

CITY OF COLUMBUS
JOINT CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGY MEETING FORMAT
STATUTES SECTION 13D.021
06-15-2022

The 06-15-2022 Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting for the City of Columbus was called to order at 6:04pm by Mayor Jesse Preiner at the City Hall. Present were City Council members Rob Busch, Shelly Logren, Sue Wagamon and Janet Hegland, Commission members present were Chair Ron Hanegraaf, Kris King, Barb Bobick and Bob Berens, City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko and Associate Planner Frank Koenen.

In attendance via interactive technology were City Planner Dean Johnson, Brown Beagle Representative Jon Sawyer and Assistant to the City Administrator Jessica Hughes.

Also, in attendance in person were Brown Beagle Professional Engineer Representative Gregory Halling of Windsor Engineers, Residents Myron and Cindy Angel and Residents Emmy and Rick Robinson.

The meeting was held in an interactive technology meeting format.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER – REGULAR MEETING – 6:00PM**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. MOTION – APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA** *Motion* Hegland to approve agenda as written. Second Wagamon. Motion carried with King, Logren, Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Bobick, Busch, Berens and Preiner voting in favor.
- 4. MOTION – APPROVAL OF AUGUST 4, 2021, JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES** *Motion* Preiner to approve 08-04-2021, Joint City Council and Planning Commission Minutes as written. Second Hegland. Motion carried with King, Logren, Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Bobick, Busch, Berens and Preiner voting in favor.
- 5. MOTION – APPROVAL OF MAY 4, 2022, JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES** *Motion* Preiner to approve 05-04-2022, Joint City Council and Planning Commission Minutes as written. Bobick questioned the minutes relating to Wagamon’s response to Equipment Transportations Non-Binding Concept Plan. Directions were given for staff to go back and listen to the audio and see if that section of the minutes needs to be updated prior to approval. *Motion* Preiner to retract last motion and will not act on this item until the tape has been reviewed for accuracy. Hegland seconded. Motion carried with King, Logren, Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Bobick, Berens, Busch and Preiner voting in favor. Berens noted a minor typo on #3 of the 05-04-2022 minutes that his last name was spelt incorrectly.
- 6. DISCUSSION - NON-BINDING CONCEPT PLAN BROWN BEAGLE LLC (JON SAWYER)**
Brown Beagle LLC owns 10.45 acres on West Freeway Drive, PID 36-32-22-32-0005, in the LI Light Industrial district. The applicant proposes to construct several 8,000 square feet to 12,000 square feet buildings for lease to small businesses, small building trades, indoor repair or supply warehouses who do not require large spaces or elaborate showrooms. The buildings would consist mostly of open warehouse space, indoor storage or workshop areas, a small office area of

approximately 400-500 square feet divided into several small offices and one bathroom, the final configuration which would be determined by the end user needs.

Representatives from Brown Beagle, Professional Engineer Greg Halling (1121 Landings Lane, Watertown, MN 55388) and Jon Sawyer (4 Hawk Lane, North Oaks, MN 55127) gave an overview of their concept plan. Planning Commissioners and City Council members were able to share their thoughts and ask questions.

Brown Beagle LLC, representatives will connect with Mursko and Johnson to discuss the next steps in applying and processing an official request.

7. DISCUSSION – RESIDENTIAL ZONED BUSINESS MORATORIUM STUDY QUESTIONS 1-3

Meeting One, for the first meeting there are three questions staff are hoping to get Planning Commission and City Council member answers on. Council and Planning Commission members discussed the meeting schedule and whether or not all of the meetings should be joint meetings. **Consensus** was to have the questions sent out to the Council and Planning Commission members prior to each meeting, Council members may attend the Planning Commission meetings and Planning Commission Chair Hanegraaf would recognize the Council members to share their thoughts during those meetings and the Council members would provide policy question feedback prior to each meeting as well.

1. How should the City define businesses in the residential district? Should the name be changed from residential zone business to home occupation?
Hegland recommended changing the name to Home Occupation (no Interim Use Permit) and Home Occupation (Interim Use Permit Required) to make it clear to others when a IUP is required and when it is not. **Consensus** was to use Hegland's recommendation for Home Occupation (no Interim Use Permit) and Home Occupation (Interim Use Permit Required).

Discussion on the definition for Home occupation (no permit required): Any gainful occupation or profession engaged in by the property owner and/or occupant of a dwelling. A home occupation is a small home-based family or professional business where the economic activity is performed within a dwelling unit with minimal storage in an accessory structure.

Hanegraaf questioned if a renter would be able to run a home occupation. Hughes clarified that the current definition states property owner and/or occupant of a dwelling, which implies that a renter would be able to conduct a home occupation when an interim use permit is not required. Hanegraaf asked if renters in the proposed apartment complex would be able to conduct home occupations. **Direction** was given for staff to seek legal advice as to whether or not renters can have a home occupation.

Discussion on the definition for Home Occupation (interim use permit required): Any gainful occupation or profession engaged in by the property owner and/or occupant of a dwelling that may impact more than the dwelling unit of a property. Home occupations (IUP required) shall not be permitted on lots less than 5 acres and will only be permitted in the rural residential district. **Consensus** to leave this definition as it is for now and to further discuss the 5 acre minimum at a future meeting.

Preiner would like to eliminate home occupation (no IUP) from the high-density and medium-density districts. King would like to include home occupation (no IUP) in the other districts (high, low and medium and mixed-use density) with the criteria currently used for residential zoned

businesses. Logren, Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch and Berens agreed with King. **Consensus** was to further discuss and consider adding a requirement for distance between home occupation and neighboring dwellings in meeting three.

Hughes read the following standards would be applied to both types of home occupations and can be adjusted throughout the discussion as needed:

- Shall not create odor, dust, noise, electrical disturbances, glare, vibrations, or other nuisances to include visual or otherwise nuisances as determined by XX that will affect nearby properties.
- Must be clearly incidental and secondary to the residential use, should not change the residential character.
- Any equipment that will create electrical interference to adjacent properties is prohibited.
- Must comply with city nuisance code.
- Shall not require internal or external alterations or involve construction features not customarily found in dwellings except where to comply with locate and state fire and police recommendations.
- The owner of the home occupation shall reside in the home associated with the home occupation

Hughes also explained that this will be the running list that the group can add to during future meetings. Berens would like to add “visual or otherwise” to the first bullet point.

2. Should there be one set of rules for all businesses in the rural residential district, or should there be more than one set of rules for different types of properties in the rural residential district?

Hughes explained that this would be in relation to Home Occupations IUP required.

There's two different options Hughes presented to the group, Option 1: Have two levels of special home occupations based on acreage. Or Option 2: one type of special home occupation, with categories built into each control measure section.

Logren, Berens, Busch, Bobick, Hegland, King, Hanegraaf, Preiner and Wagamon agreed with option 2. **Consensus** one type of special home occupation, with categories built into each control measure section.

3. Should the City have a list of business types that are prohibited in the residential district?

Consensus members would like a list of business types that are prohibited in the residential district.

The group discussed business types that generate the most complaints, and everyone will continue to think about if there are businesses that cannot be regulated through other control measures that they do not want to allow so that a list can be created at a different meeting.

Hughes explained the general schedule and agenda for the remaining RZB Moratorium meetings in July, August and September. The next meeting will be on 7-20-2022 at the Planning Commission meeting. Hughes will send policy questions to the Council members ahead of time to give their input to the Planning Commission.

8. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM Nothing at this time.

9. PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S REPORT King asked where the billboards are at, stating they put the one Columbus sign up but not the second and asked about Clear Channel updating their billboard

and the status of those projects. Mursko indicated she would look into it. King also asked about Universal's CUP and the landscaping conditions that were approved, she is wondering on the timeframe they have to get the landscaping in this year. Mursko clarified that they have one year to install the landscaping. Hegland gave an update on the new positions that the Personnel Committee is recommending to Council at their next meeting including a Planning Tech and an Accountant. Preiner asked Associate Planner, Frank Koenen, to introduce himself.

10. ATTENDANCE FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS King to attend the 06-22-2022 City Council meeting.

11. MOTION TO ADJOURN *Motion* by Preiner to adjourn, seconded by King. Motion carried with King, Logren, Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Bobick, Busch, Berens and Preiner voting in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:02pm.

Carissa Kranz

Respectfully Submitted: Carissa Kranz, Recording Secretary