

**CITY OF COLUMBUS
JOINT MEETING
INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGY MEETING FORMAT
STATUTES SECTION 13D.021
11.16.2022**

The 11-16-22 Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting for the City of Columbus was called to order at 6:09 PM by Mayor Jesse Preiner at the City Hall. Present were Mayor Jesse Preiner, City Council members Janet Hegland, Rob Busch, Shelly Logren, and Sue Wagamon, Planning Commission members Ron Hanegraaf, Barb Bobick, Kris King, and Bob Berens, City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko, Associate Planner Frank Koenen, Planning and Zoning Permit Tech Ella Giefer, and Attorney Megan Rogers.

In attendance via interactive technology were Rob Busch, Sue Wagamon, Kelly, Dave, and an iPad user.

In attendance in person were Dan Friedner and John Waldoch.

The meeting was held in an interactive technology meeting format.

1. **CALL TO ORDER – REGULAR MEETING – 6:08 PM**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **MEETING AGENDA** *Motion* Hegland to approve agenda as written. Second Logren. Carried with Logren, Hegland, Wagamon, Busch, Preiner, Bobick, Hanegraaf, Berens, and King voting in favor.
4. **October 19, 2022, JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**
Tabled until next meeting.
5. **PET BOARDING/GROOMING MORATORIUM STUDY** At this time a discussion was held to consider updating city ordinances regarding the Pet Boarding and Grooming Moratorium. Koenen gave a background of the moratorium and the questions being put forth before the Council and Commissioners. Hegland asked for clarification on how different type of pet care facilities were licensed by the City and State. Rogers stated that many cities included a provision in their licensing structure that facilities must follow state and federal regulations. Mursko clarified that City code did not have specialty licenses for dog training or grooming, and that this gap is one of the reasons why this moratorium study was called for. Hegland said that in her research she did not see a lot of licensing guidance coming from the State and that most of the regulation was written by municipalities. Logren asked if there was any organization that inspected or regulated pet care facilities. Rogers answered that there was a State regulatory structure for grooming where the State did an initial inspection but there was no enforcement after a business was established.

Koenen asked if there were any further concerns about pet boarding and grooming that the Council and Commissioners would like to put forward. Logren suggested that in addition to training and boarding more types of pet facilities should be listed. Mursko reviewed the structure of the license requirements being proposed. Task: Koenen will update the pet boarding and grooming moratorium study questions, which will be reviewed again at a future meeting.

Koenen asked if there were any zoning districts where the Council and Commissioners thought pet facilities should be prohibited. Hegland stated that the types of pet facilities needed to be more clearly defined before that question could be answered because different uses had different impacts and different districts where they would be appropriate, which Bobick agreed with. Logren suggested allowing indoor pet facilities in all zones but that ones with outside needed a CUP, which Hegland agreed with. Preiner said that there was an indoor pet business he was familiar with that was still extremely loud and interfered with nearby businesses. Task: Koenen will create definitions for pet grooming, pet training, and pet care, and will return with recommendations about which districts each use would be appropriate in.

Koenen asked if there were any specific nuisances that the City Council and Planning Commission had concerns about besides sights, sounds, and odors. Preiner stated his primary concern was noise from hunting dog training. Logren said she was concerned about pet facilities moving into buildings that were built for a different purpose and therefore are not soundproof, which Hegland agreed with.

Koenen asked if there were any design standards the City Council and Planning Commission would like to specify. Hegland suggested ventilation. King said Muddy Paws had issues with impervious surfaces when washing dogs.

Koenen asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding the moratorium study. Hegland asked what the process would be moving forward, and said she was concerned that the recommendations from the Planning Commission would be upended by policy questions from the City Council. Wagamon said she agreed and that the moratorium should be handled jointly moving forward. Mursko confirmed that another joint meeting will be scheduled.

6. **WYOMING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FINAL DRAFT REVIEW** At this time the City Council and Planning Commission had an open discussion regarding the Wyoming comprehensive plan. Koenen gave an introduction to the plan submitted and how Wyoming and Columbus are connected. King said she was concerned about potential traffic on Kettle River Blvd. Koenen stated that he anticipated needing to coordinate with Wyoming on upgrading Kettle River Blvd as well as future construction of a bike trail. Berens said there was a large amount of population growth anticipated and asked if there was an updated census, which Koenen said was 8,228 in 2020, which was lower than it was in 2017. Logren said that Columbus school districts would also be affected by Wyoming's population change. Motion Preiner for Koenen to reply to the City of Wyoming with the comments from the City Council and Planning Commission regarding an interest in a bicycle trail and concerns about traffic and a request for the Columbus city engineer to meet with the Wyoming city engineer. Second Hegland. Carried with Logren, Hegland, Wagamon, Busch, Preiner, Bobick, Hanegraaf, Berens, and King voting in favor.
7. **COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL MORATORIUM MEETING** At this time City Council and Planning Commission had an open discussion regarding the Commercial/Industrial Moratorium. Rogers gave an introduction on the previous discussions on the moratorium and the recommendations being proposed. Mursko clarified that the proposed commercial light district briefly discussed at the last meeting would be south of 141st and west of Lake Drive. Logren asked why the line was at 141st street, which Mursko said was chosen arbitrarily because it was midway through the district and that the location could be changed if needed. Rogers reviewed the new purpose and definition proposed for the commercial industrial light district and the additional uses being

recommended, which are offices, office showrooms, and limited production processing. Rogers said she recommended having permitted uses instead of conditional uses because it would incentivize development. Hegland said she was not in favor of permitted uses because there was a history of businesses bypassing the conditional use process by defining themselves as one use where the council would define them otherwise, and that the interest in the cities real estate was high enough that additional incentives were not needed. Wagamon asked for clarification on how approval of a permitted use was regulated, to which Mursko said that the business would be subject to a site plan review and that if they met conditions of the ordinance they were allowed by right to establish the business. Hegland said that she did not want to give up the control that a CUP gave the City and that she did not think the CUP process was a big disincentive for potential businesses, which Preiner agreed with. Logren stated that businesses often make changes even after a CUP is approved so the control from the City isn't always there, which Hegland said was more because of a problem with the enforcement process than the approval process. Logren asked if the CUP process could scare potential businesses away, to which Mursko said that she was not aware it was a problem. Berens said that in his experience as a developer most businesses would prefer the ease of a permitted use over a conditional use, which Busch agreed with.

Rogers reviewed the list of new conditional uses being recommended by her office. Rogers stated that the intention of the proposal was to incentivize the building of certain uses, because by recommending a broader list of uses there would be more of a potential market for the less intense uses to be built in the district. Berens asked if landscaping was part of the design standards of a district or if it was only the building that was regulated, to which Koenen answered that landscaping was considered more of a performance standard. Hegland asked if the proposed mortuary use also included crematoriums, which Rogers said was not addressed but could be if it was requested. Preiner asked if yard waste composting could be removed because it created a strong smell, which Hanegraaf agreed with. Preiner asked if outdoor music theatres could be removed as a use because the sound would likely disturb nearby homes and businesses, which Hegland agreed with. Hegland asked if there was any negotiating that could happen with a permitted use application, which Rogers said was not likely.

Rogers asked if the City Council and Planning Commission was ready to call for a public hearing or if they would like to have another meeting on the moratorium. Hegland said that she would prefer another meeting because there was new information presented at today's meeting, and asked for a map to be created that showed district boundaries and business locations.

Rogers said that due to the possibility of businesses becoming legal nonconformities she recommended for the City to adopt a provision that allowed the City Council to permit expansion of a legal nonconforming use if they met certain criteria. The joint council then discussed the schedule for future meetings where the moratorium could be discussed again.

8. **PUBLIC OPEN FORUM** Friedner said that he was opposed to the C/I Light district moving across Lake Drive because of the businesses it would affect, and that having the district on the West side was supposed to be to benefit the adjoining residential properties, but that there weren't residential properties on the East side so there wasn't a need to restrict the businesses there. Friedner asked that the outdoor storage be a 50% limit rather than the proposed 30%. Friedner said the moratorium was costing people money and that businesses needed it finished quickly.

9. **PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S REPORT** Nothing at this time.

10. **ADJOURN** *Motion* Preiner to adjourn. Second Hanegraaf. Carried with Logren, Wagamon, Hegland, Hanegraaf, Busch, Berens, Bobick, King, and Preiner voting in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:53 PM.

Ella Giefer

Respectfully Submitted by Recording Secretary Ella Giefer