

**THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON NOVEMBER 19,
2012, AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Dave Thompson. Members present were Tim Siercks, and Jack Edmonds. Staff present were Carie Fuhrman and Mary Lou DeWitt.

Absent were Dick Dobson and Mitzi Mellott.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON OCTOBER 15, 2012

SIERCKS MOVED, SECOND BY EDMONDS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 15, 2012. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. #12-12 Variance (& Site Plan Review) for Inline Packaging Addition

Jeffrey Watkins has submitted an application on behalf of Inline Packaging LLC for a variance to the 40 foot front yard setback requirement and for a site plan review in order to construct a 7,500 square foot addition on to the existing building. The site is located at 1205 18th Avenue South; is described as Lot 8, Block 3, Princeton Industrial Park Third Addition; and is zoned MN-1 Industrial.

The property is located on the northwest corner of 14th Street South and 18th Avenue South. The existing building is 41,298 square feet. The proposed building addition on the east side of the building is 7,500 square feet (50 ft by 150 ft), for a total building size of 48,798 square feet. The southeast portion of the addition is proposed to encroach into the front yard setback by four feet, for a 36 foot setback. As a part of the project, the existing loading dock to the south will be remodeled. The existing loading dock ramp to the north will remain, but a new concrete drive is proposed immediately to the south, and a new concrete loading dock ramp is proposed directly to the north.

A public hearing notice was published, and the neighboring properties were notified. According to section 2 of Chapter IV of the Zoning Ordinance, a variance shall not be granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:

1. *Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance?*

Staff comment: The expansion of a manufacturing facility that is adding jobs is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the MN-1 District, which is to “provide a district for the development and operation of manufacturing, storage, and distribution type business.”

2. *Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?*

Staff comment: The Future Land Use Plan designates this property as Industrial. The addition will accommodate new production equipment and new industrial jobs, which is in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

3. *Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?*

Staff comment: The focus of this factor is whether the request to construct the building addition within the required front yard setback is reasonable. A building expansion to allow for

new production equipment appears to be a reasonable request in the Industrial Park. It does not appear that it will affect site lines either.

4. Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?

Staff comment: The configuration of the lot is unique. In addition, the municipal airport property located to the west of the subject property prevents any further additions or further property from being purchased for future additions. The property owners worked with City staff in researching whether or not additional land could be purchased to the north (on the Flight Service Station property); however, it was discovered that several underground cables would inhibit an expansion in this direction. Previous building additions have maximized the rest of the buildable space on the lot.

Office space is located on the south end of the building. The parking lot and stormwater pond are located to the south of the building. This leaves room for an expansion to the east. Beyond this, when the building was originally constructed, it was placed at angle relative to 18th Avenue. Because of this, the southeast corner of the proposed addition will encroach into the required 40 foot setback by four (4) feet. Only a small portion will encroach; the majority of the addition will meet the setback requirement.

The surrounding uses, the configuration of the lot, and the location of the original building are all unique circumstances not created by the landowner.

5. Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?

Staff comment: The businesses within Princeton's Industrial Park have been experiencing growth in the past few years. Inline's expansion will maintain the essential character of the locality.

6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?

Staff comment: Yes, the alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations – it involves the surrounding uses, lot configuration, and original building location.

According to the League of MN Cities, practical difficulties is a legal standard set forth in law that cities must apply when considering applications for variances. It is a three factor test, and to constitute practical difficulties, all three factors of the test must be satisfied: (1) reasonableness; (2) unique circumstances; and (3) essential character of the locality.

Staff would recommend approval of the variance request subject to the following conditions:

1. The City Engineer's recommendations shall be followed;
2. Additional landscaping shall be added along the building elevation facing the right-of-way, in addition to what is currently being proposed; and
3. A building permit shall be submitted and approved by the City's Building Official prior to commencement of construction.

Mike Nielson, City Engineer with WSB wrote the following memo on November 14, 2012: This memorandum provides stormwater management review comments for the proposed Inline Packaging Expansion located southeast of the airport at 1205 18th Avenue South. The following documents were received for review:

- * Proposed Drainage Plan, dated November 12, 2012, Certified by Elfering & Associates.
- * Drainage Report, dated November 12, 2012, Certified by Elfering & Associates.

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 a 7,500 square foot building addition and 4,900 square foot concrete loading dock expansion on the 2.84 acre site. These activities will also include the removal of a concrete pad, thus resulting in a net increase of impervious surface on the parcel of 0.15 acres.

The applicant proposes to infiltrate stormwater runoff in using infiltration basins.

Stormwater Management Plan General Comments

The proposed improvements must meet the stormwater management standards outlined in Section V of the City's Water Resource Management Plan. This includes policies to limit discharge rates, and policies to promote infiltration of stormwater runoff. The applicant must provide a narrative describing how the proposed improvements can meet these requirements.

Stormwater Management Plan Specific Comments

Specific comments related to the application are provided below. The applicant should submit revised documents that address these comments for City review and approval.

Drainage Calculations

1. Provide documentation indicating how runoff leaves proposed drainage areas. For example, the drainage report shows drainage area P New-4 draining to Pond 1 on the west side of the property. It is unclear how this drainage makes it to Pond 1.
2. Provide an updated grading plan that clearly shows the intended drainage paths to each pond. The current drainage plan provided show Ponds 3, 4, and 5 illustrated, but does not provide the contours to show how drainage gets to these ponds, but does not show how the proposed contour connect into existing.

Infiltration/Ponding Systems

3. The applicant may conduct percolation tests to substantiate design infiltration rates greater than standard infiltration rates outlined in the City's Water Resource Management Plan. It is recommended that testing methods and correction factors outlined in the MN Stormwater

Manual be used to complete this analysis.

4. Indicate drawdown times for the proposed infiltration systems. The City requires that these systems drawdown with 72 hours.

5. Provide infiltration basin details including any proposed soil amendments and proposed activities that will be used to establish vegetation (including plantings or seeding that will be performed as a part of this project). Not that in sandy infiltration areas, the City requires soil amendments to help establish vegetation.

6. Include existing and proposed building opening elevations, and proposed 100 year high water levels.

Erosion Control

7. Include an erosion control plan that includes detail for inlet protection and include not on plan to provide inlet protection at the catch basins located on right-of-way south and southeast of the site.

8. Include note indicating that street sweeping shall be provided by the contractor throughout construction to remove sediment and debris that is deposited on Streets due to construction activities. The note should state that the City may order this work to be performed as the contractor's (or owner's) expense if City staff find that construction activities are resulting in sediment or debris being tracked onto City Streets.

This concludes our stormwater management review comments for the proposed Inline Packaging Site Plan.

Mike Nielson, City Engineer with WSB, addressed the points on his memo for the proposed addition. Nielson said that United States Distilled Products has in house wastewater pretreatment system. The City is looking at completing an infiltration pond for stormwater in the Industrial Park. Nielson recommends approval for the proposed addition for Inline Packaging, contingent with the condition that they provide a complete onsite stormwater improvements layout plan by July 1, 2013, incase the City does not move forward with the infiltration pond project. If the City does move ahead with this project, then Inline Packaging will participate in the assessments for the project.

Weyer said it should be okay. He has worked with the Engineer for an onsite catch basin so it can be taken care of onsite. He will not have any issues to handle it onsite.

Edmonds asked why the building is at an angle.

Weyer said he does not know why it is.

Nielson said it is a common construction error when staking out the calculations.

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

Thompson said he is fine with the addition as long as the drainage issue is handled.

EDMONDS MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO APPROVE ITEM #12-12 VARIANCE TO THE 40 FOOT FRONT YARD SETBACK REQUIREMENT TO BUILD AN ADDITION ONTO THE CURRENT BUILDING THAT IS PROPOSED TO ENCROACH INTO THE FRONT YARD SETBACK BY FOUR FEET, FOR A 36 FOOT SETBACK, IN THE MN-1 INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, AT 1205 18TH AVENUE SOUTH, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE CITY'S ENGINEER'S RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL BE FOLLOWED.
2. ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING SHALL BE ADDED ALONG THE BUILDING ELEVATION FACING THE RIGHT-OF-WAY, IN ADDITION TO WHAT IS CURRENTLY BEING PROPOSED.
3. A BUILDING PERMIT SHALL BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION.
4. APPLICANT SHALL COMPLETE ONSITE STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS BY JULY 1, 2013 IF THE CITY DOES NOT MOVE FORWARD WITH THE AIRPORT STORMWATER PROJECT. IF THE CITY DOES MOVE FORWARD WITH THE AIRPORT STORMWATER PROJECT, THE ONSITE STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS SHALL BE WAIVED, AND THE APPLICANT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN THE ASSESSMENTS FOR THE PROJECT.

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

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes, use fits well within present settings.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, the facility is use for production per Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, it allows present owner to remain at the site and grow.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, the property layout is such that building is not square to front property line.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes, it will not change the character and they are still well behind the property line.

Site Plan Review for Inline Packaging Addition

Fuhrman gave a Site Plan review for Inline Packaging addition. The building materials will match the existing building. The Planning Commission Board were given colored perspective drawings, displaying the proposed addition.

Two new landscaping areas are proposed: one directly between the new addition and the road, and the second is proposed in the northeast corner of the property. The Landscaping Ordinance (Chapter VI.L.7.) requires that landscaping be provided around a minimum of 50 percent of the exterior footprint of the building. The Planning Commission may want to consider requiring additional landscaping along the front of the new addition between the two loading docks in addition to what is proposed to meet the Ordinance requirement of breaking up large unadorned building elevations.

The parking lot is located to the south of the building. 46 total parking stalls are proposed, including six new stalls being added, which appears to meet the Ordinance requirement. The following outlines the Ordinance requirements for parking:

Industrial/Manufacturing: Five spaces plus one for each employee on the largest working shift, but not less than one per 1,000 square feet. There is currently 17 employees on the largest working shift. Approximately 34,250 square feet is or will be utilized as manufacturing/industrial. This requires 34.25 spaces.

Warehouse: Five spaces plus one for each employees on the largest working shift, but not less than one per 2,000 square feet. Approximately 14,625 square feet is utilized as warehouse space. This requires 7.3 spaces.

The applicants have prepared a Drainage Plan and Drainage Report. Both have been reviewed by the City Engineer. Approval of the variance shall be subject to the conditions listed in the memo dated November 14, 2012.

EDMONDS MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR INLINE PACKAGING ADDITION. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Subdivision Ordinance Update (Verbal)

Fuhrman said the City Attorney is reviewing the language for the Subdivision Ordinance. He has mentioned a few times that the language for lot combinations and such need to be cleaned up. Fuhrman will also have the City Engineer review the parcel size and street configurations.

B. Electronic Sign Ordinance Update (Verbal)

Fuhrman said that the sign subcommittee has met once. There are looking at signage allowed in a portion of B-2 Zoning District and all of B-3 District. The main concern in the B-2 District is to keep the historical downtown look and what the residential properties would view.

Thompson said he will attend the next meeting and help with the state regulations on the

lighting of the signs were they are not so bright.

Atwood suggested looking at what other City ordinances are and make a comparison. It could move the process along.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Princeton Auto Parking Lot Expansion (Verbal)

Fuhrman said Princeton Auto is looking at an expansion to their parking lot. They own land south of their current lot that would be more visible. Fuhrman understands in the past the City has had correspondence with Princeton Auto parking on this site without having it paved. They currently would like to have cars on that site for the winter. Fuhrman is finding conflicting definitions and would like the Planning Commission's view point on it.

In 2008, there was an Ordinance #611 amendment to Chapter II, Definitions, of Princeton Zoning Ordinance #538 by defining Parking Lot Surface, Durable and Dustless and Parking Lot Surface, Hard. There is a list of surface materials for temporary parking lots for up to one year. In the B-3 Zoning Ordinance it states that the parking area for the outside sales and storage area shall be hard surfaced before operation of business begins and maintained to control dust, erosion, and drainage. The property is located in B-3 Zoning District. Would the Planning Commission want to allow Princeton Auto to surface this additional parking area with temporary materials for one year. If they would, then the Ordinance has to be changed.

Ron Weyer commented that he thought gravel was allowed at one time and then had been changed. Princeton Auto asked him to look at a new asphalt parking lot. The drainage will be looked at. They would like to do the asphalt in the spring.

Thompson remembers Princeton Auto had wanted to put down class five aggregate instead of paving this site. It was not allowed.

Fuhrman said the Zoning regulations were changed for B-2 and B-3 Districts in 2010 where they have to be hard surfaced. That would supersede Ordinance #611 amendment for "Durable and Dustless Parking Lot Surface" in 2008.

Thompson commented that he is not in favor of changing this ordinance.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report

1) Planning Commission Vacancy

Fuhrman said that Dave Thompson will not be reapplying for his seat on the Planning Commission Board because he will be retiring from Princeton Public Utilities. The City will be advertising his vacancy in the paper along with any other Board vacancy.

2) Reschedule January and February, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Dates

The regular January 21, 2013 meeting is on Martin Luther King Day and the February 18, 2013 meeting is on President's Day. The City offices are closed those two dates in observance of the holiday. Fuhrman asked the Planning Commission members if they would like to reschedule the meetings for the day after on Tuesday or the following Monday.

The members decided to reschedule the meeting dates for Tuesday, January 22, 2013 and February 19, 2013.

3) Mille Lacs County Comprehensive Plan Community Meeting

Fuhrman said there will be a community meeting in January for the Mille Lacs County Comprehensive Plan and she will inform the Planning Commission Board on the date.

Fuhrman also wanted to add that the City is finishing plans of the Public Safety Building that would house the Fire & Rescue Department and also the Police Department. She expects the Site Plan Review on the building to be at the December or January Planning Commission meeting.

B. City Council Minutes for October, 2012

The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

Edmonds excused himself from the meeting at 7:17 P.M., to attend another meeting.

SIERCKS MOVED, SECOND BY THOMPSON, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:30 P.M.

ATTEST:

Dave Thompson, Chairperson

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant