007 by Ord. No. 07-19]
- (3) Lot size.
  - (a) Width: 90 feet minimum.

- (b) Area: 12,000 square feet minimum.
  - (4) Building height: 35 feet maximum.
  - (5) Yards.
    - (a) Street: 30 feet minimum.
    - (b) Rear: 10 feet minimum, except in the event that a utility easement is in existence, then 15 feet minimum from the edge of such easement.
    - (c) Side: 10 feet minimum.
  - (6) Parking: off-street parking area on approved surface for two cars to each unit, total four-car space.
- C. R-3 Multifamily Residential District, limited to 12 units or fewer.
- (1) Permitted uses: single-family residential and duplex unit uses and structures conforming at least to the minimum and maximum requirements of the R-1 and R-2 Districts and multifamily uses, provided that they conform to the regulations below.
  - (2) Conditional uses and structures: parks, greenways and open spaces, playgrounds, public and private schools, hospitals, cemeteries, governmental and community service buildings and functions, utility lines, pumping stations, golf courses, churches, libraries, single-family planned residential development, home occupations, agricultural uses, multifamily planned unit residential development, mobile home parks, nurseries, greenhouses, landscaping and accessory structures in excess of 400 square feet and additional accessory structures.  
[Amended 7-10-2007 by Ord. No. 07-19]
  - (3) Lot size.
    - (a) Width: 90 feet minimum.
    - (b) Area: 12,000 square feet.
  - (4) Building height: 35 feet maximum.
  - (5) Yards.
    - (a) Front: 30 feet minimum.
    - (b) Rear: 10 feet minimum, except in the event that a utility easement is in existence, then 15 feet minimum from the edge of such easement.
    - (c) Side: 10 feet minimum.
  - (6) Other requirements.
    - (a) The recreation space ratio, defined as the minimum square footage of recreation space required for each square foot of floor area, shall not be less than .16.
    - (b) The floor area ratio, defined as the maximum square footage of total floor area permitted for each foot of land area, shall not be more than .32.
    - (c) The open space ratio, defined as the minimum square footage of open space required for each square foot of floor area, shall not be less than two.
    - (d) (Reserved)<sup>[1]</sup>
      - [1] *Editor's Note: Former Subsection C(6)(d), establishing the living space ratio, was repealed 6-8-2004 by Ord. No. 04-13.*
    - (e) The occupant car ratio, defined as the minimum number of off-street parking spaces without parking time limits required for each living unit, shall not be less than 1.5.

D. R-4 Rural Development District.

- (1) Permitted uses and structures: single-family residences, parks, campgrounds, open spaces, agriculture and general farming, except farms feeding offal or garbage and mink farms, dairying, livestock raising, truck farming, forestry, poultry raising, airports and golf courses.
- (2) Conditional uses and structures: municipal service functions and structures and accessory structures in excess of 400 square feet and additional accessory structures.  
[Amended 7-10-2007 by Ord. No. 07-19]
- (3) Lot size.
  - (a) Width: 500 feet.
  - (b) Area: 10 acres.
- (4) Building height: 35 feet maximum, except for barns, silos and other buildings and structures which are customarily higher and accessory uses to farming.
- (5) Yards.
  - (a) Street: 80 feet minimum.
  - (b) Rear: 50 feet minimum.
  - (c) Side: 50 feet minimum.
  - (d) In no case shall any structure be closer than 40 feet to any lot line, nor shall any dump, disposal area, incinerator or principal structure or building for mink farms or farms feeding or using offal or garbage be less than 500 feet from any lot line.

E. RU Urban Single-Family District.

[Added 1-9-2007 by Ord. No. 07-04]

- (1) Purpose. The R-U District is intended to provide for single-family residential development on lots of record within the original plat of the Village existing at the time of the adoption of the ordinance codified under this title. The R-U District is intended to be served by public sanitary sewer and water supply facilities.
- (2) Use regulations.
  - (a) Permitted uses. The following uses are permitted within a R-U District:
    - [1] One-family dwellings.
    - [2] Accessory uses customarily incidental to the above when located on the same lot and not involving the conduct of a business.
  - (b) Conditional uses. After due notice and public hearing before the Plan Commission, the following conditional uses may be authorized by the Village Board within a R-U District:
    - [1] Bed-and-breakfast services.
    - [2] Public parks and playgrounds.
    - [3] Museums.
    - [4] Home-based service businesses with retail sales that are incidental or subordinate in terms of both sales volume and percentage of floor space occupied.
    - [5] Home-based production and sales of arts and crafts, maintenance of offices for administrative, personal service, professional, or executive uses with incidental sales and servicing upon the premises may be permitted for those structures with a primary entrance on Cascade Street. All signage must comply with the requirements for

home-based businesses. Any new structure constructed in this district for the uses provided herein shall be a residential-styled building that has been issued a certificate of appropriateness by the Historic Preservation Commission for being architecturally compatible with the character of the neighborhood. Existing structures shall retain their residential character, except that any modifications to accommodate the listed conditional uses shall be approved by the Historic Preservation Commission. The primary entrance for uses permitted by this section shall be in the front of the building and walkways shall be oriented to the main street.

[6] Additional residence if located in existing accessory building. The architectural design of all exterior modifications to the accessory building must receive a certificate of appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission as being compatible with the architecture of the principal structure. All parking for the additional residence shall be on a hard surface and shall not be located within the building setback areas.

[7] Accessory structures in excess of 400 square feet and additional accessory structures.  
 [Added 7-10-2007 by Ord. No. 07-19]

(3) Dimensional requirements.

Lot size	Gross area	7,500 square feet
	Width	75 feet at building line; 55 feet throughout the lot
Setbacks for principal structure	Front	Minimum 20 feet; maximum no less than the average of adjoining principal structures
	Interior side	10 feet
	Street side	10 feet
	Rear	10 feet
Lot coverage	Building	40%, including principal residence, private garage, and accessory structure
Building size	Maximum height of principal structure	35 feet

(4) Accessory structures. No more than one accessory structure shall be permitted, exclusive of a private garage, per residential lot. All temporary buildings shall be included as accessory structures. The maximum floor area of the accessory structure, together with any additions, shall not exceed the greater of 3% of the lot size or 240 square feet.

Setbacks	Front	No closer to street than principal structure
	Interior side	3 feet
	Street side	20 feet
	Rear	3 feet
Building size	From principal structure	10 feet
	Maximum height	20 feet, but no higher than principal structure

(5) Off-street parking.

(a) All new driveways shall be installed in accordance with the Chapter **186**, Article **II**, Driveway Access to Public Streets.

- (b) The portion of any lot or parcel of land covered by paving, gravel, crushed stone or similar non-growing surfacing other than structures shall not exceed, in area, 12% of the total square footage of the entire lot.





# Memo

To: Planning Commission  
From: Devin Swanberg Village Administrator  
CC: Village Board  
Date: November 26th  
Re: Smaller Minimum Lot Discussion

Decreasing the minimum lot width in Osceola’s residential zones can offer several potential benefits, especially as the village evaluates development needs and future growth. Here are some reasons to consider this adjustment:

## 1. Increased Housing Diversity and Affordability

- **Broader Housing Options:** Narrower lots can accommodate smaller homes, twin homes, or villa-style residences, appealing to a wider range of buyers, including young families, retirees, and singles.
- **Lower Cost of Development:** Smaller lots reduce infrastructure costs (e.g., streets, utilities) per unit, potentially lowering home prices and increasing affordability.

## 2. Efficient Use of Land

- **Maximize Development Potential:** Decreasing lot width allows for more homes to fit within the same acreage, which can help address housing shortages without requiring additional land.
- **Urban Design Benefits:** Encourages compact development, reducing urban sprawl and preserving surrounding natural and agricultural areas.

## 3. Alignment with Modern Development Trends

- **Market Demand:** Many buyers prefer low-maintenance properties with smaller yards. Narrower lots can meet this demand.
- **Sustainability:** Smaller lots can lead to more walkable neighborhoods and better integration of community spaces.

## 4. Infrastructure and Utility Optimization

- **Cost Efficiency:** More homes on narrower lots can help offset the fixed costs of infrastructure projects by spreading them across a larger number of units.

- **Utility Connectivity:** Compact neighborhoods reduce the length and expense of sewer, water, and electrical systems.

#### 5. Supporting Comprehensive Planning Goals

- **Flexibility for Developers:** Developers like Pinnacle and engineers such as Cedar Corp may benefit from the ability to design more varied housing styles and densities, potentially increasing their interest in projects within the village.
- **Village Appeal:** Denser, well-planned neighborhoods can enhance Osceola's appeal to new residents, increasing population and economic activity.

#### 6. Responding to Demographic Trends

- **Aging Population:** Villa-style or smaller homes on narrow lots may attract older adults looking to downsize while staying within the community.
- **Younger Professionals:** Affordable, compact housing can attract younger residents seeking starter homes.

While decreasing the minimum lot width in Osceola's residential zones can provide benefits, it's important to consider potential drawbacks. These challenges must be addressed to ensure successful implementation of such a policy:

#### 1. Neighborhood Aesthetics and Character

- **Potential Overcrowding:** Smaller lot widths can result in higher housing density, which may feel inconsistent with the character of established neighborhoods, especially those with larger lots.
- **Reduced Green Space:** Narrower lots often mean smaller yards, which could impact the overall appearance and open feel of a community.

#### 2. Increased Infrastructure Demands

- **Traffic and Parking Issues:** Higher density can lead to increased traffic and greater demand for on-street parking, potentially creating congestion in residential areas.
- **Strain on Utilities:** More homes per acre may require upgrades to water, sewer, and electrical infrastructure to meet increased demand.
- **Stormwater Management:** Smaller lots with higher impervious surface coverage (e.g., roofs, driveways) can exacerbate stormwater runoff issues, requiring improved drainage systems.

#### 3. Community Opposition

- **Resident Pushback:** Current residents may oppose higher-density housing, fearing property devaluation or changes in neighborhood character.
- **NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) Sentiment:** Residents may resist changes near their properties, particularly if they associate higher density with noise or reduced privacy.

#### 4. Economic Considerations

- **Potential Devaluation of Existing Larger Lots:** A shift toward narrower lots could impact the perceived value of existing larger properties, especially if demand for bigger lots declines.

#### 5. Environmental Impacts

- **Loss of Natural Features:** Compact developments might encroach on natural landscapes or leave insufficient room for trees and greenery.
- **Urban Heat Island Effect:** With reduced yard sizes and potentially fewer trees, areas with narrower lots may become warmer and less comfortable during hot weather.

#### 6. Social and Quality of Life Concerns

- **Privacy Concerns:** Homes on narrow lots are closer together, which can lead to reduced privacy for residents.
- **Noise Levels:** Higher density can result in increased noise from nearby homes and streets.

#### 7. Regulatory and Planning Challenges

- **Zoning Compatibility:** Reducing lot widths will require changes to zoning codes, potentially causing delays or disputes.
- **Development Oversight:** Ensuring quality design and compatibility with the village's long-term vision requires additional planning resources and enforcement of design standards.



# Memo

To: Planning Commission  
From: Devin Swanberg Village Administrator  
CC: Village Board  
Date: November 26th  
Re: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) can present both opportunities and challenges for the Village of Osceola. Here's a breakdown of the potential pros and cons, along with regulatory considerations based on examples from other Wisconsin municipalities:

## Pros

1. **Increased Housing Supply:** ADUs can help alleviate housing shortages by providing additional living spaces, especially in rural or small-town areas experiencing population growth or housing demand.
2. **Affordable Housing Options:** They often serve as more affordable rentals compared to standalone homes, benefiting seniors, young professionals, or families in need of cost-effective housing solutions.
3. **Support for Multigenerational Living:** ADUs offer a way for families to live close together while maintaining privacy, which is particularly helpful for caregiving or shared family resources.
4. **Economic Benefits:** Homeowners can generate rental income, potentially improving property values and contributing to local taxes.
5. **Efficient Land Use:** Utilizing existing lots for additional units promotes denser, more sustainable development without the need to expand municipal services excessively.

## Cons

1. **Infrastructure and Service Strain:** Increased density may place additional demands on local utilities, parking, and emergency services.
2. **Cost Barriers:** Constructing ADUs can be expensive, with projects often involving permitting fees, utility upgrades, and high construction costs, making affordability a challenge for homeowners.

3. **Community Resistance:** Some residents may oppose ADUs due to concerns about neighborhood character, privacy, or property values.
4. **Regulatory Complexity:** Implementing and enforcing zoning and building codes for ADUs can be administratively burdensome. Local governments need to address issues such as setbacks, lot coverage, and utility connections.

## Regulatory Considerations

- **Zoning Flexibility:** Cities like Madison have recently eased restrictions, allowing ADUs on lots with up to eight units and simplifying permit processes to encourage development.
- **Size and Use Limits:** ADUs are often limited to 900 square feet with restrictions on the number of bedrooms, ensuring they remain accessory rather than primary residences.
- **Permit and Fee Requirements:** Owners may face fees like impact fees and requirements for separate utility meters and sewer connections.

## Recommendations for Osceola

- Conduct a community engagement process to understand public sentiment and address concerns proactively.
- Review and adapt zoning codes to balance flexibility with maintaining neighborhood aesthetics and infrastructure capacity.
- Consider offering incentives, like reduced fees or streamlined approvals, to encourage homeowners to build ADUs while ensuring compliance with safety and environmental standards.

Integrating ADUs into Osceola's housing strategy could provide significant benefits, but success will depend on thoughtful planning and clear communication with stakeholders.