

**THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON JULY 20, 2015, 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, and Jim Kusler (Princeton Twsp. Representative). Staff present were Jolene Foss (Comm. Dev. Director) and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assistant).

Absent was Chad Heitschmidt.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON JUNE 15, 2015

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 2015. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS:

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE ADDITION TO NEW BUSINESS, ITEM C, PRINCETON SPEEDWAY REPORT. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. #15-10 Rezoning from R-2 Residential to MN-1 Industrial for Heritage Village Site
Community Development Director Memo:

City Staff has initiated a change of boundary from R-2 Residential to MN-1 Industrial for the 4 parcels located on the western edge of the Princeton City Limits.

Rezoning from R-2, Residential District, to MN-1, Industrial for the following four property sites described as:

*PID #24-031-0010, CITY OF PRINCETON – SE OF NE & PART OF SW OR NE BEG AT SE CORN, W ON S LINE 1054.05 FT, N'LY 331.22 FT, NE'LY 827.30 FT, E'LY 509.74 FT TO E LINE, S 967.27 FT TO PT OF BEG, SEE 10/8/03 SURVEY,

Section 31, Township 36, Range 26, MILLE LACS COUNTY, 59.99 ACRES

*PID #24-031-0020, CITY OF PRINCETON – NW OF NE LYING E'LY OF W 57.76 FT; & SW OF NE, EX PART BEG AT SE COR, W ON S LINE 1054.05 FT, N'LY 331.22 FT, NE'LY 827.30 FT, E'LY 509.74 FT TO E LINE, S 967.27 FT TO PT OF BEG, SEE 10/8/03 SURVEY, Section 31, Township 36, Range 26, MILLE LACS COUNTY, 60.00 ACRES

*PID #24-031-0030, W 57.76 FT OF NW OF NE; E 603.46 FT OF NW OF NW & NE OF NW EX S 16 RDS (264 FT) OF W 20 RDS (330 FT) & EX A TR DESC AS BEG AT A PT 540 FT E OF NEW COR OF NE OF NW THEN W 540 FT, S 525 FT, E 364.33 FT, NE'LY 236.42 FT, N 315.9 FT TO PT OF BEG SEE 10/28/04 SURVEY, Section 31, Township 36, Range 26, MILLE LACS COUNTY, 54 ACRES

*PID #24-031-0050, THAT PART OF NW OF NW LYING W'LY OF E 603.46 FT SEE SKETCH FILED 5/3/04, Section 31, Township 36, Range 26, MILLE LACS COUNTY, 23.29 ACRES

This property is owned by James Boo and James Saxon. The rezoning of this property is the

final step in the Shovel Ready Certification process through the State of Minnesota's Department of Employment and Economic Development.

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*****

Edmonds wanted to know who is asking for the rezoning.

Foss said City staff is starting it.

Edmonds asked what is shovel ready.

Foss said she has been working on this and the State of Minnesota asked to provided soil samples and such and they will deem it ready as shovel ready certified site. It goes on a State map and this would be one of the 26 sites.

Edmonds asked when the soil testing was done.

Foss said soil testing and environmental was done prior when it was rezoned residential in 2007 and they were done at that time.

Johnson asked who pays the infrastructure for this.

Foss said if someone purchases the property and develops on it then we go into the meetings of the payment and such. This would be data center certified with East Central Energy. They would help with the process. Industrial land is needed here so if this did not go through it would be good to use this for maybe our Industrial Park.

Edmonds asked who is doing the Industrial Park expansion.

Foss said WSB Engineering is doing the Industrial Park expansion.

Johnson said aren't we jumping the gun.

Foss said the property owners are okay with this.

Edmonds opened the public hearing.

Greg Anderson, 1524 110th Avenue, said he farms this property and everything around it. Have they looked at the information given to Foss from Susan Shaw (District Administrator with Mille Lacs Soil & Water Conservation District).

Foss said she got it last Friday and has not read it all. There is 60 acres of wet land and 133 acres that is dry land.

Anderson asked if everyone has seen the wetland maps.

Foss held it up. The 133 acres is the green area.

Anderson said there is some of that land they farm that is a foot above the water table. There was above ground water. The City has 80 acres that is zoned Industrial that is not being used. Take that off the tax rolls in Sherburne County. There is also Aero Business Park. It is shovel ready for Aero Business Park. Why aren't we using that.

Edmonds said we have to see the Feasibility Study that is being done.

Anderson asked if there has been an Environmental Study.

Foss said phase one has been done, but no Environmental Study.

Anderson said what happens if it comes back and it is not developable. They will legally ask for an Environmental Study.

Brandy Wempner, 10895 17th Street, said their property will be effected by this. There is already tons of traffic along their road. They do not want to live next to Industrial. There are so many wild life animals in the area. Where will they go. They wanted to live in the county, not in the Industrial Park.

Damien Toven, City Attorney said the wetland issue has been addressed and reviewed by the County. His understanding is the property owners are in support of this. He cannot speak of the available Industrial Park of 80 acres that was mentioned. This land would be for a particular market and this would bring to the tax base business.

Anderson said he wanted to respond to that. He understands the concern for the owners of the property. What about those that live here. If he wanted to live in an Industrial Park he would move there. That land was farm land and should stay farm land. It is perfect land for wildlife. Support local people.

Jim Saxon, property owner, said we have never asked the City for any dollars that they put into this. They do not plan to ask for anything going forward. They are not saddling the public concern with more obligation.

Jim Boo, property owner, said it was farm land they bought about 10 years ago for residential. With the economic changes they want to find the right use for everybody. Foss has been working well in this. He understands everyone has differences in this. They want to see the sale of this land to someone. This would be an energy data center. If it is considered or chosen,

they as owners are working alongside the City to possibly bring jobs and tax base. Not asking for anything, but the consideration of the zoning. If they do get someone who has an interest of that data center they will take the necessary steps.

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

Edmonds said he learned a couple things tonight and one is that there is a Feasibility Study in place that he did not know of. Is there a time line for the rezoning.

Foss said it is the last step for getting it shovel ready.

Edmonds asked if there is a time line otherwise he wants to table it until the Feasibility Study is done.

Johnson said it was jumping the gun. It was dumped on them on Thursday and we do have other land that could be used. The idea of shovel ready site in our small community, and what if nothing happens. There is a lot of money being spent. Why do they need 200 acres. We are turning more land loose than we need to for an Industrial Park. All projects that the City went through the last few years were disastrous. 50% of the taxes in the City is Tax Increment and that is unreasonable. They say it will be paid for by the developer, and if they go belly up, then the City eats it. It can be used for housing and that can happen. This does us no good to have almost 300 acres for Industrial and haven't used that in 50 years.

Reynolds said it could be chopped up for houses since it is zoned for residential. If we had a data center it would be a huge asset to the community. If we have a chance to get a data center it would be a minimal interruption and he would not like to wait and be knocked out of the running for it. There is a data center interested and if we do not move forward we could miss out on it. It needs a quiet location and would be a quiet business.

Edmonds said it is about rezoning a property and not about bringing in a business. It is better left residential. There are so many unknowns here. The charge of the public body here is to listen to staff and the land owner and find a happy medium.

Foss said out of 200 acres, about 60 wet lands and 140 dry land. A data center is where they store data. It would depend on who would purchase it and store their digital files. A developer could build it and rent out space to store the data. They employ about 15-30 people, but the taxes would be great. She invited Richard Baker and Michele McPherson (Mille Lacs County). She has information from Susan Shaw and they have addressed the concerns brought to attention tonight. They believe it is developable land and any drainage concerns would be addressed when developing on it. This would be less environmental concern then if residential

were put there. This would be 1 out of 3 largest sites. Elk River has two sites and looking at a third. Blaine has one also.

Anderson asked what kind of voltage comes in that place.

Foss said it depends on what tier for a data center it would.

Anderson said stray voltage would kill cattle. He was the conservationist of the year for the State of Minnesota. He has a huge concern for electrical runoff.

Richard Baker (Mille Lacs County Community Development Coordinator) said he is not sure of where the 80 acres is that was brought up. He said they had someone come in for a data center and they wanted 200 acres. It would be high paying jobs. They had a site solicitor coming in September that is hosting this gentlemen and one of the marketing features is the certified Industrial site.

Brandy Wempner asked if anyone here lives by a data center and no one does.

Richard Baker commented that it is a huge building with storage of data.

Michele McPherson (Mille Lacs County Director of Land Services) said look at the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan and if the zoning works with that. If an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is requested, there are mandatory EAW categories that the City will have to meet. If the City does not meet the mandatory EAW, you can contest it and there needs to be a minimum of 25 people to contest it. There is a data center in Elk River that is located directly across the street from a residential housing site. That one is owned by Target. The employee shifts are small. The data center that Target owns has half that amount of employees. Does the requested rezoning fit with the language plan is what needs to be looked at.

Anderson said what about using just the high land area on the map.

Edmonds said he does not want to do anything until the Feasibility Study is done.

Foss said the Future Land Use map shows Industrial Park and residential.

Edmonds said they have not had time to look at the information she has.

Johnson said the 80 acres in Sherburne County could be used for this.

Foss said all the work is done now for this land. Question today is for this land to be rezoned to MN-1.

Boo said it does not work as residential so why not rezone it.

Edmonds said it is being used as agriculture right now and it works.

Boo said that if we want to bring a data center in, it would work on this 200 acres of land.

Edmonds said he supports growth and land use. He had worked on the Mille Lacs County Comprehensive Plan and they had probably 30 meetings. The residents said their taxes are too high and we need less government. So that is what we are hearing tonight.

Foss said the rights of the property owner are within the guidelines is what we have to think of right now. We need to consider that now. If we do not allow the rezoning, what basis would that be on. Susan Shaw wrote that it falls into Mississippi drain land. The City has runoff guidelines that would need to be followed. Dillon Hayes (Environmental Resources Technician Mille Lacs County Land Services) had said there are 3 or 4 wetlands on the site. He does not see the wet lands as an issue on this site. She has contacted the Farm Services Agency and she got a report back on the 133 acres he farmed.

Anderson said it has gone down on each year. He said he supports creating jobs and employs more people at his business than the number of people in this room.

Edmonds said the question tonight is if we allow to rezone from R-2 to MN-1. He was glad to hear there is a Feasibility Study going on right now. If the rezoning is not time sensitive, he would like to wait on it.

Foss said a site solicitor will look at the highlights of the area in September. We would want to say that we have a shovel ready 200 acre site. They would not want to wait for this to be ready. She believes it is time sensitive for this to be rezoned.

JOHNSON MOVED, TO DENY THE REZONING FROM R-2 RESIDENTIAL TO MN-1 INDUSTRIAL FOR THE OLD HERITAGE VILLAGE SITE (PID's #24-031-0010, #24-031-0020, #24-031-0030, AND #24-031-0050). THERE WAS NO SECOND. THE MOTION DIED.

EDMONDS MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO TABLE THIS REZONING REQUEST FROM R-2 RESIDENTIAL TO MN-1 INDUSTRIAL FOR THE OLD HERITAGE VILLAGE SITE (PID's #24-031-0010, #24-031-0020, #24-031-0030, AND #24-031-0050), UNTIL THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HAS MORE TIME TO REVIEW THE INFORMATION AND WHEN THE FEASIBILITY STUDY IS DONE.

Reynolds feels we should take the next step for rezoning. We may miss out on opportunities. Nothing may happen to this property and he would like to proceed with the change in zoning.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 2 AYES, 1 NAY. (AYES: EDMONDS AND JOHNSON. NAY: REYNOLDS.) 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.

Based on the findings, a recommendation to table the rezoning will be made to the Princeton City Council.

B. #15-11 Lot Split at 707 10th Street North

Community Development Assistant Memo:

BACKGROUND

Shawn Williams (AJW Contracting Inc.) has recently purchased the property site at 707 10th Street North. The legal description of this site is: Original Townsite, Block 60, Lot 7 & 8.

ZONING

This site is located in R-2 Residential Zoning. The Zoning Ordinance states for a permitted use in the R-2 District;

- * Two-family dwellings
- * Conversion of single-family structures to a two-family unit when each unit contains 800 square feet of floor area or more
- * Twinhome
- * Accessory buildings not exceeding 800 square feet related to the above principal use.

The twin home yard requirements for R-2 District;

- * Lot area minimum square feet is 6,000
- * Lot width minimum feet is 40
- * Maximum lot coverage is 30%
- * Front yard minimum setback (living area) & (front porch) is 20 feet
- * Side yard minimum setback (living area) & (garage) is 10 feet
- * Street side yard minimum setback is 20 feet
- * Rear yard minimum setback is 30 feet
- * Rear yard minimum alley setback is 30 feet
- * Maximum height 30 feet

PROPOSAL

There is currently a home on the site that will be torn down and the applicant would like to replace it with a twin home. The legal description for the lot split would be separating Lot 7 & 8 and putting them on their own property identification number. The twin home would be built on the common line of the two lots per building code, with a fire wall between them.

The existing property is 19,600 square feet. With the Lot Split, Lot 7 would be 9,800 square feet and Lot 8 would be 9,600 square feet. This does meet the lot size requirement for a twin home in the R-2 Zoning District. The 800 square feet of floor area or more, and also the setbacks would have to meet the Zoning Ordinance when the building permit is submitted.

The property currently has two dirt driveways; one off of 8th Avenue North and the other off of 10th Street North. There is two sets of twin homes across the street where the access to the driveway would be off of 8th Avenue North. DeWitt spoke to Bruce Cochran (Mille Lacs County Engineer) for his opinion of the access of this proposed twin home. Cochran thought the access would be best off of 8th Avenue North. This is not a county road. DeWitt also spoke with Mike Nielson, City Engineer and he said he did not have any issues with the lot split if there are no zoning issues.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION

The proposed Lot Split appears to meet the standards for the Zoning Ordinance. Staff would recommend approval of the Lot Split at 707 10th Street North, subject to the following conditions (as listed in the Ordinance):

Permitted Uses

In the R-2 Residential District, no building or land shall be used or divided and no building shall be erected, unless otherwise provided herein, except for one or more of the following as well as similar uses:

- * Any Uses permitted in R-1 District;*
- * Two-family dwellings;*
- * Conversion of single-family structures to a two-family unit when each unit contains 800 square feet of floor area or more;*
- * Twinhome;*
- * Accessory buildings not exceeding 800 square feet related to the above principal use.*

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant must follow the permitted uses and regulations of the R-2 Zoning Ordinance;
 2. A building permit for the demo of the current home must be approved by the Building Inspector and the necessary Notification of Intent to Perform a Demolition be submitted to MN Pollution Control Agency;
 3. A building permit must be applied for and approved to construct the proposed twin home.
- *****End of Staff Memo*****

Edmonds asked staff on what the demo permit is.

DeWitt explained that the form would be filled out by the applicant. We do have them at City Hall and will give them a form to complete when they come in for a demo building permit. The

applicant mails the demo form to Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and it needs to be postmarked or received ten days prior to when the demolition begins. They want to make sure any materials that may have contamination such as asbestos are properly disposed of.

Shawn Williams, applicant said prior to 1978 needs to have this form. The home on the property was built in 1955.

Edmonds opened the public hearing.

There were no questions asked from those in the audience.

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

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE ITEM #15-11 LOT SPLIT AT 707 10TH STREET NORTH AND FORWARD ON TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE APPLICANT MUST FOLLOW THE PERMITTED USES AND REGULATIONS OF THE R-2 ZONING ORDINANCE;
2. A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE DEMO OF THE CURRENT HOME MUST BE APPROVED BY THE BUILDING INSPECTOR AND THE NECESSARY NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO PERFORM A DEMOLITION BE SUBMITTED TO MN POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY;
3. A BUILDING PERMIT MUST BE APPLIED FOR AND APPROVED TO CONSTRUCT THE PROPOSED TWIN HOME.

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

C. #15-12 Conditional Use Permit for Two Additions at Princeton High School

Community Development Director Memo:

BACKGROUND

The Princeton Independent School District #477 has applied for a conditional use permit for the property address at 805 8TH AVE S. PRINCETON MN 55371

PID # 24-033-0010 CITY OF PRINCETON W ½ OF SE OF SW EX ½ A IN NE COR & COM 40 RDS E OF NW COR OF SE OF SW, S 825 FT E 264 FT. N 825 FT, W TO BEG, EX N 55 OF E 185 FT LYING S OF LOT 1 BLK 7 CHULA VISTA 33 36 26 24 27

PID # 24-033-0030 CITY OF PRINCETON S 490.25 FT OF W 481 FT OF E ½ OF SE OF SW, EX N 94 FT OF E 217 FT 33 36 26 4.93

ANALYSIS

The request is for two separate additions in order to construct a gymnasium and additional classrooms.

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 current zoning for this property is R-3. Schools and educational facilities are allowable uses with a Conditional Use Permit in R-3.

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.
3. *Adequate parking and loading is provided in compliance with the Ordinance.*
Comment: No charges to the parking or loading are proposed with the CUP.
4. *Possible traffic generation and access problems have been addressed.*
Comment: No changes to the traffic generation or access are proposed with the CUP.
5. *The proposed use can be accommodated with existing public services and will not overburden the city's service capacity.*
Comment: The proposed use can 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 for the addition and renovation of the Princeton High School with the following conditions:

No recommendations were added.

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

Ryan Hoffman, (ICS Consultant) was present and spoke of the two additions for the High School. The gym addition will be 20,000 square feet and the other addition is to connect the building to the shop area and that addition will be 6,000 square feet. This connection to the shop area will make it enclosed where they do not have to walk outside. The shop is not expanding into this area. There will be a couple classrooms in the area. The gym will have two practice courts and with an overlay competition court on top. The portables will be gone.

Edmonds opened the public hearing.

There were no questions from those in the audience.

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

Foss said when she wrote the memo she did not include any conditions at the time. They can add some if they would like.

EDMONDS MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE ITEM #15-12 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR TWO ADDITIONS THAT ARE APPROXIMATELY 20,000 SQUARE FEET AND 6,000 SQUARE FEET IN A R-3 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, AT PRINCETON HIGH SCHOOL, LOCATED AT 805 8TH AVENUE SOUTH. 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.

The Commission approves the Conditional Use permit, based upon the Findings Fact, with the noted conditions.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Site Plan Review for Two Additions at Princeton High School

Community Development Director Memo

BACKGROUND

Princeton Public Schools Independent School District 477 has submitted an application for a site plan review in order to construct an addition and expansion to the Princeton High School building. The property is zoned R-1 Residential, and an application for a Conditional Use Permit has been received.

ANALYSIS

The property address is 805 8th Ave. S. PRINCETON MN 55371

PID #24-033-0010 CITY OF PRINCETON W ½ OF SE OF SW EX ½ A IN NE COR & COM 40 RDS E OF NW COR OF SE OF SW, S 825 FT E 264 FT, N 825 FT, W TO BEG, EX N 55 OF E 185 FT LYING S OF LOT 1 BLK 7 CHULA VISTA 33 36 26 24.27

PID #24-033-0030 CITY OF PRINCETON S 490.25 FT OF W 481 FT OF E ½ OF SE OF SW, EX N 94 FT OF E 217 FT 33 36 26 4.93

SITE PLAN REVIEW

The expansion and addition will consist of two buildings. One of which is 20,000 square feet and one of which is 6,000 square feet.

Building Materials. The project consists of building materials that are in compliance with state and local ordinances.

Landscaping. A landscaping plan has been provided and meets landscaping requirements.

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 sign require a building permit.

Parking. No changes are to be made to the current parking configuration.

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 requesting additional items that need to be addressed by the architect. The provision of a Fire Road may be required.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending approval of the site plan review of the Princeton High School, subject to the following conditions:

1. Additional items submitted by the Fire Marshall must be addressed;
2. The City Engineer's conditions and recommendations shall be follow;
3. A Developer's Agreement shall be put in place;
4. An updated site plan shall be submitted; and
5. A building permit shall be submitted and approved by the City's Building Official prior to commencement of construction.

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

Mike Nielson, WSB City Engineer wrote the following memo:

July 15, 2015

The site plan for the above referenced High School improvements was reviewed and approved with the understanding that there would be an ultimate reduction in the impervious area for the entire school site when the North Elementary School was completed. Based in this future reduction in impervious area and the minimal increase in impervious area with this project, it is my recommendation that no additional storm water improvements are required at this time.

It is also my understanding that all fire hydrant spacing and fire access road issues will be worked out with the fire depart.

Based on this understanding it is my recommendation that the site plan be approved.

If you have any questions in this regard, please give me a call at 320-534-5940.

*****End of City Engineer Memo*****

Loren Kohen, Fire Marshall & Building Official wrote the following memo:

July 18, 2015

Review of Site Plan for compliance with State Fire Code

On July 8, 2015, a meeting was held at Princeton City Hall regarding the High School additions and renovation Site Plan review with the City Engineer, City staff, I.C.S. (representing the School District) and myself.

Drainage was discussed by the City Engineer.

I asked the representative of I.C.S. to provide me with a complete and accurate site plan, showing the total building with additions, setbacks, fire hydrant locations, and required fire apparatus access roads. I was provided with an aerial of the site, not a true site plan.

Three fire hydrants were showing on the site plan. I visited the site and found one hydrant to close to the building on the south side. One hydrant is in the grass area on southeast area of the building. The hydrant was installed wrong with the openings facing in the wrong direction.

The third hydrant on the northeast area of the building is placed correctly, and serves the fire sprinkler system inside the building.

As per State Fire Code, Sec.508.5, three to four additional hydrants are required on the north side, west side, and site area.

Fire access road design is in Sec 503.3.1. of the State Fire Code.

This is a large school in the area and must meet code. It is the responsibility of the School District and City Fire Department to make sure the young people (students) and staff are properly protected.

This proposed plan should be reviewed by the Fire Chief and his staff. We must remember the Fire Marshall or Fire Department cannot lower requirements of the State Fire Code.

******End of Fire Marshall & Building Official Memo******

Ryan Hoffman, (ICS Consultant) said in Nielson's memo he wrote that it is North Elementary and it should be South Elementary. He also has it saying when North Elementary School was completed and it should be when South Elementary is demolished. Hoffman said he read the memo from Loren Kohen and he agrees with Kohen and has started a fire road where it will come out on Smith System Road. They are looking at the most cost effective way. They met on updated hydrant plans and they will work that out and the fire road. Trust that they are in the process on that. The building is fully sprinkled.

Edmonds said they will have adequate fire protection.

Hoffman said yes.

Foss said staff recommends approval with conditions.

Johnson said it looks good.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN FOR A 20,000 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION AND A 6,000 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION AT PRINCETON HIGH SCHOOL LOCATED AT 805 8TH AVENUE SOUTH. THE CITY ENGINEER'S AND CITY FIRE MARSHALL & BUILDING OFFICIAL RECOMMENDATIONS MUST BE FOLLOWED. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

B. SuperAmerica LED Stripe Tube Lighting

Foss said that there was a request to put neon tube lighting on the top of the canopy at the gas station. There is nothing in the Sign Ordinance on this. She is asking for the Planning Commission Boards recommendation.

Damien Toven, City Attorney said if it is not specifically in the Ordinance it cannot be done. Otherwise the Ordinance has to be amended.

Edmonds said the lighting restrictions and conditions could be applied if we found the type of light it could fall under.

Toven said the form of lighting is not in our Ordinance so it is not a permitted use. It would need an amendment.

Johnson said to bring it back as a public hearing for next month.

Foss will see what other cities have on this and then have a public hearing on it.

C. Speedway Report

Foss said she provided the list for the Planning Commission Board to review. On June 5th the last race ended at 11:20, otherwise they have stayed within their time frame. Looks good.

Edmonds said on the form where it has "Last Tech" that is not the race, but does have some noise.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Ordinance Amendment for B-1 Conditional Use

Community Development Director Memo:

City Staff is requesting the consideration of an Ordinance Amendment to the B-1 Central Business District.

Zoning Ordinance #538 has no language contained therein that relates to or describes in any way the provision for the sale of or repair of motorcycles, snowmobiles or other recreational vehicles such as 4-wheelers, wave-runners etc.

Staff has looked at other cities and has found language related to this use and has requested that the City Attorney draft up language that could be added to the B-1 Zoning Ordinance as a Conditional Use within that zone.

Upon review, additional language regarding parking and outdoor storage has been added to the amendment.

Please look over draft language for your consideration. If the Planning Commission is in favor of adding this provision to the Zoning Ordinance a public hearing would be in order. The amendment would then be brought to the City Council.

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

Foss said that this has been reevaluated and should be in B-1 instead. For motorcycle and recreational vehicles the lot size would not need to be that large so staff thought to have this added to the B-1 instead of B-2. Overnight storage would not be permitted. The items for sale would have to be put away at night. Parking only on paved portion of the site.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE B-1 AMENDMENT PROPOSAL TO ADD A CONDITIONAL USE FOR ATV/SNOWMOBILE/MOTORCYCLE SALES AND SERVICE, AND BRING THIS BACK FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ON AUGUST 17, 2015 FOR A PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

B. Ordinance Amendment for Boundary Line Adjustment

Community Development Director Memo:

Upon careful review of the City's Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances, it does not appear as though our City has any provisions authorizing lot combinations and boundary line adjustments.

City Staff is requesting the consideration of an Ordinance Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that will reflect the benefits of having provisions within our ordinance allowing boundary line adjustments and lot combinations.

Provided is draft language for your consideration. If the Planning Commission is in favor of adding this provision to the Zoning Ordinance a public hearing would be in order. The amendment would then be brought to the City Council.

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

Foss said the Zoning Ordinance does not have boundary line adjustments in our Ordinance.

Edmonds asked on page two of the amendment, number five says the property has not been divided through the provisions of this section within the previous five years. Why have five years?

Toven said other municipalities has this number so he used it.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE SIMPLE LOT SUBDIVISIONS, SIMPLE LOT CONSOLIDATIONS, AND BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENTS, AND BRING THIS BACK FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ON AUGUST 17, 2015 FOR A PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report

7:00 PM on August 3rd.

1) Special Meeting for Site Plan Review for Riverstone Dental

DeWitt informed the Planning Commission Board that Riverstone Dental would like to have a special meeting for a Site Plan Review of their new Dental Office. They would like to have the review date before the regular Planning Commission meeting on August 17, 2015. She gave the Planning Commission a calendar of available dates for August.

The Planning Commission agreed they could meet on August 3, 2015 at 7:00 P.M. at City Hall Council Chambers.

DeWitt said she will talk to the applicant tomorrow and see if this meeting date will work for them. She will email the Planning Commission Board tomorrow to confirm the date.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:45 P.M.

ATTEST:

Jack Edmonds, Chairperson

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant