

**CITY OF COLUMBUS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGY MEETING FORMAT  
STATUTES SECTION 13D.021  
08-17-2022**

The 08-17-2022 Planning Commission meeting for the City of Columbus was called to order at 6:32 pm by Chair Ron Hanegraaf at the City Hall. Present were Planning Commission members Ron Hanegraaf, Kris King, Barb Bobick, and Bob Berens, City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko, Associate Planner Frank Koenen, Planning and Zoning Permit Tech Ella Giefer, and Assistant to the City Administrator Jessica Hughes.

In attendance via interactive technology were City Council Member Shelly Logren and Josh Brobeck.

Also, in attendance in person were Mayor Jesse Preiner and City Council Member Janet Hegland.

The meeting was held in an interactive technology meeting format.

1. **CALL TO ORDER – REGULAR MEETING – 6:30PM**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA** *Motion* Berens to approve agenda as written. Second Bobick. Motion carried with King, Hanegraaf, Bobick, and Berens voting in favor.
4. **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 3, 2022, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES** Item tabled until upcoming September 7 meeting.
5. **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 3, 2022, PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES FOR ST. CLAIR LAKES, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT (MARK OLSON)** Item tabled until upcoming September 7 meeting.
6. **PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION – SHORELAND MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE** At this time a public hearing was held to consider a request for a to consider a City Code amendment updating the shoreland management ordinance and development standards related to shoreland, thereby amending Chapters 7A and 7E of the City Code. Separate minutes for the public hearing are prepared.

Discussion- Shoreland Management Ordinance

Hanegraaf asked the other Planning Commission members for any additional comments. There were none at this time. *Motion* King to recommend City Code Amendment to Chapter 7A and 7E. Second Berens. Motion carried with King, Hanegraaf, Bobick, and Berens voting in favor.

7. **DISCUSSION – RESIDENTIAL ZONED BUISNESS MORATORIUM STUDY** At this time a public discussion was held to consider updating city ordinances regarding Residential Zoned Businesses.

Discussion - Storage, Screening, Building Space, Sights/Sounds/Odors, And Signage.

At this time the Planning Commissioners had an open discussion regarding their thoughts on the Residential Zoned Business Moratorium Study. Hughes began by outlining the current zoning rules and reading the questions that had been sent to the commission, then read an outline of the recommendations that city staff had given.

Discussion - Regulation of Storage and Screening.

Hughes stated that currently there is no outside storage allowed for Home Occupation 1 or Home Occupation 2, and that there was a question of if outside storage should continue be prohibited. Hughes outlined what City Staff recommended, which was to allow outside storage with 80% screening.

**King, Hanegraaf, and Bobick agreed that outdoor storage should not be allowed under Home Occupation 1.**

Berens asked how outdoor storage ordinances would affect truck drivers who parked their work vehicles at home overnight. Mursko clarified that this was considered parking and would be covered under the parking section of the code. Hughes stated that a vehicle being parked for less than a week was regulated under rules for parking and that vehicles parked more than a week were considered vehicle storage. Berens stated he agreed that outdoor storage of vehicles should not be allowed under Home Occupation 1, which King and Hanegraaf agreed with. Bobick agreed and added that vehicles should have a dedicated spot to be stored. Hughes stated that the City Staff recommendation was that outdoor storage should be allowed with visual screening and with storage size limited relative to acreage. Bobick stated that IUP applications should include proof of a large enough building to store their items. King stated that screening should not be included because the screening systems themselves are often unattractive, which Bobick agreed with. The commissioners also discussed how preexisting buildings would be affected, which Hughes said would be covered in a future meeting.

**The commissioners came to a consensus that there would not be any type of outdoor storage allowed and that businesses installing screening would not create an exception.**

Discussion - Building Space.

Hughes explained that the question was how much of the residence should be allowed to be used for either Home Occupation 1 or Home Occupation 2, if accessory buildings should be permitted, and that if accessory buildings were to be allowed how many square feet they would be permitted to be. Hughes outlined what the current ordinances were and what the Staff recommendations were. Hegland explained that her mindset was that residential zoned businesses were primarily residences and therefore should not need to have accessory buildings dedicated to them, and that those home based businesses should not be competing with commercial zoned businesses who pay commercial taxes. King asked for clarification on what the accessory buildings could be used for, which Mursko and Hughes answered there were not limits on. Mursko asked the Commissioners to also consider if people who work from home should be regulated the same as Home Occupations were. The commissioners discussed if there should be a limit on what accessory buildings could be used for, but agreed that there was not an effective way to enforce it. King stated that if they were going to make extremely narrow rules they might as well just ban residential zoned business altogether. Hughes advised that some of the commissioner's concerns could be addressed by a future meeting where a list of prohibited business types could be discussed.

**The Planning Commissioners came to a consensus that 20% of a residence are could be dedicated to Home Occupation 1 with one accessory building allowed which could be a maximum of 300 sq**

**ft, and that 30% of the residence could be dedicated to Home Occupation 2 with one accessory building allowed with a maximum of 1200 sq ft.**

Discussion - Signage. Hughes read that currently both types of home occupations allowed one sign with a maximum size of 2 sq ft, that signs must be affixed to the residence, and that illuminated signs were allowed under Home Occupation 2 but not under Home Occupation 1.

**The commissioners all agreed that illumination should not be allowed under either home occupation types but that the other regulations should remain as written.** Hanegraaf asked if there could be an exception for people who had long driveways or houses that were visually obscured, and Mursko stated that those owners could plead their case when they were applying for their Home Occupation 2 permit.

Discussion- Sights, Sounds, and Odors. The planning commissioners next discussed the wording for prohibiting nuisance sights, sounds, and odors. Hughes stated that her recommendation was that hazards and environmental concerns should also be included. King stated that previously issues with environmental impacts were regulated with IUPs.

**TASK** - Hughes stated she would research the language other cities used in their code to regulate businesses that caused environmental issues, and suggested that the Planning Commission consider that business that inherently cause negative environmental impacts could be included as prohibited uses. The commissioners also named electrical interference and vermin as things they would like to be specifically named in the working of the ordinance.

#### **Discussion - vehicle storage, traffic, customers, and employees.**

At this time the Planning Commissioners had an open discussion regarding the results of the Residential Zoned Business Moratorium Study regarding vehicle storage, traffic, customers, and employees.

Discussion- Vehicle Storage. **Hughes stated that the recommendation from staff was that the current allowance of 4 parking spots be eliminated under Home Occupation 1, which all members of the Planning Commission agreed with.**

Hughes asked the commissioners if the current allowance of 4 parking spots should continue to be allowed under Home Occupation 2. Bobick stated that there were families who had multiple generations living in one household and may need that much parking for their own personal use, to which Mursko responded that those households would have to build a larger driveway.

**King stated that there should be no on-street parking under Home Occupation 1 or Home Occupation 2, which the rest of the commissioners agreed with.**

Hughes asked the commissioners if there should be regulation on the parking of commercial vehicles with business' names on them. Berens stated that he believed that parking should be allowed but that keeping the vehicle parked in one spot all the time should not be allowed because it could be used as a way to circumvent the ordinances regarding signs in the yard. The other Planning Commissioners agreed on this, with a limit of 1 commercial vehicle per residence. Hughes asked if the commissioners wanted to include limits on customer parking. Hanegraaf said that he thought there should be a maximum of 1 or 2 parking spaces for customers. Berens stated he supported having a maximum of 2, which Bobick and King both agreed with.

**Hughes stated that vehicle storage was currently defined as a vehicle not moving for over 1 week, and that because the Planning Commission was prohibiting outdoor storage it followed that vehicles being left in one spot would be prohibited. The Commissioners agreed with this prohibition.**

The Planning Commissioners then discussed ordinances regarding residential businesses installing parking pads for customers.

**Hegland suggested that parking pads be limited to being next to or behind the accessory building or garage and within setback limits, which Hughes clarified as currently being 50 feet from the lot line. The commissioners agreed with Hegland's recommendation.**

Discussion- Employees. **Hughes stated that currently Home Occupation 1 does not allow non-resident employees, which the Commissioners agreed they did not want to change.** Hughes stated that under Home Occupation 2 non-resident employees are currently allowed under non-regular or infrequent bases, and explained that she did not know how that could be enforced and that her recommendation was that they say non-resident employees were allowed but that the number of those employees be limited. Berens said he had concerns about business who let multiple employees park their cars and then leave their personal vehicles at the residence so they could drive a commercial vehicle to a job site.

**The Commissioners agreed that for Home Occupation 1 there could be a maximum of 1 non-resident employee and that the employee could leave their vehicle at the residence if they were driving a commercial vehicle to a job site.**

Discussion- Traffic. The Planning Commissioners discussed limits on traffic and the types of vehicles that could be allowed to be used at the Residential Businesses. Hughes stated her recommendation was that deliveries over 20,000 GVW to 1 per week. King stated that there were weight limits on the roads and that those would also limit the types of vehicles that were making deliveries.

**The Commissioners agreed to limiting vehicle size to 20,000 GVW with only 1 trip being allowed per week which could only happen Monday through Friday.**

The commissioners began discussing the types of vehicles that should be allowed, but agreed they needed further time to consider those points and that they would table the remainder of the discussion until a future Planning Commission meeting.

8. **REQUEST – PUBLIC OPEN FORUM** Preiner thanked Hughes for all the work she put into preparing the materials for the Residential Zoned Business study and facilitating the commissioner's discussion.
9. **INFORMATION – PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S REPORT** Nothing at this time.
10. **INFORMATION – ASSOCIATE PLANNER'S REPORT** Koenen stated that he had contacted Outfront Media for a compliance review and was waiting to hear back from them.
11. **ATTENDANCE OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING** King to attend the 08-24-2022 City Council meeting.
12. **MOTION TO ADJOURN** Motion by Bobick to adjourn. Second Hanegraaf. Motion carried with King, Hanegraaf, Bobick, and Berens voting in favor. Meeting adjourned 9:01 PM.

*Ella Giefer*

Respectfully Submitted by Recording Secretary Ella Giefer