

**THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON FEBRUARY 22,
2016, AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Jack Edmonds. Members present were Jeff Reynolds, and Jules Zimmer. Staff present were Jolene Foss (Comm. Dev. Director) and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assistant).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2016

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2016. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ZIMMER, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Ordinance Amending Chapter VII (Signs – adding Gas Station Canopy Tube Lighting)

This is an Ordinance amending Chapter VII (Signs) of Title 11 (Zoning) of the Princeton Code of Ordinances by adding Gas Station Canopy Tube Lighting to Electronic Changeable Copy Signs, Electronic Graphic Display Signs within the City of Princeton.

Gas Station Canopy Tube Lighting is referred to lighting that borders gas or filling station canopies. The canopy tube lighting will be permitted on property that is zoned B-2 neighborhood Business, B-3 General Commercial, HC-1 Health Care, MOR Medical Office Residential, MN-1 Industrial, and MN-2 Industrial Districts. The signs shall not be located within 125 feet of any existing residence (including single family homes, townhomes, multi-family residential buildings, apartments, etc.) without proper shielding to ensure that the brightness does not exceed maximum illumination of 5,000 nits (candelas per square meter) during daylight hours and a maximum illumination of 500 nits (candelas per square meter) between dusk and dawn, as measured from the sign's face at maximum brightness.

Edmonds opened the public hearing. There was no one in the audience that wanted to speak on this item.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE NO. 730 AMENDING CHAPTER VII (SIGNS) OF TITLE 11 (ZONING) OF THE PRINCETON CODE OF ORDINANCES BY ADDING GAS STATION CANOPY TUBE LIGHTING TO ELECTRONIC CHANGEABLE COPY SIGNS, ELECTRONIC GRAPHIC DISPLAY SIGNS WITHIN THE CITY OF PRINCETON. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

B. Ordinance Amending Chapter II (Definitions for Restaurant)

This is an Ordinance amending Chapter II (Definitions) of Title 11 (Zoning) of the Princeton Code of Ordinances by Expanding the Definition of Restaurants within the City of Princeton. The current definition reads as; “An eating facility where food is prepared and sold to the public for consumption on or off the premises.”

Amended definition would read; “An eating facility, other than a hotel, under the control of a single proprietor or manager, where meals are regularly prepared on the premises, where full waitress/waiter table service is provided, where a customer orders food from printed menus, and where the main food course is served and consumed while seated at a single location. To be a restaurant as defined by this section, an establishment shall have a license from the state as required by Minnesota Statutes, Section 157.16, as it may be amended from time to time, and meet the definition of either a “small establishment,” “medium establishment,” or “large establishment” as defined in Minnesota Statutes, Section 157.16, subd. 3d, as it may be amended from time to time. An establishment which serves prepackaged food that receives heat treatment and is served in the packaged or frozen pizza that is heated and served shall not be considered to be a restaurant for purposes of this Ordinance unless it meets the definitions of a “small establishment,” “medium establishment,” or “large establishment.”

Edmonds commented that the difference on this would be for example; Papa Murphy’s would not be defined as a restaurant under this definition because it is take out and you bake it and Pizza Hut would because they are a sit down full service establishment.

Edmonds opened the public hearing. There was no one in the audience that wanted to speak on this item.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ZIMMER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE ORDINANCE NO. 731 AMENDING CHAPTER II (DEFINITIONS) OF TITLE 11 (ZONING) OF THE PRINCETON CODE OF ORDINANCES BY EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF RESTAURANTS WITHIN THE CITY OF PRINCETON. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

C. #16-01 Zoning of Annexed School Properties (Four Properties)

Community Development Assistant Memo:

BACKGROUND

Zoning of Annexed Properties

The School District has submitted a Zoning application to zone the four (4) properties that were

annexed into the City in 2015 to R-1 Residential District. The four properties have the Property Identified Description of #24-021-0800, #24-022-0100, #24-021-0700, and #24-027-0100.

Staff has included a site map with the zoning identified on the properties connected to the annexed sites. North Elementary and the new K-2 School are zoned R-1 Residential. The properties connecting to the four sites are zoned R-1 Residential. The Princeton Middle School is zoned R-2 Residential.

Rezoning Review Standards. The Zoning Ordinance does not list review standards for rezoning applications. However, many communities utilize the following factors as review standards in rezoning requests, which are being provided as information:

1. The proposed action has been considered in relation to the specific policies and provisions of and has been found to be consistent with the official City Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed use is or will be compatible with present and future land uses of the area.
3. The proposed use conforms with all performance standards contained in this code.
4. The proposed use can be accommodated with existing public services and will not overburden the city's service capacity.
5. Traffic generation by the proposed use is within capabilities of streets serving the property.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission review the application and recommend final approval to the City Council to zone the property R-1 Residential.

Staff suggests the Planning Commission make a recommendation to City Council to zone the four (4) annexed properties of the School District to R-1, based on the following findings of fact:

1. The proposed action has been considered in relation to the specific policies and provisions of and has been found to be consistent with the official City Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed use is or will be compatible with present and future land uses of the area.
3. The proposed use conforms with all performance standards contained in this code.
4. The proposed use can be accommodated with existing public services and will not overburden the city's service capacity.
5. Traffic generation by the proposed use is within capabilities of streets serving the property.

*****End of Staff Memo*****

DeWitt explained that she did an aerial map showing where the annexed properties are located and what the zoning is around those sites. Ryan Hoffman (ICS Consulting) the representative for the School District completed the applications to have the properties zoned to R-1

Residential. The two property sites that are owned by the School District will be the next item on tonight's agenda and those two properties are zoned R-1 Residential. Those two sites connect to the annexed properties and will be two of the four lots that will be discussed for a Conditional Use Permit request for ball fields and softball fields. The R-1 Residential Zoning is the logical zoning for these sites.

Edmonds asked Michelle Czech (School District Representative) if she was okay with the zoning request to R-1 Residential.

Michelle Czech, (School District) said she was okay with this.

Edmonds opened the public hearing.

Dennis Leaser, 1321 Shady Lane, asked how the ball fields are going to impact their area.

Edmonds explained to Leaser the item being discussed now is the zoning of the annexed properties. The Conditional Use Permit is next on the agenda. His question will be answered at that time.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ZIMMER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL ITEM #16-01 ZONING OF THE ANNEXED SCHOOL PROPERTIES; #24-021-0700, #24-021-0800, #24-022-0100, and #24-027-0100 TO R-1 RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT AND CORRESPONDING WITH THIS ZONING WILL BE AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FUTURE LAND USE PLAN BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT THAT THE PROPOSAL COMPLIES WITH THE RESIDENTIAL CONCEPT, WHICH ALLOWS SCHOOLS AND EDUCATIONAL BUILDINGS ADJACENT TO RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS AND THE DESIGNATION IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE PRESENT AND FUTURE LAND USES OF THE AREA. THE CONDITIONS FOR THIS APPROVAL IS THAT THE FUTURE LAND USE OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES SHALL COMPLY WITH THE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS CONTAINED IN THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND TRAFFIC GENERATION AND ACCESS TO AND FROM THE PROPOSED USE SHALL BE WITHIN CAPABILITIES OF STREETS SERVING THE PROPERTY. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Is the rezoning consistent with the Princeton Land Use Plan? Yes.
2. Have there been changes in the character of development in the vicinity? Yes.
3. Does the rezoning constitute spot zoning of the property? No.

D. #16-02 Conditional Use Permit to Allow Softball & Baseball Fields in R-1 District (Four Properties) – and also Site Plan Review

Community Development Assistant Memo:

BACKGROUND

The Princeton Independent School District #477 has applied for a Conditional Use Permit for these four properties;

Land is in the City of Princeton, Mille Lacs County, PID #24-021-0800, Section 21, Township 36, Range 26, N ½ of SE of SE, & SW of SE of SE Lying N'LY of a line beginning 460 FT N. of SW corner, SE'LY 250 FT, S45D11M00S E 604.96 FT to PT 40 FT N of SE COR of SW of SE of SE, SEE 9/6/04 Survey, 25.05 acres;

Land is in the City of Princeton, Mille Lacs County, PID #24-021-0700, Section 21, Township 36, Range 26, SE of SE of SE, 10 acres;

City of Princeton, Mille Lacs County, PID #24-028-0300, Section 28, Township 36, Range 26, E ½ of NE of NE, EX W 295.16 FT of S 295.16 FT of N 935.16 FT, 18 acres;

City of Princeton, Mille Lacs County, PID #24-028-0200, Section 28, Township 36, Range 26, W 295.16 FT of S 295.16 FT of N 935.16 FT of E ½ of NE of NE, 2 acres.

The School District has requested at this February 22, 2016 Planning Commission meeting for zoning of their annexed property. If the Planning Commission decided to approve the zoning to R-1 Residential District and forward on to the City Council for final approval, we are now asking to review the Conditional Use Permit application to allow baseball and softball fields in four of the School District properties, two are the annexed sites (#24-021-0800 and #24-021-0700) and the other two sites are currently in the R-1 Zoning District (#24-028-0300 and #24-028-0200).

ANALYSIS

In R-1 Residential District with a Conditional Use Permit schools and educational buildings are permitted. The ball fields and softball fields would be allowed under this provision. The layout of four proposed ball fields would consist on a portion of the four property sites. The existing frame structure that is located on the northwest site layout would be relocated to the southwestern site. This building is for storage only.

At this time, the School District is not intending to put in any additional lighting. If in the future they decide to add lighting, the Princeton Public Utilities will service the area and have a lighting plan that the School District will have to follow. If they put in underground irrigation they plan to run it from the service at the Princeton Middle School existing service. The City of Princeton has an Ordinance that does not allow underground wells. There is no private well located on the school sites. At this time, no sewer is needed. The restroom facilities will be onsite porta potties.

ANALYSIS

The request is for four ball fields and softball fields that would be built on a portion of four School District property sites.

Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use Plan designates this property as Public & Semi-public. The Comprehensive Plan states that the City should support the enhancement or expansion of (public and semi-public uses, including governmental facilities, churches, and schools). Care should be given to ensure that adequate integration with surrounding land uses occurs.

Zoning. The zoning for this property is R-1. Schools and educational facilities are allowable uses with a Conditional use Permit in R-1.

General CUP Review Standards

Subsection 3.B. of Chapter IV outlines the standards for review of a conditional use permit:

1. *The proposed use does not violate the health, safety, or general welfare of Princeton residents.*

Comment: It does not appear that the proposed use will violate the health, safety or general welfare of Princeton residents.

2. *The proposed use has been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer in regards to erosion, runoff, water pollution, and sedimentation.*

Comment: Potential erosion, runoff, water pollution and sedimentation issues have been addressed in the site plan and reviewed by the City Engineer and all concerns will be met.

3. *Adequate parking and loading is provided in compliance with the Ordinance.*

Comment: The striping of a current asphalt are will provide additional parking.

4. *Possible traffic generation and access problems have been addressed.*

Comment: Any additional traffic generation or access are addressed with the CUP and Site Plan Review.

5. *The proposed use can be accommodated with existing public services and will not overburden the city's service capacity.*

Comment: The proposed use will not add any additional use to the City sewer system. If in the future, water, lighting and/or sewer are added to the site they will be accommodated with existing municipal sewer and water.

6. *The proposed use conforms to the City's Comprehensive Plan and is compatible with present and future land uses of the area.*

Comment: The Comprehensive Plan states that the City should support the enhancement or expansion of (public and semi-public uses, including governmental facilities, churches, and schools.)

Recommendation

It is City Staff's recommendation to approve the Conditional Use Permit/Site Plan Review for the proposed ball fields and softball fields for the School District with the following conditions:

1. If the School District in the future would like to add lighting, water, and/or sewer services to this area, they must contact the City of Princeton and Princeton Public Utilities for review and approval.
2. Jeff Row, City Engineer stated in his memo dated February 17, 2016 that information is missing where he cannot complete his review and that information be submitted and approved prior to any construction. All concerns the City Engineer addressed must be approved also prior to any construction.
3. Relocation of the storage building must go through the City Building Inspector for review and necessary permits prior to the move.

*****End of Staff Memo*****

Jeff Row, City Engineer with WSB Memo:
Dated February 17, 2016
Re: Princeton Schools Athletic Fields

This memorandum provides plan review comments for the proposed Princeton Schools Athletic Fields located north of the Princeton Middle School at 1100 82nd Avenue. The following documents were received for review:

- Site Layout of Proposed Fields (North and South)
- Grading, Drainage, and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (North and South)

Documents were reviewed to verify that they conform to the policies outlined in the City's Water Resources Management Plan. Based on these documents, we offer the following comments:

Project Description

The applicant proposes to construct five baseball fields, trail, and new pavement markings for the existing bituminous pavement parking lot.

General Comment

1. WSB received four plan sheets to review (C1.11, C1.12, C1.21, and C1.22). It appears that several plan sheets including the standard details, removals and some of the construction plan sheets are missing from this submittal.

2. Signature is necessary for all plan sheets.

Ball Field Design

1. Provide runoff calculation and drainage maps indicating where the stormwater runoff goes. Provide both the before and after construction for the stormwater calculations.
2. Provide documentation indicating how runoff leaves proposed drainage areas. Current design shows runoff running to neighboring property.

Trail Design

1. Provide proposed typical section for the trail in the plans. WSB received an email from the project engineer indicating it would be 2 inches of bituminous pavement and 8 inches of aggregate base.
2. Provide ADA approved pedestrian ramp necessary at the trail and parking lot intersection. A detail for the pedestrian ramp is necessary as well as it being shown on the site plan.
3. Provide documentation showing the trails meet ADA requirements.

Parking Lot

1. Provide parking lot layout design including handicap parking and fire department accessibility.

Utility Plan

1. It is recommended for the City, PUC and School to discuss if there is a need for a water and sewer service. That work should be incorporated into this project if it will be needed in the future.
2. The future sewer and water would be necessary if any bathroom or concession buildings are proposed.

Site Plan

1. Include removal plan for existing structures.
2. Verify that all slopes are not steeper than a ratio of 3:1 or provide special approval of treatment.

This concludes our plan review comments for the proposed Princeton Schools Athletic Fields. If there are any questions or comments associated with this review to contact Jeff Row.

*****End of Memo*****

DeWitt explained that this Conditional Use Permit request is for four properties sites. Two of the sites are the annexed area and the other two are what the School District is currently using. The reason for the additional ball fields is because the two ball fields at North Elementary

School is where the new K-2 School is being built. The proposed additional parking area is currently a paved area by the Middle School tennis courts and will be striped for 48 stalls. There is no proposed lighting for the ball fields. If in the future the School District does decide to add ball fields, they will have to contact the City of Princeton and the Princeton Public Utilities for review and approval. The Princeton Public Utilities does service power in that area and have a lighting plan that the School District would need to follow. If the School District decides to put in underground irrigation, they plan to run it from the service at the Princeton Middle Schools existing service. The City does have an Ordinance in place that does not allow underground wells. There is no private well located on the school sites. At this time, no sewer is needed. The restroom facilities will be onsite porta potties. There are residents present from Shady Acres development and I heard one of their concerns is the widening of 14th Street North and Melissa Stein-Wold (School District Representative from Wold Architects Engineer) is present to address questions.

Melissa Stein-Wold spoke on the project. There will be five ball fields. They are proposing to close 14th Street North. All traffic goes to 12th Street North. They will be restriping the paved area by the tennis courts and have an accessible route for the Fire Department and other emergency vehicles. The storage shed will be relocated on the site.

Edmonds asked if these fields will be primarily for the Middle School activities.

Stein-Wold said they will be for the youth at the Middle School and the other two schools around there.

Edmonds opened the public hearing. He said it would be easier if Melissa Stein-Wold were to take notes and answer the questions at one time.

Stein-Wold said that is fine.

Dennis Leaser, 1321 Shady Lane, asked if there is no lighting for the ball fields, what time would the activity on the fields be done and what about weekends.

Kathy Roosma, 1334 Shady Lane, in regards to lighting what will be the steps taken that reduce the lighting from going to the homes nearby. Where will the porta potties be placed.

Ron Gensler, 1311 Shady Lane, asked how this is being funded. How will this impact property taxes. How is this being paid. If it is used for Middle School he understands, but why can't the baseball fields be in place where South Elementary is. Are they thinking in the future of using South Elementary site when they take that building down. He has seen a change in his area already with the trees gone on this site. There is more wind. He wants 14th Street North looked at where it will make vehicles stop, they are not stopping.

John Volkmuth, 1402 3rd Avenue Court North, lives in a cul-de-sac and when she said they would close 14th Street North, did she mean closing it to the ball fields. He understands moving

the shed. If they do need to add additional parking in the future, it might be needed on the north side of the site. Would 4th Avenue North be improved or widened. Perhaps paved.

Gerald Boser, 1322 Shady Lane, lives west of the tennis courts. If there is a tennis game and the ball fields are being used also, there could be a need for more parking.

Diane Boser, 1322 Shady Lane, commented that she would be gassed out with all the fumes. They have fumes now with the buses parking near their place and smell all the fumes. She does not want any more traffic to the area and added fumes. No more fumes or traffic.

Edmonds said the transfer lots for the new school will be moving back over to the North Elementary and K-2 School site.

Ron Gensler said there is a wide section of woods north of the site and that would be an idea for a road there in the future.

Kevin Walz, 4004 Brickton Road, owns the woods and no comment has been spoken of for a road there, but he would support it.

Ron Gensler asked if there has been discussion of changing Mark Park.

Edmonds said no he has not heard of anything.

Kathy Roosma, 1334 Shady Lane, asked if there are statistics on how much the ball fields are used. She would like to see those.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Melissa Stein-Wold addressed the questions. The time where there will be activity at the ball fields will be during the week and there will be weekend use. During the week the schools have not yet determined the times of use. They are not installing lights so it would be early enough when the field use is done for the day. If in the future, lighting is installed it would be looked at where the lighting would not go into their yards, and it would need a public hearing so they would be aware of it. The porta potties she believes would be in the middle of the pin wheel or by the parking area. The ball fields were funded by the referendum. There were ball fields removed by the new K-2 School area and replacement ones are needed.

Michele Czech said the replacement fields will be funded by the referendum. Additional funds is from a Building Construction Fund and would have no effect on additional taxes.

Melissa Stein-Wold said in regards to the South Elementary land the documents have been issued and once that is demoed it will be soccer fields. 14th Street North would be shut down and rerouted to 12th Street North. The proposed event parking they will restriped the area and that will give over 200 parking stalls with the Middle School lots. Improvements to County Road 4 she is not sure off. There would be another public hearing for improvements. There has been no one looking at a road to the north of this site. The ball fields are needed. There have been multiple meetings on the ball fields and they find this site plan will balance this out.

Kevin Walz who owns the woods by this site asked if 14th Street North will be completely closed or will there be access for emergency vehicles.

Melissa Stein-Wold said that 14th Street North goes into the storage area so it does not connect into a parking lot area. They do not want public access from this road.

Kevin Walz believes they need emergency vehicle access.

Melissa Stein-Wold will look into this.

Kathy Roosma is concerned with the traffic being redirected from 14th Street North during playing times. Would vehicles be parked on the street by their house.

Kathy Volkmuth, 1402 3rd Avenue Court North, said when North Elementary had their fields, cars would park on 4th Avenue North. That would make it difficult. She could see where vehicles will park on Shady Lane. How is restriping going to make more parking. It is so packed now.

Edmonds said parking on public streets is a concern for the City and School District and signage would be needed. Police force will work on this.

Dave Warneke, 1401 3rd Avenue Court North, asked how many ball fields will there be.

Melissa Stein-Wold said there will be five fields added and two existing fields. There will be tournaments also at the fields.

Dave Warneke said parking will be an issue.

Edmonds commented to Warneke that he was a Police Chief for the City of Princeton and he should understand parking issues on the street and how they are handled.

Reynolds said for the bus transfer lot if it were properly stripped it would work better.

Edmonds said the transfer lot will be moved over to the new school.

Diane Boser said multiply the number of vehicles that will be coming with more fields and that adds up.

Zimmer said he is happy to have access to the fields from the Middle School. He is happy they are following through to what they said they would. All the parking stalls being filled will be highly unlikely. More fields are needed. We have an organized youth baseball and softball programs and there is a limit of fields in the summer and that makes it difficult. More ball fields is very much needed.

Foss said she supports growth and community development. This might not be a bad possibility of what is coming in this area. Could have been industrial and it is not. Look at the use.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE ITEM #16-02 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW SOFTBALL AND BASEBALL FIELDS IN R-1 RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT AT THE PROPERTY SITES LOCATED AT; #24-021-0800, #24-021-0700, #24-028-0300, AND #24-028-0200, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. IF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE FUTURE WOULD LIKE TO ADD LIGHTING, WATER, AND/OR SEWER SERVICES TO THIS AREA, THEY MUST CONTACT THE CITY OF PRINCETON AND PRINCETON PUBLIC UTILITIES FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
2. JEFF ROW, CITY ENGINEER STATED IN HIS MEMO DATED FEBRUARY 17, 2016 THAT INFORMATION IS MISSING WHERE HE CANNOT COMPLETE HIS REVIEW AND THAT INFORMATION BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION. ALL CONCERNS THE CITY ENGINEER ADDRESSED MUST BE APPROVED ALSO PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION.
3. RELOCATION OF THE STORAGE BUILDING MUST GO THROUGH THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR FOR REVIEW AND NECESSARY PERMITS PRIOR TO THE MOVE.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Does the proposed use violate the health, safety or general welfare of the Princeton residents? No.
2. Has the proposed use been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer in regards to erosion, runoff, water pollution, and sedimentation (if applicable)? Yes.
3. Is adequate parking and loading provided in compliance with the Ordinance? Yes.
4. Have possible traffic generation and access problems been addressed? Yes.
5. Can the proposed use be accommodated with existing public services and not overburden the City's service capacity? Yes.
6. Does the proposed use conform to the City's Comprehensive Plan and is compatible with present and future land uses of the area? Yes.

Are there conditions that could be attached to the granting of a permit that would mitigate any potential the adverse impact? Yes.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN FOR THE SOFTBALL AND BASEBALL FIELDS IN THE R-1 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AT THE PROPERTY SITES LOCATED AT; #24-021-0800, #24-021-0700, #24-028-0300, AND #24-028-0200, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS THAT WERE STATED IN THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

1. IF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE FUTURE WOULD LIKE TO ADD LIGHTING, WATER, AND/OR SEWER SERVICES TO THIS AREA, THEY MUST CONTACT THE CITY OF PRINCETON AND PRINCETON PUBLIC UTILITIES FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
2. JEFF ROW, CITY ENGINEER STATED IN HIS MEMO DATED FEBRUARY 17, 2016 THAT INFORMATION IS MISSING WHERE HE CANNOT COMPLETE HIS REVIEW AND THAT INFORMATION BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION. ALL CONCERNS THE CITY ENGINEER ADDRESSED MUST BE APPROVED ALSO PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION.
3. RELOCATION OF THE STORAGE BUILDING MUST GO THROUGH THE CITY BUILDING INSPECTOR FOR REVIEW AND NECESSARY PERMITS PRIOR TO THE MOVE.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

E. #16-03 Rezoning from A-1 Agricultural to MN-2 Industrial (PID #90-005-2300)

Community Development Director Memo:

City Council has initiated a change of boundary from A-1 Agricultural to MN-2 Industrial for the one parcel located on the south western edge of the Princeton city limits.

Rezoning from A-1 Agricultural to MN-2 Industrial for the following property site described as:

*PID #90-005-2300

32143 136TH ST NW, PRINCETON MN, SW ¼ OF NW ¼, SEC.5, T35N, R26W

This property is owned by the City of Princeton. The rezoning of this property is requested in order to bring the city zoning ordinances into compliance with state and federal law.

It is the recommendation of staff to approve the rezoning request, and upon approval, this request will go to the City Council for final approval.

*****End of Staff Memo*****

Foss said the rezoning will bring adult use into compliance with the City Zoning Ordinance.

Edmonds opened the public hearing. There was no one in the audience that wanted to speak on this item.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ZIMMER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL ITEM #16-03 REZONING FROM A-1 AGRICULTURAL TO MN-2 INDUSTRIAL AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 32143 136TH STREET NW, (#90-005-2300), ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT THAT THE PROPOSED ACTION HAS BEEN CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO BRINGING THE CITY ZONING ORDINANCE INTO COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAW AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OFFICAL CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AND THE DESIGNATION IS COMPATIBLE WITH PRESENT AND FUTURE LAND USES OF THE AREA. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Is the rezoning consistent with the Princeton Land Use Plan? Yes,
2. Have there been changes in the character of development in the vicinity? No.
3. Does the rezoning constitute spot zoning of the property? No.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Micro Brew Ordinance

Community Development Director Memo:

A recent request for the opportunity to include microbrewery as a home occupation in a residential district has initiated the research into proposed changes to our zoning ordinance.

The zoning ordinance does not address microbreweries, wineries, etc.

Below you will find draft language for defining microbreweries and an amendment to include micro brewing as a home occupation.

Home occupations are an allowed use in R-1, R-2, and R-3 with a Conditional Use Permit.

Chapter 2: Definitions

Brewer

A person who manufactures malt liquor for sale.

Brewpub

A state licensed brewer under Minn. Stats. § 340A.301, subdiv. 6(d) with a restaurant use operated on the same premises as the brewery. To sell their own malt liquor, a brewpub is required to obtain an intoxicating on-sale liquor license and may obtain an on-sale Sunday liquor license if they want to be open on Sundays.

Home Occupation

Any occupation or profession, regulated within this ordinance, which is carried out for gain by a

resident and conducted as a secondary use in the resident's dwelling unit or in an accessory building as long as it does not utilize more than 25% of the total floor area of the dwelling or no more than 625 square feet of accessory building. ~~Home occupations may not utilize garages or accessory buildings.~~ (See Chapter VI – Performance Standards, J. Home Occupations)

Microbrewery

A facility that is licensed under Minn. Stats. §340A.301, subdiv. 6(c), (i), or (j) and may brew no more than 20,000 barrels of its own brands of malt liquor annually.

Micro distillery

A distillery producing premium, distilled spirits in total quantity not to exceed 40,000-proof gallons in a calendar year as regulated by Minnesota Statutes.

Tap room

A state licensed brewer under Minn. Stats. § 340A.301 [subdiv.6](c), (i), or (j) permitting the on-sale consumption of malt liquor produced by the brewer for consumption on the premises of a brewery or an abutting property in common ownership of the brewer, which may include the sales of malt liquor produced and packaged at the brewery for off premises consumption as allowed by Minnesota Statutes.

Chapter 6 Performance Standards

J. Home Occupations (Rev. 11-18-2010; Ord. 658)

A home occupation is that accessory use of a dwelling that shall constitute either entirely or partly the livelihood of a person living in the dwelling. All permitted home occupations require an approved conditional use permit.

1. Permitted Home Occupations

The following are permitted home occupations with an approved conditional use permit:

- * Childcare.
- * Dressmaking, sewing, and tailoring.
- * Home microbrewing, cooking and preserving.
- * Home crafts such as model making, rug weaving, lapidary work, and woodworking.
- * Laundry-related services.
- * Telephone answering and clerical work.
- * Tutoring, limited to four students at a time.
- * Other approved occupancy.

The following conditions must be met to meet the conditional use permit requirements:

- a. The home occupation does not change the outside appearance of the dwelling and is not visible from the street.
- b. The home occupation does not generate traffic, deliveries, parking, or sewerage and/or water use in excess of what is normal in the residential neighborhood.

- c. The home occupation does not create a hazard to person or property or generate hazardous waste.
- d. The home occupation does not create any detriments to the residential character of the neighborhood due to the emission of noise, smoke, dust, gas, heat, glare, vibration, electrical interference, or any other nuisance resulting from it.
- e. The home occupation does not result in the outside storage or display of anything except a nameplate no larger than two square feet in area which may only be attached to the wall of the dwelling.
- f. The home occupation does not utilize more than 25% of the total floor area of the dwelling. If an accessory building is used for such home occupation, it shall not exceed 625 square feet in total floor area.
- g. The home occupation is conducted by no more than two person, one of whom shall reside within the dwelling.

*****End of Staff Memo*****

Foss said she used Elk River’s Microbrewery Ordinance and narrowed it down. Foss said that Dieter Kurzweg is present tonight if the Planning Commission Board has any questions for him. Kurzweg showed her his business plan.

Reynolds asked Kurzweg if the 625 square feet floor area for an accessory building will be enough room.

Kurzweg said yes.

Zimmer asked if this is the guideline for the Ordinance.

Foss said yes. They would need a Conditional Use Permit for it.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ZIMMER, TO HAVE STAFF PREPARE A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE MARCH 21, 2016 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, AN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR THE R-1, R-2, AND R-3 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS TO ADD MICROBREWERIES AS A HOME OCCUPATION WITH A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND ADD PERFORMANCE STANDARDS REGARDING THIS USE. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

B. Alternative Building Materials

Community Development Director Memo:

Numerous request for the allowance of alternative building materials have been directed

toward the Planning and Zoning office in the recent past.

The three materials that have been most prevalent have been:

- 1) **Pole types construction** also known as post frame, customized steel building, wood frame, pole buildings, etc.
It uses large poles or posts buried in the ground or on a foundation to provide the vertical structural support and girts to provide horizontal support. The method was developed and matured during the 1930s as agricultural practices changed, including the shift toward engine-powered farm equipment and the demand for cheaper, larger barns and storage areas. Unlike competing building methods, once the poles, girts, and rafters are put in place, much of the construction work on a pole-built structure can be handled by a single individual over the course of a month or season.
- 2) **Fabric and frame structures** also known as hoop buildings.
Fabric structures are forms of constructed fibers that provide end users a variety of aesthetic free-form building designs. Custom-made fabric structures are engineered and fabricated to meet worldwide structural, flame retardant, weather-resistant, and natural force requirements. Fabric structures are considered a subcategory of tensile structure.
- 3) **Insulated Concrete Form** or stay in place concrete forming systems. Insulating concrete form or insulated concrete form (ICF) is a system of formwork for reinforced concrete usually made with a rigid thermal insulation that stays in place as a permanent interior and exterior substrate for walls, floors, and roofs. The forms are interlocking modular units that are dry-stacked (without mortar) and filled with concrete. The units lock together somewhat like Lego bricks and create a form for the structural walls or floors of a building. ICF construction has become commonplace for both low rise commercial and high performance residential construction as more stringent energy efficiency and natural disaster resistant building codes are adopted. ICFs may be used with frost protected shallow foundations (FPSF).

After discussion with the Building Inspector and the Public Works Director, as well as the City Engineer, Staff would like to propose for the allowance of these materials, provided they are inspected by a structural engineer at the time of construction, in the MN-1 Industrial and in the B-3 General Commercial District. If the Planning Commission would like, Staff will draft an Ordinance Amendment to allow for these alternative structures.

*****End of Staff Memo*****

Foss said there is a request that has been asked of her on pole type construction buildings and it is not allowed. She believes in the past they looked like barns. Since that time they can look as good as a steel frame building. This material is safe and if built right, it is just as good per the City Building Inspectors. She believes it could be allowed in Industrial and B-3 Districts.

Zimmer asked when this goes through would they show a photo of what it would look like.

Foss said yes. It would have to be designed and nicer.

Edmonds said that it be written on the type allowed so there is no confusion. She should make sure the City Engineer looks at this.

Foss said yes, she would make sure it is written well. Maybe some of the types would not go into all areas. The Octaform does not have the ICC-ES evaluation report form for inspectors okay on this product. The City Building Inspector will not approve this product without that form.

Edmonds said he would like more information on the Octaform.

Reynolds said it takes the place of concrete block. Usually foundation. You add siding to it.

Edmonds said the fabric structures should be more restrictive.

Foss said the second photo of the fabric structure the Public Works Director would like to buy for the use of storing salt and sand. Foss will provide more information on the different types.

Zimmer said she should also check with different cities and see what they allow.

Reynolds said to ask when she is making the calls if they allow a different brand of Octaform.

Foss will ask the City Building Inspector if it is used in residential. It is financially cheaper.

C. TIF District No. 7

Resolution No. #16-01 is a Resolution finding development program for Development District No. 7 and the Tax Increment Financing Plan for Tax Increment Financing District No. 7-1 (the "TIF District" within that Development District, and the Development Program and the TIF Plan have been submitted to the Planning Commission for comment. The Planning Commission has to review the Development Program and the Tax Increment Financing Plan for the TIF District and have compared them with the plans for development of the City as a whole. The Planning Commission must find that the Development Program for the Development District and the Tax Increment Financing Plan for the TIF District are found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. If the Planning Commission approves the resolution, they will make a recommendation that the City Council hold a public hearing required by law and adopt the Development Program and the proposed Tax Increment Financing Plan for the TIF District. This is for the former Arcadian Homes site along West Branch Street that the City now owns and is being developed.

Foss said this is for the MN Housing Partnership and we need an affordable element. Central MN Housing Partnership needs to apply for low financing.

Edmonds said TIF Districts do have their issues and he believes it is helpful for communities to have this to promote growth

Zimmer asked if this site was the reason for the water looping and the City owns that site.

Foss said yes. This site would not be sold at market value. We can help them with the scoring by not having market scoring on it. The consultant fees for this will be paid from the NSP funding.

Zimmer asked when this site would start being taxed.

Foss said in 15 years or so. We would give them funds twice a year and after 15 years we would get the full taxes. The increment amount we get back. Central MN Housing Partnership is proposing to build a 16 unit housing unit. The Housing Study showed there is a demand for more housing.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ZIMMER, TO APPROVE RESOLUTION NO #16-01 FOR DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT NO. 7 AND THE TAX INCREMENT FINANCING PLAN FOR TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICT NO. 7-1 WITH THE REASONING THAT IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CITY OF PRINCETON, AND FORWARD THIS RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report

Foss said that someone is interested in being on the Planning Commission Board. We recently changed the Bylaws where one of the members may be a person who owns a business located within the City of Princeton as long as they live within the 55371 zip code area. This person has a business in town, but lives in Zimmerman. Does the Planning Commission Board want to amend the Bylaws where they can live in the Princeton School District.

Edmonds said it would be limited to one seat only.

Foss said it could be limited to one.

Edmonds said defining boundaries is hard unless you have it where they are in the Princeton School District.

Foss said they could live in the zip code area or be in the Princeton School District. As one or the other. They could have a business in the city limits and have to live in the 55371 zip code or live in the Princeton School District. Foss will bring a draft ordinance and have a map that shows the school district boundaries and a map that shows the zip code.

Foss said she had contact Steak and Shake because she read where they are expanding and wanted to see if they would be interested in coming to Princeton. They said they are looking at coming into Minnesota and were willing to come to an informational meeting on what the criteria is for investors that may want to open a Steak and Shake Restaurant. The presentation will be held on March 1, 2016 at 6:00 P.M., at the Civic Center.

B. City Council Minutes for January, 2016

The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

ZIMMER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:40 P.M.

ATTEST:

Jack Edmonds, Chairperson

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant