

**THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON APRIL 21, 2014,
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, Eldon Johnson, Mitzi Mellott, Chad Heitschmidt, Jim Kusler (Princeton Twsp. Rep). Staff present were Carie Fuhrman (Comm. Dev. Director) and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assistant).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 17, 2014

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 17, 2014. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS: None

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. #14-01 Interim Use Permit for Greater Life Princeton/Zimmerman (Extension)

Fuhrman updated the Planning Commission that in March 2013, Michael Brooks, on behalf of Greater Life Princeton/Zimmerman, submitted an application for an Interim Use Permit for church services and other religious activities to take place on the premises at 127 Rum River Drive North (former Ben Franklin building).

The City Council granted the Interim Use Permit, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The Interim Use Permit shall terminate on March 28, 2014, with the option to be renewed after review by the City; and
- 2) A sign permit application shall be submitted for review.

The applicant, on behalf of Greater Life Princeton/Zimmerman, has submitted an application requesting to extend the Interim Use Permit until August 1, 2014. The City Attorney has stated that the procedure for a new Interim Use Permit application, including a new public hearing, is required.

Greater Life Princeton/Zimmerman is proposing to continue holding church services, Bible Study on Thursday nights from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, and bread distribution on the first and third Saturday of each month until August 1, 2014. There are no changes in the proposed use of the property from what they currently have been doing.

The B-1 Central Business District allows churches or places of worship as Interim Use Permits, provided that:

(a) Such space is within a multi-tenant building.

Staff Comment: The church is located in a multi-tenant building; however, at this time, no other use is occupying the building.

(b) Joint parking arrangements allow for compliance with parking requirements for all uses (as regulated by Chapter VI, Performance Standards).

Staff Comment: Staff is not aware of any concerns or complaints received regarding enough parking to accommodate church attendees and downtown employees and customers since the Greater Life IUP was issued last year. The existing parking available on-street, in the public parking lot across Rum River Drive, and also behind the building has been sufficient to serve the bread distribution. The church services and Bible Study are held during “off-peak” hours.

When reviewing an application for an interim use, the city shall base its judgment on the following factors and any other factors it may deem appropriate for the specific property. The interim use may be granted if:

1. *The proposed use is interim use listed in the district in which the application is being made;*

Staff Comment: Churches and places of worship are listed as an interim use in the B-1 Zoning District.

2. *The date or event that will terminate the use can be identified with certainty and continued;*

Staff Comment: The Planning Commission shall recommend to the City Council a date or event that will terminate the use. Greater Life Princeton/Zimmerman is pursuing another location as the building owners are planning to occupy the building in the future, but that date has not been determined yet. The applicant has requested to continue the IUP until August 1, 2014.

3. *The interim use does not result in adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare nor does it create additional pollution potential for ground and surface waters;*

Staff Comment: It does not appear that the proposed interim use will result in adverse effects on the public health, safety, and welfare, nor does it create additional pollution potential for ground and surface waters.

4. *Permission of the use will not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future.*

Staff Comment: It does not appear that permission of the use will impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future.

Based on the findings that the proposed Interim Use appears to meet the review standards and provisions as listed in the Zoning Ordinance, Fuhrman would recommend that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the proposed Interim Use Permit for church services and other religious activities at 127 North Rum River Drive, subject to the condition that the Interim Use Permit shall terminate on August 1, 2014.

Edmonds opened the Public Hearing.

Those present had no questions or comments.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Edmonds asked Michael Brooks, the applicant if they are able to rent the current location past the August 1, 2014 deadline, would they want another extension.

Michael Brooks said they will probably be out of that location sooner. They are required to move out by the middle of June, 2014.

Fuhrman suggested having the Resolution deadline till October 1, 2014. Just in case they do need more time.

Brooks said they will not need more time.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE PROPOSED INTERIM USE PERMIT FOR CHURCH SERVICES AND OTHER RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES AT 127 RUM RIVER DRIVE NORTH, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT THE INTERIM USE PERMIT SHALL TERMINATE ON OCTOBER 1, 2014. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Is the proposed use an interim use listed in the district in which the applicant is being made? Yes.
2. Is the date or event that will terminate the use can be identified with certainty and continued? Yes.
3. The interim use does not result in adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare nor does it create additional pollution potential for ground and surface waters? Yes.
4. Would permission of the use not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future? Yes.

B. Repeal of Ordinance No. 702 – Dynamic Sign Moratorium and Amendment to Chapter VII (Signs) of the Princeton Zoning Ordinance (Title 11 of the City Code) – Dynamic Sign Regulations

Fuhrman informed the Planning Commission Board that the City Council established a moratorium in order to study dynamic, electronic changeable copy, graphic display and video display signs. The Planning Commission has been reviewing and discussing potential changes to the Sign Ordinance in order to address these types of signs. Fuhrman prepared an Ordinance with the proposed draft language for the public hearing.

The Planning Commission shall hold the public hearing to consider:

- 1) Recommending to the City Council the repeal of Ordinance 702, which established a moratorium on the installation of and issuance of permits for dynamic, electronic changeable copy, graphic display, and video display signs.
- 2) Recommending to the City Council the proposed changes to regulate dynamic signs.

Fuhrman will bring forward the Planning Commission's recommendations to the next City Council meeting for the first reading of the Ordinance. If the City Council requests that the Planning Commission do more research on the Ordinance, they can leave the moratorium in place. If they are satisfied with the results, the Council can adopt the Ordinance and repeal the moratorium.

Fuhrman said that the amendment does not address billboards with dynamic, electronic changeable copy and graphic/video display. If the Planning Commission does not want to see that type of signage on billboards, we should include that to the recommendation to the City Council. Otherwise, they would be allowed on billboards.

Edmonds said to leave it and address it if it comes up.

Heitschmidt asked if MnDOT has regulations in place for that type of signage along the highway.

Fuhrman said she had tried contacting the person with MnDOT to ask the question, but was unable to reach him. She will try again.

The Planning Commission Board believes MnDOT has regulations set in place that would need to be followed so leave the Ordinance amendment as is.

Fuhrman said the electronic text or graphic signage could have a Conditional Use Permit requirement with those. How the Ordinance amendment is written they do not need a Conditional Use Permit, just the Planning Commission's approval. Would the Planning Commission like that changed where a Conditional Use Permit is required with those types of signs.

Edmonds said he is fine with how the amendment is written. Heitschmidt and Johnson agree. Edmonds commented that the Downtown Committee did not want this type of signage downtown and this Ordinance amendment does not allow them downtown.

Edmonds opened the Public Hearing.

Tim Siercks, Minuteman Press, asked what determines the downtown area.

Fuhrman pointed out on the map where the B-1 District is located.

Bill Haroldson, 101 6th Avenue South, asked how long will it take for the findings to be done where this amendment is in effect.

Fuhrman said the process has taken the past couple months. The City Council put a moratorium on the dynamic signage so the Planning Commission could review the Ordinance. Once the Planning Commission forwards the Ordinance amendment to the City Council, it will take two readings by the City Council before it can be approved.

Bill Haroldson said that will be about another month. If a business needs a sign up it is a long time to wait for a sign.

EDMONDS MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Fuhrman will get an answer back from MnDOT and bring that back to the Planning Commission.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AN ORDINANCE REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 702 AN INTERIM ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM AND STUDY PERIOD ON THE INSTALLATION OF DYNAMIC, ELECTRONIC CHANGEABLE COPY, GRAPHIC DISPLAY AND/OR VIDEO DISPLAY SIGNS AND THE ISSUANCE OF PERMITS THEREFORE. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AMENDING CHAPTER VII (SIGNS) OF TITLE 11 (ZONING) OF THE PRINCETON CODE OF ORDINANCES ADDING REGULATIONS FOR DYNAMIC, DIGITAL, ELECTRONIC CHANGEABLE COPY, GRAPHIC DISPLAY AND/OR VIDEO DISPLAY SIGNS WITHIN THE CITY OF PRINCETON. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

C. Amendment to Chapter VII (Signs) of the Princeton Zoning Ordinance (Title 11 of the City Code) – Wall, Projecting, Under-canopy/Suspended, Temporary, and Fascia/soffit Sign Regulations

Fuhrman said the Planning Commission has been discussing several updates to the Sign Ordinance. The draft Ordinance proposes potential changes to the Sign Ordinance in order to address these types of signs: wall mounted, projecting, under-canopy, fascia/soffit, and temporary signs.

Fuhrman is requesting the Planning Commission hold the public hearing and review the draft Ordinance. Pending the review, Fuhrman will then forward the Planning Commission's recommendations on to the City Council for the first reading. If the Planning Commission does

not like what is written for the temporary signs, they could pull that part, and the remaining signage amendment can go to the City Council.

Edmonds said we have been on this Sign Ordinance review since August and staff did a good job with the direction they were given.

Johnson said it looks like what was talked about and put together.

Heitschmidt asked on the wordage being removed on the limitation for the number of permits for non-profit signage. On the current Temporary Sign Ordinance there is a limit to no more than six per calendar year. Is this covered under Section 3A on the amendment.

Fuhrman said she understood that right now non-profits are not limited to one property. There is a piece of property that has a number of signs per location. It will affect for-profit businesses so that land that R.W. Builders owns can have four for-profit signs on that land and no limit for non-profit.

Edmonds opened the Public Hearing.

Ron Weyer, R.W. Builders, said that strip of land by Super America that R.W. Builders owns is asked a lot to put signage on. If there is a limit of signs for-profit businesses, but not for non-profit, they will have to watch what goes there for the number of signs for businesses. He will have to say who do they support.

Fuhrman said non-profit will be okay on that site. It is for-profit that will be up to a number of four signs per year. She will clarify that better in the wording.

Johnson asked if more than one sign at a time can be on the property.

Fuhrman said it is one sign at a time per property, no matter if non-profit and profit.

Thom Walker, City Council Member, suggested that adding the discussion in the wording that the intent is not to limit non-profit signage.

Johnson asked Ron Weyer how many feet R.W. Builders owns in that strip of land.

Weyer was not sure, their land is right in front of the mall.

Walker asked on the canopy signs if illuminated that it needs to be ground fault okayed.

Fuhrman said fascia and soffit are not looked at as wall signs. They are defined separately. We can add no electronic in the fascia or soffit signs if the Planning Commission would like.

Heitschmidt said we were not going to allow these types of signs being electronic.

Siercks asked what the difference is from a wall sign and projecting sign.

Heitschmidt said the wall sign is attached to the wall.

Siercks said the fascia part of the building is like a wall.

Heitschmidt said the fascia sign is hanging out in front and a wall sign is not.

Siercks does not understand why we would not allow the projecting or under-canopy signs to be electric.

Chuck Nagel, Baldwin Township resident, said Section 3D, "One sign per property at any one time shall be allowed." For non-profit only one sign per property could make it difficult. The south mall has had more than one sign at a time. With the Lions Club putting up there fishing contest sign, and if the school system wanted a sign to advertise an advent, they couldn't.

Fuhrman said the Planning Commission could allow more than one non-profit sign at a time. It is a popular location. Otherwise the non-profit would have to look at another location if the one they wanted was taken.

Tina Struck, Paws Up 4 You, said if a fascia sign had electricity installed to code by an electrician so it would be safe, what difference does it make if the sign is lit.

Edmonds commented that he thought they were allowed.

Johnson did too.

Edmonds is okay with them having electricity if they are wired to code.

Heitschmidt said we do not need to get too regulated with the Ordinance.

Walker suggested having the wording say ground fault interrupted.

Johnson said he cannot imagine a business person putting something up that is not ground fault.

Reynolds said any outdoor electrical has to be GFI.

Walker is not asking them to put it in there if it says per code in the Ordinance.

Ron Weyer said they are required to pull a permit and with the electrical it will have to be GFI to code.

Fuhrman asked if they want it written in the Zoning Ordinance, it is in the building code.

Heitschmidt suggested that the Ordinance could read it must meet electrical standards.

JOHNON MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER VII (SIGNS) OF TITLE 11 (ZONING) OF THE PRINCETON CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES REVISING PORTIONS OF THE SIGN ORDINANCE, INCLUDING WALL AND TEMPORARY SIGNS, AND ADDING REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO PROJECTING, UNDER-CANOPY, AND FASCIA/SOFFIT SIGNS.

Heitschmidt asked if we need to talk about the number of signs at this time.

Reynolds said it depends on the size of the property.

Mellott said the lights on the fascia and soffit. That should be under Section 2H.

Fuhrman will add to Section 2H, "Each sign shall meet electrical code standards".

Heitschmidt said one sign per property for temporary signs.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Site Plan Review for Minnesota Industrial Coatings

Glenn Properties LLC has submitted an application for a site plan review in order to construct a new 30,300 square foot manufacturing facility on a vacant lot in the Industrial Park (Lot 2, Block 4, Princeton Industrial Park). The new building will house Minnesota Industrial Coatings (MIC), owned by Joe Glenn, which provides coatings on industrial parts. Currently, the business is located in the same building as Glenn Metalcraft, Inc. (1502 South 14th Street) – due to business growth and expansion, a new facility is needed.

The property is zoned MN-1, Industrial, and designated as Industrial on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map.

The property is located directly to the east of the Matrix Manufacturing building and to the west of Outlot D, which serves as a drainage pond.

Site Plan Review: The project consists of building a new pre-engineered metal building that is approximately 30,300 square feet in size. Of this, about 1,500 square feet will house the offices, restrooms, and break room. The remainder will be manufacturing. A drive-in door and four loading doors are proposed facing the road. The main entrance is off of the office area in the northwest corner of the building. A concrete sidewalk is proposed from the main entrance along the west wall of the building.

Building Materials: The siding will be all steel panel type, composed of re-engineered metal. Building elevations shall be provided.

Landscaping: According to the site plan, a landscape area is proposed between the parking entrance and loading/unloading entrance area. In addition, landscaping is proposed along the west wall of the new building. A landscaping plan is being worked on and shall be required to be submitted.

Signage: No signage is proposed at this time. The builder is aware that if any freestanding signage is proposed, review by the Planning Commission is required, and signs require a building permit.

Parking: Parking is proposed along the west side of the building. 29 parking stalls are proposed at 90 degrees, 20 by 9 feet, with a 24 foot aisle width.

Industrial/Manufacturing: Five spaces plus one for each employee on the largest working shift, but not less than one per 1,000 square feet. Approximately 28,800 square feet is or will be utilized as manufacturing/Industrial. This requires 28.8 spaces.

Warehouse: Five spaces plus one for each employee on the largest working shift, but not less than one per 2,000 square feet. The approximate amount of warehouse space is not known at this time.

Office: One parking space for every 250 square feet of useable floor area. Approximately 1,500 square feet will be utilized as office space. This requires 6 spaces.

According to the provided proposed use of the floor space, approximately 34.8 spaces are required. The Planning Commission may reduce the number of required spaces if the applicant can demonstrate that the required off-street parking is excessive and a lesser requirement is justified. The applicant has been requested to provide this documentation.

Drainage: The applicants have prepared a Grading and Drainage Plan. The City Engineer has reviewed the plan and has requested additional information, which the applicant is working on. Approval of the site plan review shall be subject to the conditions from the City Engineer.

Fire Inspector: The Fire Inspector has reviewed the plans and is requested a turnaround area near the southwest corner of the building.

Fuhrman is recommending approval of the site plan review of the Minnesota Industrial Coatings facility, subject to the following conditions:

1. Building elevations shall be submitted;
2. A landscape plan shall be submitted;
3. Signage shall require a permit prior to installation. New freestanding signage requires Planning Commission review;
4. The applicant shall provide justification for less parking stalls than what is required by Ordinance;
5. The City Engineer's conditions and recommendations shall be followed;
6. A turn around for fire trucks shall be provided near the southwest corner of the building;
7. An updated site plan shall be submitted; and
8. A building permit shall be submitted and approved by the City's Building Official prior to commencement of construction.

Fuhrman said they are keeping the building pretty tight to the property line. They are proposing 29 parking stalls. When the calculations were done, they are required to provide 35 spaces. The Ordinance does say the Planning Commission can wave that number if they are not needed. The applicant stated that they are likely having 18 employees working on the largest shift so they are not proposing to ever fill up that number of parking stalls. Fuhrman said what she used is a rough data that also includes the restrooms and such. Those should not be calculated so the number of stalls required would be less. The applicant will provide to the City Engineer the building evaluations and the parking stall calculation would be needed also. The Fire Department does want the south side of the building where the road is to be graveled so the fire trucks can get around the building.

Curt Haugen, representative for BJ Baas said they are in the process of getting all the required information that the City Engineer is in need of. The relocating of the southwest door will go to the southeast side of the building. The parking will not be an issue to have a few more now on the southwest side.

Johnson said he is in favor to reduce the parking to 29 stalls so they are on that side of the building only.

Edmonds agreed.

Heitschmidt said the current line is 4-5 employees so it will take a while to get to that top peak on a shift. In the future if they were to expand it would be to the south and there is not a lot of room there.

Johnson said it is a good addition to the Industrial Park.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN FOR MINNESOTA INDUSTRIAL COATINGS, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. BUILDING ELEVATIONS SHALL BE SUBMITTED;
2. A LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED;
3. SIGNAGE SHALL REQUIRE A PERMIT PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. NEW FREESTANDING SIGNAGE REQUIRES PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW;
4. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION FOR LESS PARKING STALLS THAN WHAT IS REQUIRED BY ORDINANCE;
5. THE CITY ENGINEER'S CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL BE FOLLOWED;
6. A TURN AROUND FOR FIRE TRUCKS SHALL BE PROVIDED NEAR THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE BUILDING;
7. AN UPDATED SITE PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED; AND
8. A BUILDING PERMIT SHALL BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY'S BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

B. Site Plan Review for BioMatrix

R.W. Builders Inc. has submitted an application for a site plan review on behalf of S&B LLC for the construction of a 9,600 square foot addition to the existing BioMatrix facility. The existing facility is approximately 14,350 square feet in size and located at 1002 16th Avenue South.

The project involves a 9,600 square foot addition, additional parking space, and a new loading dock area. The addition will house office space, manufacturing and warehouse space.

The property is zoned MN-1, Industrial, and designated as Industrial on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map.

The property owners have purchased the lot to the north of the existing facility to accommodate the growing business and another future expansion. They plan to combine the lots in the near future.

Site Plan Review: The 60 foot by 160 foot addition is proposed to the east of the existing facility with the manufacturing and office area to the north and warehouse space to the south. The new loading dock area is on the southwest corner of the building and will consist of removing an existing retaining wall on the south end and replacing with an extended wall; removing another existing retaining wall; and constructing a new one. A new 10' by 10' overhead door is proposed as well as relocating an existing 10' by 10' overhead door.

Building Materials: The building materials shall match the existing materials.

Landscaping: The colored renderings indicate shrubs/landscaping along the east side of the expanded parking area.

Signage: No new signage is proposed at this time.

Parking: An expanded parking area is proposed to the north of the existing parking lot, along with a new curb cut/access. The project involves the re-striping/re-designing of the parking area for better flow of vehicles. 25 total parking stalls are proposed, all 90 degree stalls, 0 feet wide by 19 feet long.

Industrial/Manufacturing: Five spaces plus one for each employee on the largest working shift, but not less than one per 1,000 square feet. Approximately 8,680 square feet is or will be utilized as manufacturing/industrial. This requires 8.68 spaces.

Warehouse: Five spaces plus one for each employee on the largest working shift, but not less than one per 2,000 square feet. Approximately 11,536 square feet is or will be utilized as warehouse space. This requires 5.77 spaces.

Office: One parking space for every 250 square feet of useable floor area. Approximately 1,440 square feet will be utilized as office space. This requires 5.76 spaces.

According to the provided proposed use of the floor space, approximately 21 spaces are required. It should be noted that the two new spaces proposed in the northeast corner of the existing parking area may prove difficult to maneuver in and out of.

Drainage: The applicant's engineer has been working on drainage calculations. Approval of the site plan review shall be subject to the review and conditions from the City Engineer. Fuhrman is recommending approval of the site plan review of the BioMatrix facility addition, subject to the following conditions:

1. The City Engineer's conditions and recommendations shall be followed; and
2. A building permit shall be submitted and approved by the City's Building Official prior to commencement of construction.

Fuhrman said the new loading dock area will be on the southwest portion of the building and more parking has been added to the north of the building. They are combining the current and new parking lots. This site has two parcels and the additional parking lot will be crossing over to the other parcel. Fuhrman said with the parking lot crossing into the other parcel she is okay with it at this time since it is not a building crossing over the property line. They intend to combine the two parcels into one. They are designing the parking with a 90 degree angle where it will be easier to get into and out of. They have the number of parking spaces required. They need to get the drainage calculations to the City Engineer

Ron Weyer, representing R.W. Builders said the flow of the parking lot will be put into effect and he is good with the requirements.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR BIOMATRIX ADDITION LOCATED AT 1002 16TH AVENUE SOUTH, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE CITY ENGINEER'S CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL BE FOLLOWED;
AND
2. A BUILDING PERMIT SHALL BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY'S BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

C. Review of Development District for Minnesota Industrial Coatings Project

Fuhrman informed the Planning Commission Board that in order to facilitate the development of the new MN Industrial Coatings facility, MIC has requested the use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF). TIF is a financial incentive tool for communities to use to encourage economic development. It uses future gains in taxes that result from the development to subsidize current improvements. The project is expected to add 20-25 jobs in the next two years, paying approximately \$12 to \$20 per hour with full benefits. Not only will this project add to the tax base and add jobs to the area, it will allow room for future expansion possibilities for Glenn Metalcraft as well.

In order to establish TIF District No. 6-1, a Development District must be established first by State Statute. This requires the Planning Commission's review of the proposed project to ensure it is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed Development District, as indicated on the map that was provided, is proposed to encompass the parcel with the new facility: Lot 2, Block 5, Princeton Industrial Park.

This lot is designated as Industrial on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map. The proposed manufacturing facility is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan encourages the development of new privately owned industrial sites, diversify the types of industrial uses within the City, and encourage the development of "clusters" in the industrial park by providing incentives to businesses that support and work with our current businesses. This project meets all of those objectives in the Comprehensive Plan.

Fuhrman would recommend a motion from the Planning Commission approving the Resolution that is presented tonight.

Edmonds commented that there are some in the community that are not supportive of the Tax Increment Financing, but he believes this is a plus for the community.

Heitschmidt agrees that people can have the wrong impression on Tax Increment Financing. That it is giving some businesses a break. He supports it.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE RESOLUTOION NO. #14-01, A RESOLUTION FINDING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT NO. 6 AND THE TAX INCREMENT FINANCING PLAN FOR TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICT NO. 1 CONSISTENT WITH THE PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY OF PRINCETON. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report

Fuhrman said there will be a meeting on the Housing Study that the City of Princeton and Mille Lacs County had done. Otherwise, there are no further updates.

Edmonds said he will be attending the third meeting of Mille Lacs County Land Use Plan.

Fuhrman said she will give him the City map to give to Roxy.

B. City Council Minutes for March, 2014

The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:08 P.M.

ATTEST:

Jack Edmonds, Chairperson

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant