

CITY OF MARSHALL
LEGISLATIVE & ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Tuesday, May 27, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT: James Lozinski, See Moua-Leske and Amanda Schwartz
MEMBERS ABSENT: None.
STAFF PRESENT: Sharon Hanson, City Administrator; Pamela Whitmore, City Attorney; Jason Anderson, Director of Public Works/ City Engineer; E.J. Moberg, Director of Administrative Services; Lauren Deutz, EDA Director; Ilya Gutman, Plans Examiner; and Steven Anderson, City Clerk.
OTHERS PRESENT: None.

At 8:30 AM Chair Lozinski called the meeting to order.

Consider Approval of the Minutes

Motion made by Moua-Leske, seconded by Schwartz to approve the minutes as presented. All voted in favor.

Ordinance Amending Sections 86-96 A Agricultural District, 86-104 B-3 General Business District, 86-106 I-1 Limited Industrial District, and 86-107 I-2 General Industrial District to Update Billboard Requirements

Gutman explained that all billboards required a conditional use permit and may only be installed in a general business commercial or industrial district only. With the increase in the number of applications to install billboard staff looked at comparable cities to see how Marshall's ordinance equated. After finding several comparables staff recommended increasing the minimum distance between billboards and adding a buffer to residential districts, parks, churches, and schools. As well as reducing the maximum width and height requirements everywhere in the city, other than along the Highway 23 corridor which would remain the same. Per the request of the committee from the last meeting a provision was added to include five hours of use, for free, for the city in addition to emergency messages. Lozinski asked for clarification on the advertising use for the city.

Motion made by Schwartz, seconded by Moua-Leske to recommend the revisions to Section 86-96, 86-104, 86-106, and 86-107 to update billboard requirements be brought to full council for consideration. All voted in favor.

Ordinance Amending Section 86-1 Definitions to Address Sober Houses

Sober homes are not state licensed facilities, unlike group homes and other residential programs. A sober home would be considered a rental property where several unrelated adults live. Lozinski questioned the difference between licensure and regulation on the state end. Whitmore provided background on state statute regarding sober homes. Since Marshall had removed a limit on the number of unrelated adults in a rental unit, the only limit left was the maximum number of people (two) per bedroom from the current City Housing Code. Members discussed a couple communal homes in Marshall and the number of people that could be in a rental property. Gutman did clarify that the number of parking spaces available in front of the rental would limit the number of occupants.

Motion made by Schwartz, seconded by Moua-Leske to recommend the revisions to Section 86-1 to incorporate sober homes be brought to full council for consideration. All voted in favor.

Ordinance amending Section 86-248 Outside Storage to clarify Commercial Display and Sales Lots Requirements

The current ordinance required that all sales and display lots are paved. Staff proposed changing the ordinance to allow small equipment to be displayed on grass or other landscaped areas provided there is a paved surface within 5 feet, such as a sidewalk or parking lot. Small equipment sales lots are of much more limited utilization than car sales lots with significantly less traffic and typically have customers traversing on foot to sit on equipment. The proposed change would help distinguish between high use display and sales areas, such as car sales lots, and low use display and sales areas such as lawn equipment sales and would relax current paving requirements. Members discussed various sales lots around the city and whether they were in commercial or industrial zones. With industrial zones being laxer on sales lot requirements because of heavier machinery on display. Members also discussed the possibility of issuing variance adjustment permits.

Motion made by Lozinski, seconded by Schwartz to have staff bring the recommended revisions to Section 86-248 to clarify commercial display and sales lots to the full council for consideration.

Discussion on Proposed Exterior Standards

In trying to keep in line with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan that recommended that the city "...should adopt area specific design standards to guide the look and feel of development within key areas of the city." Staff concentrated on the areas of the city with the most traffic and initial first impressions for visitors, which typically centered around the Highway 23 corridor. Within the concentrated areas the exterior standard was split into Level One and Level Two areas. Level one areas would have a higher standard than level two. Director Anderson mentioned that the city used to have citywide performance standards but after push-back from local businesses the ordinance was repealed, and zero standards were put into place. Staff would like to meet in the middle by limiting areas where standards would be enforced and by having the different levels (one and two) the building requirements would be less than the original requirements that were repealed. Members discussed the possibility of creating a committee comprised of citizens to re-address exterior standards. Lozinski requested that if a natural disaster/damage were to occur building owners would have the option to restore the building using the original materials within a certain number of days after the damage occurred without having to use a higher class of material.

Motion made by Moua-Leske, seconded by Schwartz to direct staff to create a committee of stakeholders to review and create an ordinance for exterior standards in targeted areas. All voted in favor.

Other Business Items: Parks & Open Spaces

Staff wanted to bring the item back to the committee for additional discussion and clarification. Whitmore provided background on the ordinance changes and the court decision that spurred them. Members discussed the process of how a parkland fee was tracked and whether the fee was paid upfront by the developer or after the fact once a building permit was submitted. The ordinance was worded to allow either the developer to pay up front or wait until lots were sold and developed. Typically, the assessing department kept track if a developer opted to not pay upfront. Director Anderson reiterated that the building department has streamlined the internal process for parkland fees and new potential building developers are made aware of the upcoming fee much earlier in the process than they used to.

Motion made by Moua-Leske, seconded by Schwartz to recommend that revisions to Parks & Open Spaces be brought to the council for consideration.

Adjournment

Motion by Moua-Leske, seconded by Schwartz to adjourn the meeting. All voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Steven Anderson
City Clerk