

CITY OF COLUMBUS
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
02.05.20

The February 5th, 2020 regular meeting of the Planning Commission for the City of Columbus was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chair Ron Hanegraaf at the City Hall. Present were Commission members: Kris King, Pam Wolowski, and Barb Bobick; City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko; City Planning Technician Ben Gutknecht; and City Planner Dean Johnson.

Also, in attendance were Mayor Jesse Preiner; City Council Member Janet Hegland, Jeff Duraine, and Shelly Logren; Dan Mike, and Dick Haluptzok.

A portion of this meeting was held jointly with the City Council and Planning Commission for discussion on Land Use and Zoning.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion by Wolowski to approve agenda as written. Second by Bobick. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL – APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES ON 01.15.20

Motion by Bobick to approve the minutes of the January 15th, 2020 regular Planning Commission meeting, as written. Second by King. Motion carried unanimously.

JOINT DISCUSSION WITH CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION ABOUT LAND USE vs ZONING CONTINUED

This portion of the meeting was used as a joint workshop with the City Council to decide on definitions for common commercial uses, determine proposed zoning district boundaries, and determine the uses for each proposed district within the I-35 district. All discussion taken from this workshop will help to further the development of the Zoning Ordinance and continue to bring it into compliance with 2040 Comprehensive Plan. This first meeting only included discussion regarding the first four proposed commercial uses; Community Commercial (C-1), Mixed Use 1 (MU-1), Mixed Use 2 (MU-2) and General Commercial (C-2).

Gutknecht began the discussion by addressing the need to determine the definitions of Commercial Uses. Stating that by agreeing on definitions first, it will help to prevent any confusion later in the process when the Planning Commission and City Council assign uses to specific proposed districts. Gutknecht asked each Commission and Council member one by one to state if they had any comments, concerns, or questions for each of the listed use definitions. After going through the entire list and discussion from the Planning Commission and City Council ended, the following was determined to be the draft definitions for common commercial uses:

- **Retail-** An establishment engaged in the display and sale of products produced off site directly to consumers/ end users within 70-80% of the building, including limited display for retail sales as out lined in the City Code.
- **Professional Office-** A building used as the place of business for recognized professional (such as a Doctor of Medicine, financier, architect, landscape architect, professional engineer, lawyer), or to conduct the affairs of a business or profession. Where limited goods are sold as retail from the premises.
- **Services (Off Site)-** A company that provides labor, maintenance, repair and activities incidental to business production or distribution where the service is provided at the customer's location, including delivery services, catering services, plumbing and sewer services, and other uses of similar character.
- **Restaurant-** An establishment primarily engaged in providing food services to patrons who order and are served while on or in premises.
- **Hotel/Motel-** A Building in which lodging and boarding are provided and offered to the public for compensation. As such it is open to the public in contra-distinction to a rooming house, boarding house, lodging house, or dormitory which is herein separately defined.

At the end of the definition discussion, the group also engaged in conversation regarding language for Air BnB and Bed and Breakfast uses. Gutknecht will prepare a draft definition of both and deliver at the next Planning Commission Meeting on February 19th, 2019.

Continuing the conversation, Gutknecht then had the group review the map of the proposed zoning districts in the I-35 district and asked for any feedback. There were no comments on changing the boundaries. The consensus was in approval of the map as shown.

Following the district boundary discussion, Gutknecht then asked that the group comment on the definitions for the proposed zoning districts. The group again went one after another and addressed any comments, concerns, or questions they had. After the group had an opportunity to share their thoughts and discuss their concerns the following was formed as the draft definitions for the proposed districts:

- Community Commercial District (C-1) the purpose of this district is to provide space for high-intensity retail sales, entertainment, and convenience with low intensity onsite services and office space that serve local and regional population bases. The high visibility and accessibility of this district will support high building and site design standards with no intention to serve extensive land users or uses with prominent outdoor display.
- High Density Residential, Mixed -Use (MU-1) provides an area for high intensity retail uses, convenience, office, recreational, and entertainment uses with high visibility from the regional freeway and high design standards There is also opportunities for mixed use residential buildings with a maximum of 30 units/acre.
- Medium Density Residential, Mixed -Use (MU-2) the purpose of this district is to allow a broad range of retail uses and low impact service businesses, and office spaces, with a maximum residential density of 16 units/acre.

- General Commercial District (C-2) The intent for this district is to provide a quality environment for a mix of business uses, convince, and services. Including office/business campuses, more extensive retail, financial institutions, combined office/showroom, and indoor service with no outdoor storage.

The last discussion was determining the specific uses that should be in each of the districts. The following is the draft list of uses that the group had decided on for the following two districts. The uses that are crossed out on the list are the ones proposed to be removed from that district, the uses underlined are the proposed uses to be added to that specific district.

Community Commercial C-1: (No Outdoor Storage) Red

1. Gasoline Sales
2. Convenience related retail sales
- ~~3. Small grocery sales~~
4. Indoor Sales and storage of retail goods to consumers, such as groceries, alcohol, clothing, household goods, medical, ~~hardware, auto supplies~~, electronics, sporting goods, ~~building supplies, household furnishing, and similar~~, excluding pawn shops.
 - a. Note: should we break these up and list them separately, or just change the definition for each individual district
5. Bakeries with primarily direct retail sales to consumers
6. Indoor Commercial Recreation
7. Hotel/motel
8. Restaurant
9. Café
10. Café with Accessory Drive Thru
11. Restaurant with accessory drive thru
- ~~12. Fitness Center~~
13. Professional Offices
- ~~14. Financial Institutions~~
15. Beer production ~~and~~ with direct sales
16. Boutique/Gift Shop
17. Licensed Child Care
18. Movie Theaters
19. Dog grooming, ~~message studios~~ wellness studio, hair salons, and other retail services
20. Art galleries, photography studios, dance studios, and similar
21. Micro Distillery
22. Micro Distillery with Accessory Open-Air Patio
23. Drug Store with Accessory Drive Thru

High Density Residential, Mixed-Use MU-1: (No Outdoor Storage) Dark Yellow

1. Gasoline Sales
2. Convenience related retail sales
- ~~3. Small grocery sales~~

4. Indoor Sales and storage of retail goods to consumers, such as groceries, alcohol, clothing, household goods, medical, ~~hardware, auto-supplies~~, electronics, sporting goods, ~~building supplies, household furnishing, and similar~~, excluding pawn shops.
5. Bakeries with primarily direct retail sales to consumers
- ~~6. Indoor Commercial Recreation~~
7. Hotel/motel
8. Restaurant
9. Café
10. Café with Accessory Drive Thru
11. Restaurant with accessory drive thru
12. Fitness Center
13. Professional Offices
- ~~14. Financial Institutions~~
- ~~15. Office Campus~~
16. Beer production ~~and~~ with-direct sales
17. Boutique/Gift Shop
18. Licensed Child Care
- ~~19. Movie Theaters~~
20. Art galleries, photography studios, dance studios, and similar
21. High Density Senior Housing
22. High Density Apartments
23. Mixed Use Apartments
24. Ice Cream/Confectioners Shop

After finishing the discussion surrounding the High-Density Mixed-Use district uses, the group determined that they would finished discussion the Medium Density Mixed-Use and General Commercial District uses at the subsequent meeting on 02.19.20. Gutknecht also stated that at the next meeting they will address definitions for industrial uses and go over edits made to the proposed uses and district definitions that were generated by the comments at the 02.05.20 meeting.

PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

Nothing to report.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mursko noted that the meeting on February 19th would likely be closer to 3 hours. She addressed the Council and Planning Commission on whether they would like to start the meeting at 6pm. The consensus is to start the meeting at 6pm.

Mursko also stated that the City Hall will be open for early voting for the County Commissioner on Saturday February 8, 2020. The election is on February 11th.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORT

Nothing to report.

ATTENDANCE - NEXT CC MEETING

Wolowski is scheduled to attend the City Council meeting on February 12th, 2020.

Motion by King to adjourn. Second by Wolowski. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Rochelle Busch, Recording Secretary

CITY OF COLUMBUS
JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
02.19.20

The February 19th, 2020 joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission for the City of Columbus was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chair Ron Hanegraaf at the City Hall. Present were Commission members: Kris King, Pam Wolowski, and Barb Bobick; Mayor Jesse Preiner, City Council members: Denny Peterson, Janet Hegland, Jeff Duraine, and Shelly Logren, City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko; City Planning Technician Ben Gutknecht; Public Communication Coordinator Jessica Hughes; and City Planner Dean Johnson.

Also in attendance were: Myron & Cindy Angel, Dan Mike, and John Young.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion by Wolowski to approve agenda as written. Second by King. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL – APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES ON 02.05.20

Bobick noted that she believes the showroom percentages should be added to the retail definition on page two of the minutes. The other Commission members were in agreement of amending the minutes to reflect “Retail- An establishment engaged in the display and sale of products produced off site directly to consumers/ end users within **70-80% of the building, including limited display for retail sales** as outlined in the City Code.”

Motion by Bobick to approve the minutes of the 02.05.20 regular Planning Commission meeting with the amended change. Second by Wolowski. Motion carried unanimously.

JOINT DISCUSSION WITH CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION ABOUT LAND USE vs ZONING CONTINUED

This meeting was used as a joint workshop with the City Council to decide on definitions for common commercial uses, determine proposed zoning district boundaries, and determine the uses for each proposed district within the I-35 district. All discussion taken from this workshop will help to further the development of the Zoning Ordinance and continue to bring it into compliance with 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

City Planning Technician Ben Gutknecht began by revisiting the commercial land use definitions that were discussed at the previous meeting. He asked the group if there were any questions about the changes made, and there was not.

Gutknecht moved on to discuss industrial land use definitions. The following was discussed:

- **Manufacturing** – A question was raised as to whether a business like wood chipping would be allowed in this district? There was a consensus that a yard waste site or something similar would not be desirable here. City Planner Dean Johnson said that he would investigate the wood chipping business question.
- **Laboratory** – Concerns were raised about the lack of an animal rights component in this definition. A suggestion was made to change the language to read “non-animal” research. A secondary concern was related to the “all of which is conducted in the building” language because environmental or agricultural labs will have an outdoor component. Gutknecht said that he would develop language to accommodate this type of laboratory and address the animal rights question.
- **Distillery** – The consensus from the group was that they would allow food to be served at such an establishment. However, the state may have regulations on locating alcohol production and food production in the same building. Gutknecht said that he would look into this question.
- **Distribution Center** – There was consensus from the group to remove the phrase “or directly to consumers” from this section.
- **Storage Yard** – There was consensus from the group to change the term “primary” to “principal”, to add storage of automobiles, and replace “enclosed landscape area” with something like “screened landscape area”.
- **Truck Terminal** – The group’s consensus was to add the phrase “primarily by semi-truck” to the definition.

At this time discussion shifted to the definitions of individual zoning districts. Gutknecht went over changes that he made based on direction from the 02.05.20 meeting.

- **Community Commercial** – The word “low” was replaced with “high”.
- **Mixed Use 1** – The word “low” was replaced with “high”, and “convenience” was added.
- **Mixed Use 2** – The word “impact” was replaced with “intensity indoor”, and language was added stating that the district will be held to “quality design standards”.
- **General Commercial District** – The phrase “and repair” was struck from the definition. A discussion was had about whether there should be categories of design standards for this district such as high, medium, and average. Gutknecht said this question will be addressed at a later date.
- **Light Industrial** – Gutknecht asked if this district should have a requirement that outdoor storage of raw materials be covered? The consensus from the group was that there should be.

- **General Industrial** – There was a brief conversation about whether this district should be eliminated so that any heavy industrial uses will not be allowed in the future. It was noted that this would make the Bituminous Roadways facility legal non-conforming, which would have an impact on their ability to do certain things like expand their office. The group agreed that there needs to be a conversation with the City Attorney about the legality of this decision, especially because this district was amended only two years ago.

The conversation then shifted to zoning district uses. The first use listed for the Light Industrial district is “all permitted uses in the General Business district”. Therefore, the group began by considering General Business district uses, and whether they should be included in the Light Industrial district. Gutknecht explained that he will be removing the “all permitted uses in the General Business district” language and adding all General Business district uses that they determine could be located in the Light Industrial district.

A determination was made that the following uses from the General Business district list should be removed from the Light Industrial list:

3. Indoor sales and storage of retail goods to customers, such as groceries, alcohol, clothing, household goods, medical, hardware, auto supplies, electronics, sporting goods, building supplies, household furnishing, and similar, excluding pawn shops.
4. Display of retail goods
5. Bakeries with direct retail sales to consumers
6. Restaurant/café
7. Restaurant with accessory drive thru
8. Medical clinics and support facilities
9. Hospital
10. Urgent care
11. Assisted living
15. Boutique/gift shop
16. Licensed childcare
17. Movie theaters
18. Dry cleaners, hair salons, photofinishing, massage studio, and other onsite indoor retail services
20. Art galleries, photography studios, dance studios, and similar
21. Drug store with accessory drive thru
23. New automobile sales
24. Automobile rental
26. Recreational vehicles/trailers sales and service
27. Recreational equipment service
31. Funeral home

34. Garden center/nursery
35. Landscaping (with the understanding that the business Horticulture Services would be characterized as a contractor shop)
37. Vet clinic
38. Animal boarding
39. Kennel
40. Professional office campus
41. Commercial campus/complex

It was determined that the following uses from the Light Industrial district uses should also be eliminated:

1. Permitted uses in the General Business District
4. Non-feedlot crop or animal agriculture
5. Storage yards
7. Manufacturing
12. Recycle center, excluding outdoor waste management facility.

In addition, “with effective screening” should be added to number 10.

The next zoning district discussed was the Mixed-Use 2 district. Dean Johnson noted that the City’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan states that 90% of this district should be dedicated to residential uses. The following uses were eliminated from that district:

1. Gasoline sales
3. Small grocery sales
6. Restaurant/cafe
7. Restaurant with accessory drive thru
8. Fitness Center
11. Licensed childcare
12. Movie theaters
15. High density senior housing
16. Single family detached residential dwelling
17. Twin homes/town homes
18. Car Wash
19. Assisted living

Items 15-17 above shall be combined into one use describing all types of medium density housing that will be allowed. There was also agreement that “hardware, auto supplies, building supplies, and household furnishing and similar” should be removed from number 4.

At this time a general discussion was had about organizing the list of uses. It is possible to add a final statement at the end of the list saying “any uses not described are not permitted”. Gutknecht noted that ordinances which include such a statement tend to follow a lengthy list of uses that are permitted. The group did not come to a consensus on this question.

Another question posed for the group was whether there should be a distinction made between banks and financial institutions. The consensus was that during drafting staff should ensure that there is a definition of what a financial institution is. There was conversation about not including check cashing businesses.

PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

Nothing to report.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko reported that there will be a joint City Council and Planning Commission workshop on 02.26.20. She noted however that the Council will have a separate conversation at the beginning of the workshop on different topic.

She continued to report on other items happening in the City over the next month.

Gutknecht has been working with billboard companies to complete new applications for billboards located in the City. The City also recently received a concept of what a billboard column cover could look like. She added that she expects a number of billboards will be removed from the area because of the ordinance amendment.

Mursko also had a conversation with Horticulture Services. At this time, they have a Purchase Agreement on a new property in the Light Industrial district and will be submitting a CUP application in the near future.

Lastly, during the 03.04.20 Planning Commission meeting they will consider a subdivision application for one lot on Pine Street.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORT

Pam Wolowski asked if there is any news on the HyVee development? Mursko said that HyVee indicated they are waiting for the traffic light at the intersection of TH 97 and Hornsby Street to be installed before they break ground. She had a discussion with MnDOT about the traffic light. They indicated that the traffic light will definitely be installed, but did not provide a timeline.

ATTENDANCE - NEXT CC MEETING

Bobick is scheduled to attend the City Council meeting on 02.26.2020.

Motion by Wolowski to adjourn. Second by King. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Jessica Hughes, Public Communications Coordinator

CITY OF COLUMBUS
JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
03.04.20

The March 4th, 2020 joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission for the City of Columbus was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chair Ron Hanegraaf at the City Hall. Present were Commission members: Kris King, Pam Wolowski, and Barb Bobick; Mayor Jesse Preiner, City Council members: Denny Peterson, Janet Hegland, and Shelly Logren; City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko; City Planning Technician Ben Gutknecht; Public Communication Coordinator Jessica Hughes; and City Planner Dean Johnson.

Also in attendance were: John Young; Xieng Lee; and Matt Davich.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion by Wolowski to approve agenda as written. Second by King. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL – APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES ON 02.19.20

Motion by Bobick to approve the minutes of the February 19th, 2020 regular Planning Commission meeting as written. Second by Wolowski. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING – LEE PRESERVE, PRELIMINARY PLAT REVIEW, 5223 PINE ST NE (PC20-101) REQUEST

At this time, a public hearing was to consider a request for a preliminary plat “Lee Preserve” creating two (2) new lots in the Rural Residential zoning district. Separate minutes for the public hearing are prepared.

LEE PRESERVE, PRELIMINARY PLAT REVIEW, 5223 PINE ST NE (PC20-101) REQUEST

After the closing of the hearing discussion took place amongst the Planning Commission members. Hanegraaf asked if Lee had read all recommendations from the engineer. Lee stated he has a general understanding of what’s going on, and he had received a copy.

Planner Johnson stated items relating to the development agreement must be done before the final plat is recorded. He noted some of the items consisted of a shared driveway easement agreement, a driveway maintenance agreement, and development agreement (with acknowledgment of possibly being assessed if Pine Street is developed). Planner Johnson stated the watershed district will also have requirements when the new home is built. He wanted to address the applicant and make them aware that there are other agencies involved.

Findings of Fact

1. The preliminary plat application was received on January 16, 2020, and upon supplemental information received on January 31, 2020, was found complete for review.
2. The 120-day preliminary plat review deadline is May 30, 2020.
3. There are a total of 40.16 gross acres in the proposed plat, located at 5223-Pine Street NE, on property legally described as the West Half of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter and the West Half of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 31, Township 32, Range 22 (“Property”).
4. The Property is zoned RR Rural Residential.
5. Two residential lots are proposed. There is one existing dwelling on the proposed southwesterly 12.35-acre lot (Lot 1, Block 1).
6. The proposed northerly lot (Lot 2, Block 1) is 25.26 acres in size and includes adequate areas for a future home and SSTS area.
7. The density of the proposed development is one home per 20.8 acres, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
8. Both parcels exceed the minimum 220 feet lot frontage requirement on Pine Street.
9. Access to both parcels is proposed via an existing driveway to the existing residence, which is centered on the common lot line between Lot 1 and Lot 2 and is encumbered by a 33 feet private driveway easement.
10. The applicant is proposing to sell the existing residence on Lot 1 and build a new residence on Lot 2.
11. The applicant proposes to separate two existing accessory buildings on the Property from the existing residence and locate them on the proposed vacant parcel.
12. The accessory buildings are located between the proposed new residence and Pine Street.
13. The larger accessory building is approximately 125 feet from the existing residence.
14. Landscaping has been proposed along the southerly and westerly sides of the accessory buildings.
15. There is also existing landscaping abutting the Property along Pine Street.

16. An existing 66 feet street, utility and drainage easement is located on the westerly edge of Lot 1, which provides private driveway access to two parcels located west of the plat. The private easement is being platted as public right-of-way.
17. Thirty-three feet of right-of-way is also being publicly dedicated for the north half of Pine Street, which is a jurisdictional road with the City of Lino Lakes.
18. A subdivision development agreement will be required for a shared road and maintenance agreement, as well as an escrow or acknowledgement of potential future assessments for any Pine Street public improvements.
19. There is potential to re-subdivide Lot 1 and Lot 2 if new public street improvements are made within the plat.
20. The proposed drainage and utility easements on both lots are consistent with City Code requirements.
21. Soil borings have been submitted for the home and SSTS locations on proposed Lot 2.
22. A wetland delineation “Notice of Decision” was issued by the Coon Creek Watershed District on December 20, 2019. The delineated wetlands are protected by drainage and utility easements, including 16.5-foot-wide buffers.
23. There are no apparent Shoreland or Floodplain areas affecting the plat.
24. Subsequent NPDES II permits will be required for any individual site grading that exceeds one acre.
25. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Lee Preserve Preliminary Plat on March 4, 2020.

Recommendations

Based upon the above Findings of Fact, the Lee Preserve Preliminary Plat should be approved subject to the following:

1. Recommendations of the City Engineer.
2. Title review and recommendations of the City Attorney.
3. A subdivision development agreement.
4. Recommendations of the Anoka County Survey Department.
5. Recommendations of the Coon Creek Watershed District.
6. Wetland buffer plaques at locations determined by the City.

7. Cash in lieu of park land dedication requirements.
8. Construction of a new home on Lot 2 must commence within 12 months of approval of the final plat or the existing accessory structures must be removed.
9. Subsequent NPDES II permit(s) for any individual site grading that exceeds one acre.
10. Reimbursement of City expenses associated with plat review.

Motion by Wolowski to recommend to the City Council the Lee Preserve Preliminary Plat request, for approval subject to Planner Report dated 02.27.20 and revised City Engineers Letter dated 03.04.20, with the findings of fact 1-25 and recommendations 1-10. Seconded by Bobick. Motion carried unanimously.

JOINT DISCUSSION WITH CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION ABOUT LAND USE vs ZONING CONTINUED

Mursko received a formal request from property owner to change the bottom section (nearest 35w) that is highway commercial to light industrial. Gutknecht noted that they are anticipating more requests for changes, once the public hearing notice for the ordinance is published. Both Gutknecht and Mursko noted that the comprehensive plan has this area listed as commercial, therefore this requested cannot be accommodated.

Hegland asked the reason the owner wanted light industrial? Mursko stated they felt that being industrial would increase sale potential. However, it has historically been commercial showroom zoning district. She reiterated that the land use plan guides these properties as commercial, not industrial. It would be contradictory to have an industrial land use with commercial zoning on top. The only option to accommodate this request would be to amend the comprehensive plan. Mursko noted the planning commission and council could consider adding uses like outdoor storage, that would be more friendly to industrial uses. Gutknecht added that at the last meeting this area was changed from B1 to highway commercial. The reason it was changed to highway commercial was because of its visibility from the freeway. Hegland asked if there was a fair amount of upland in the requested area. Mursko acknowledged the amount of land but noted that some property had highway frontage and some property that does not have highway frontage. There is a total of 7 parcels in the area that they are considering. Two of them are little slivers. These are not buildable and would have to be combined with other parcels. They are remnants of lots across the freeway.

The feedback given was that they are not going to entertain this request because it is not consistent with the land use designations in the comprehensive plan. The current consensus is to maintain the highway commercial zoning.

Gutknecht asked Planner Johnson on guidance for two uses: financial institutions, and wood chipping. He had made necessary changes. Gutknecht is asking if there is any feedback on the wording on these definitions.

Regarding financial institution, Bobick questioned if the “quick loan” or “payday loan” would cover check cashing businesses? Johnson said check cashing places are essentially giving out loans because they give you the paycheck ahead of time, in exchange for a “loan”. Bobick said she is concerned about check cashing institutions because some seem unreputable. Hegland requested to exclude fee for service check cashing business. Johnson responded that could be a possibility by adding “or check cashing” after “payday loan” to cover what they are concerned about. All agree to add those changes.

Wood chipping. Hegland questioned wasn’t the storage of wood chips the issue they had come across before? Johnson stated that the problem before had to do with the zoning. This description states piles of wood chips would not be allowed outside but they would allow the storage of the woodchipper on the property. This language would allow someone to do off premise services of wood chipping, but not the storage of the actual woodchips. The description does not account for something on Lake Drive that may be a wood chipping business on that site. This is for an off-premise service business, some may likely end up doing bringing a truck full of wood chips back to the property overnight for storage but not accumulating piles.

Industrial use definitions

Hegland noted in previous discussion they had decided removing of the word “limited” from #2 in industrial use. Gutknecht stated because the area is largely manufacturing, the original intention was there as to not be direct consumer retail. He noted that without the word limited it would allow for more consumer retail than he thought the consensus of the group was. Johnson stated there are few manufacturing companies these days that have zero consumer retail. Preiner directed the question to Mursko on what her thinking of limited means. Mursko noted 50% of the property would be by her understanding of the word “limited”. Preiner asked why we don’t just put the 50% in the ordinance? Johnson stated it would be hard to quantify that when a business comes in with an application. Hegland specified the group should decide between “limited” and “very limited”. The group agrees to change it to “very limited”.

In reference to the “Outdoor testing facility” Hegland noted the outdoor area could also not be enclosed with this type of business. Gutknecht agreed and will be keeping high design standards for the district. Hegland also noted within that same use, “with an accessory indoor laboratory”, she would like to suggest saying “with or without” an accessory indoor laboratory. The group agreed with the recommended changes.

Hegland advised on the “Distribution Centers” term she would like to suggest saying “and/or” wholesalers. The Commission and Council acknowledged that change as well.

Commercial use definitions

Hegland commented on “Office, General” to add “operation of” to the “day to day activities”. Agreed to make the change.

Hegland stated that under the “Office, Professional” if there is a better word than “recognized” professionals? She had suggested “credentialed”. Gutknecht said the “other recognized professionals” is associated with the other words in the sentence – “licensed” and “registered” – so they are all grouped together. The goal was to make it easy for someone who is a licensed professional to fit into this use even if they (for example) come from a different state where they might have a different term for their professional position. Preiner inserted the request to ask the attorney what he would suggest for a different term, if any. Overall, Hegland stated her feeling, that recognized is too nebulous. Gutknecht will consult our attorney on his advice.

Hegland addressed the description around “Restaurant, carry out” and whether they need to specify on the way orders are taken. Gutknecht noted it’s not necessary as electronic or by phone is the only option. By not specifying in the definitions you are assuming both options are included. Hegland is leaving it up to Gutknecht if he would like to implement the change.

Hegland noted that it is important to add in the vehicle when you pick it up for the description on “Restaurant, Drive-thru”. All agree this should be added.

Hegland clarified that some hotels/motels that charge weekly or monthly, she was wondering if that should be added into the “Hotel/Motel” description. However, something should be added like “and/or extended stay”.

The meeting continued in discussion of the proposed zoning district definitions.

Hegland noted in the light industrial area we were going to require that the outdoor storage be enclosed. She advised an option for an addition to the definition to would be, “outdoor storage areas for non-retail goods (enclosed)”. Mursko commented the idea of outdoor storage is that it would be outdoor storage of finished product, not raw materials. The decision from the group was to enclose the raw materials.

Logren commented on a grammatic error the general commercial district. Under justification, it should read “areas, while still providing”. Hegland noted that in that area as well they had decided to add a different qualifier than higher to design standards like “quality”. This would be a step down from high design standards. Gutknecht will come up with the terminology.

Mayor Preiner questioned in the description of general business district, what is small animal care? Hegland stated she understood it to be a groomer or doggy day care, etc. The goal was to not allow feed lots, they put small animal. Gutknecht we should leave it as “small animal care”. Mayor Preiner also requested to put the animal care part at the end of the sentence, it will flow better.

The meeting continued in discussion of the moving on to zoning district uses list.

Hegland questioned if in the general commercial district, the addition of “truck” to car wash? Gutknecht stated his initial thought was just low impact passenger cars. Discussion concluded that he will add truck and RV to car wash.

Hanegraaf noted should we add urgent care to General Commercial? Highway commercial C3 breaks up “medical clinics and support facilities” and “urgent care” as different uses, but general commercial C2 only lists medical clinics. Planner Johnson stated he would not make a distinction between “medical clinic and support facilities” and “urgent care”. Conclusion was to delete urgent care with that understanding. Everyone agreed with medical clinics covering urgent care. Gutknecht will strike urgent care from general commercial and general business B1.

Logren stated her confusion, as she had thought highway commercial C3 was going to be where there were bigger businesses. Gutknecht to add “commercial” to 8, 22, 23. They would like to strike 5, 24, 30, 43.

Do we need to better define garden center? General Business B1 says garden center/nursery. highway commercial C3 just says garden center. Consensus is that they would like to see a concept nursery/greenhouse similar to Bachman’s would be okay. Gutknecht and Johnson will add nursery and garden center to definitions of General Business B1 and highway commercial C3 for review at the next meeting.

Conversation continued to General Business B1.

Changes from highway commercial C3 should flow to General Business B1 besides data centers. Gutknecht will add “commercial” to 8, 22, 23, and striking 24, 30. The general consensus is to keep datacenters in General Business B1. Gutknecht would make the change to take out “primarily direct retail sales to consumers” from bakeries.

Logren made mention that the goal was to encourage people to go to the intersection for retail. Johnson stated the McCombs study repeats what Logren stated. General Business B1 should not be retail. Gutknecht to eliminate 1-4, 6, 7, 18, 15, 21, 22.

Hanegraaf calls on Dan Mike to give his comment. Mike’s comment was relating to his property and CUP specifically, and not applicable to the discussion around definitions. His main concern was how the new guidelines would affect his ability to sell and potentially his CUP.

Gutknecht will take what they have decided so far and make it into its own “ordinance”. Then we will analyze each district separately. The City is soon to be approaching the busy season, the Planning Commission will be reviewing applications therefore there is not a lot of time for workshops. Gutknecht recommended to look at one district at a time at each meeting as less time is used up, leaving time allotment for applications. Once this is complete, they still have work on the permitted, conditional, and interim uses as well as design standards for each district.

Mursko recommended to immediately adopt the ordinance. If later changes are needed, amendments can be made. As of now, the City is still operating under the old ordinances. All new applications coming in are having to come in under the old zoning code. Once approved, all new applications will have to comply with the new ordinances. The Planning Commission and Council can make amendments to components of the ordinance as it is being worked through them. They would still have to work permitted, CUP, IUP, design standards, but the old ones will remain in place until amended. It is going to take at least 2 more months to get through the ordinance.

Hegland questioned when the draft language would be available for viewing? Mursko stated the Planning Commission would view the draft, after it is complete. Then to complete the process the City would post notice for the hearing. Planner Johnson stated this is a major reformatting of the ordinance and it is best to figure out the most appropriate approach. Johnson noted they currently have the start of ordinances for mixed use districts and that could be used as a starting point, and he would add the design standards in, based on previous conversation on what he understands the group wants, and then the Planning Commission and City Council can tweak it from there. They will fine tune the details once formatting is figured out.

Hegland asked when and how would they see this. Hegland would prefer to see it in a workshop format for efficiency.

Mursko noted the next meeting is just the concept review for Clear Channel Billboard Design. Gutknecht and Johnson stated there would not be enough time for them to prepare the draft for the meeting on March 18th.

Mursko noted Gutknecht and herself will prepare a presentation about the closest to the interchange districts because they will have the highest standards.

PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

Nothing to report.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mursko noted the election for the Presidential Nominee Party (PNP) took place Tuesday, March 3rd. 445 people voted.

Applications are coming in for the Planning Commission to start considering.

Ribbon cutting at Aces hotel is next Wednesday, March 11th. Anyone can attend.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORT

King made mention that not having the joint meetings would have made this process for discussion around land use even more lengthy and difficult.

ATTENDANCE - NEXT CC MEETING

Hanegraaf is scheduled to attend the City Council meeting on 03.11.2020.

Motion by Wolowski to adjourn. Second by King. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Rochelle Busch, Administrative Technician