

**CITY OF PRINCETON
Planning Commission
Agenda
August 17th, 2015
7:00 P.M., City Hall**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting on July 15, 2015 - Tab A**
- 3. Agenda Additions/Deletions**
- 4. Public Hearing:**
 - A. #15-13 Conditional Use Permit at 701 16th Avenue North - Tab B**
 - B. #15-14 Variance at 501 2nd Street South – Tab C**
 - C. Ordinance Amendment for B-1 Zoning District (Conditional Uses) – Tab D**
 - D. Ordinance Amendment for Boundary Line Adjustment – Tab E**
- 5. Old Business:**
 - A. LED Stripe Tube Lighting Signage (SuperAmerica) – Tab F**
- 6. New Business:**
 - A. EDA Update – Tab G**
- 7. Communication and Reports:**
 - A. Verbal Report**
 - B. City Council Minutes for July, 2015 - Tab H**
- 8. Adjournment**

MEETING PROTOCOL

1. The chair of any board or commission has the same rights as the other board or commission members in that he/she can both make and second motions.
2. The chair of any board or commission also has the right to vote on all motions that come before the body. Historically, if there's a roll call vote (as opposed to the standard voice vote) the chair sometimes opts to vote last.
3. Generally, a board or commission member should vote on all issues before the group unless they have a disqualifying personal interest in the issue. In cases where the member has a conflict of interest, the member should:
 - A. Advise the board of their intent to abstain and state the conflict before the vote is taken.
 - B. If the member has a true disqualifying personal interest they should take the liberty of seating him/herself in the audience for the duration of the discussion (from where the member can comment on the proposal) until the vote is recorded.
4. On a voice vote, if a member does not vote 'aye' or 'nay', then the member is considered to have voted with the prevailing side. In other words, on a 5 person board, if only 2 members vote 'aye' and the others don't say 'aye' or 'nay', then the vote should be recorded as passing unanimously.
5. If the chair, or one of the member, is not sure of the outcome after a voice vote is taken the chair or member can request a roll call vote whereby the chair asks each member to indicate their preference and the final tally is taken from the results of that polling.
6. It is incumbent on all board and commission members to exhibit professionalism and maintain the respectful decorum required of a assemblage representing the public. Members (as well as the public) should raise their hand and be recognized by the chair before commenting on the issue before the body. Members should also refrain from engaging in member to member debate. The public discussion of issues should not deteriorate into an argument between members. Comments of members and of the public should be directed to the Chair, not to individual board or commission members or other members of the public. The members should also treat their fellow board/commission members and staff with respect.

**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 than 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 descript 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 SPIT AT 707 10TH STREET NORTH 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 APPORVED 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.)



DRAFT

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.

DRAFT



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?



DRAFT

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

MEMORANDUM

TAB B

TO: Princeton Planning Commission
FROM: Jolene Foss, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit for Jim Thompson
DATE: August 17th, 2015

BACKGROUND

Jim Thompson, on behalf of Moose International, Inc. Lodge # 2331, has applied for a conditional use permit for the property address at 701 16th Ave N PRINCETON MN 55371 PID # 24.560.0020 Section 29, TWP 36, Range 26, Lot 2, Block 1, Maple View Development, Mille Lacs County.

ANALYSIS

The request is for Auto Sales Lot and Recreational Vehicle Sales and Service.

Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use Plan designates this property as Highway Commercial.

Zoning. The current zoning for this property is B-3 General Commercial.

Automobile and Recreational Sales and Service is an allowable use in B-3 with a Conditional Use Permit provided that:

(a) A minimum lot area of 1 acre is required and the use shall be on 1 lot or contiguous lots not separated by a public street or other use.

(b) A minimum lot width of 100 feet is required.

(c) The parking area for the outside sales and storage area, whether for a new or the expansion of an existing facility, shall be hard surfaced by the date determined by the Planning Commission after consideration of the size and scope of the project, and the effect of the cold weather season on paving construction materials, but in no event more than 10 months after final city approval. Parking areas shall be maintained to control dust, erosion, and drainage before and after hard surfacing. No parking or display of vehicles for sale shall occur on landscaped areas. Customer parking shall be clearly marked (Rev. 02-28-13; Ord. 696).

(d) Interior concrete or asphalt curbs shall be constructed within the property to separate driving and parking surfaces from landscaped areas.

(e) All areas of the property not devoted to building or parking areas shall be landscaped.

(f) Noise from electronic speaker devices shall be regulated in Chapter VI, Performance Standards.

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: It does not appear that the proposed use will create any potential erosion, runoff, water pollution and sedimentation issues.

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

Comment: The parking requirements are being met and any potential repair will be either overlay or seal coated and re-striped

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 strive to expand and diversify the area tax base by promoting sound economic development opportunities and encourage wise land use patterns in the area

Staff Recommendation

It is City Staff's recommendation to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the Auto Sales Lot and Recreational Vehicle Sales and Service.

Purpose of Request

My business has grown and it is necessary to expand my space. The former Moose Lodge property is available and right next door. It is a great opportunity to grow this way. I own the property to the south as well so this will tie all ~~three~~ ^{four} pieces together. I feel this use is the best opportunity for the location.

x *James Stoyard*
7-10-15

Lighting - There are currently 5 light poles around the parking lot, all facing the blacktop area and building. One in the south west corner is a couple of feet onto the property to the south west of the parking lot, owned by myself.

Landscaping - There are currently ~~many~~ many mature trees of all kinds to the west 1/2 of the property. The building and parking lot has none, as the blacktop covers to the south north and east sides of property.

Building - No current changes to any bearing walls inside.

Garbage - To be stored on the north side of the building in a contained container

PARKING - Display Area - If Replaced, overlaid on Seal Coated over. The Black topped Area will Be Re-Striped As showed in sight plan

Customer parking. To be on ~~both sides~~ East And West Sides of the building with Customer And Handi Cap spaces clearly marked NEAR building entrances

Signs - Currently there is A pole sign Located on the Far South West Corner of the property. Also A EXISTING sign on A pole owned And controlled by A switch in the building in the easment outside property.



TO: Planning Commission
 FROM: Jolene Foss, Community Development Director
 SUBJECT: Variance to allow a pylon sign within the minimum of 15 feet from any surrounding buildings or structures.
 DATE: August 17th, 2015

BACKGROUND

Chris Clark of Leroy Signs on behalf of Spire Bank, has applied for a variance to allow a pylon sign within the minimum of 15 feet from any surrounding buildings or structures.

ANALYSIS

The property is located at 501 Second Street South and legally described as City of Princeton, Lot 6, Block 6, Damons Addition, Mille Lacs County, Section 33, Township 36, Range 26, PID #24-041-0540. The location is zoned B-1 Central Business District. It is the intent of the B-1 Central Business District to create an area which will serve as the focal point of community interest and as a focal point of commercial, financial, office, entertainment, and governmental activity.

VARIANCE

To allow a pylon sign within the minimum 15 foot setback from any surrounding buildings or structures in a B-1 Central Business District. Spire Credit Union would like to install a new double sided internally lit illuminated pylon sign at the East side of their property in order to enhance the visibility of their Princeton branch. This sign meets all existing city sign codes in regards to size, area, height and location inside their property lines. The sign will be installed in the SE corner of the property 17'-10" from the bank building but only 4'-10" from the East edge of the auto bank canopy. The request is for a setback variance of 10'-2" from the west edge of the sign to the east end of the bank auto canopy.

GENERAL VARIANCE REVIEW STANDARDS

Subsection 3.B of Chapter IV outlines the standards for review of a Variance:

1. *Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance?*
Comment: Yes-The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance.
2. *Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?*
Comment: Yes-It appears the variance will remain consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. *Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the zoning ordinance?*
Comment: Yes-he property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the zoning ordinance.
4. *Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?*
Comment: Yes-There are circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner.
5. *Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?*
Comment: Yes-Such variance will not alter the essential character of the district in which it is located or the property for which the variance is sought.
6. *Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?*
Comment: Yes-The request for this variance is due to the small size of the lot. The granting of the variance will allow the credit union to provide a high quality image and compete with the neighboring financial institute larger signs in the area.



Driven by Midwestern Values

July, 27, 2015

To whom it may concern:

Spire Credit Union authorizes Chris Clark from Leroy Sign Inc. to pursue the monument sign placement variance on our behalf at our Princeton, MN branch located at 501 South 2nd Street, Princeton, MN 55371.

Sincerely:

Jim Kuchelmeister

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Kuchelmeister", written over a light blue horizontal line.

Facilities Manager for Spire Credit Union

651-641-2106

2025 Larpenteur Ave W. Falcon Heights, MN 55113.

OVER 70 YEARS

LEROY
SIGNS

DESIGN CONSULTING • FABRICATING • MAINTENANCE • SERVICE • INSTALLATION

July 28, 2015

City of Princeton
705 2nd Street North
Princeton, MN 55371
RE: Spire Credit Union Pylon sign setback variance

To Whom It May Concern:

I am applying for a sign set back variance of 10'-2" on behalf of Spire Credit Union. Spire Credit Union would like to install a new double sided internally illuminated pylon sign at the East side of their property in order to enhance visibility of their Princeton branch.

- 1) This variance request is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. The pylon meets all existing city sign codes in regards to size, area, height and location inside their property lines. Unfortunately, due to the small size of their corner lot we cannot meet the 15' set back from building/structures. The sign will be installed in the SE corner of the property, completely inside their property lines as per code. The sign will be 17'-10" from the bank building but only 4'-10" from the East edge of the auto bank canopy. Thus we are requesting a setback variance of 10'-2" from the West edge of the sign to the East end of the auto bank canopy.
- 2) This variance request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- 3) The property owner proposes to continue the use of this property in a reasonable manner as permitted by the zoning ordinance.
- 4) The circumstances unique to this property were not created by the land owner.
- 5) The issuance of the variance will keep in tact the essential character of the locality.
- 6) The request for this variance is due to the small size of the lot. The granting of the variance will allow the credit union to provide a high quality image and compete with the neighboring financial institute larger signs in the area.

Respectfully submitted,



Chris Clark
Leroy Signs Inc.

6325 Welcome Ave. N. • Minneapolis, MN 55429 • Office: 763-535-0080 • Fax: 763-533-2593

Leroy Signs Inc. has teamed with S.M.L. Electrical, a licensed electrical company.
This bid is subject to further clarification between the parties and does not constitute an offer to perform the aforementioned services

CITY OF PRINCETON,
MINNESOTA ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PROVISION C (CONDITIONAL USES) SECTION 8 (B-1 CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT) CHAPTER V (ZONING DISTRICTS) OF THE CITY OF PRINCETON'S ZONING ORDINANCE BY ADDING A CONDITIONAL USE FOR ATV/SNOWMOBILE/MOTORCYCLE SALES AND SERVICE

SECTION 1: Provision C (Conditional Uses) Section 8 (B-1 Central Business District) Chapter V (Zoning District) of the City of Princeton's Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended to add the following definition:

ATV/Snowmobile/Motorcycle Sales and Service provided that

- (a) The parking area for the outside sales and storage area, whether for new or the expansion of an existing facility, shall be hard surfaced by the date determined by the Planning Commission after consideration of the size and scope of the project, and the effect of the cold weather season on paving construction materials, but in no event more than 10 months after final city approval. Parking areas shall be maintained to control dust, erosion, and drainage before and after hard surfacing. No parking or display of ATVs/Snowmobiles/Motorcycles shall occur on landscaped areas. Customer parking shall be clearly marked. The number of spaces required for customer parking shall be determined by the Planning Commission on a project case by case basis.
- (b) Interior concrete or asphalt curbs shall be constructed within the property to separate driving and parking surfaces from landscaped areas.
- (c) All areas of the property not devoted to building, parking or storage areas shall be landscaped.
- (d) Outdoor storage of ATVs/Snowmobiles/Motorcycles shall be limited to the business hours of operation. Overnight storage is not permitted. All outdoor storage of ATVs/Snowmobiles/Motorcycles shall only be upon the paved portion of the property and within any setback requirements of the City of Princeton Zoning Ordinance.

SECTION 2: The remaining sections of Provision C (Conditional Uses) Section 8 (B-1 Central Business District) Chapter V (Zoning Districts) of the City of Princeton's Zoning Ordinance remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 3: EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall take effect upon its summary publication in the City's official newspaper. Said publication shall read as follows:

Ordinance # _____ amends Provision C (Conditional Uses) Section 8 (B-1 Central Business District) Chapter V (Zoning Districts) of the City of Princeton's Zoning Ordinance by adding a conditional use for ATV/Snowmobile/Motorcycle Sales and Service.

A copy of the full ordinance is available for review at City Hall.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Princeton this ____ day of _____ 2015.

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor

ATTEST:

Mark Karnowski, City Administrator

CITY OF PRINCETON,
MINNESOTA ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF PRINCETON'S SUBDIVISION
ORDINANCE BY ADDING CHAPTER XVIII ALLOWING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
SIMPLE LOT SUBDIVISIONS, SIMPLE LOT CONSOLIDATIONS AND BOUNDARY
LINE ADJUSTMENT

SECTION 1: The City of Princeton's Subdivision Ordinance is hereby amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER XVIII:

ADMINISTRATIVE SIMPLE LOT SUBDIVISIONS/SIMPLE LOT
CONSOLIDATIONS/BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENTS

(A) *Purpose.* This section is established to provide for administrative approval of simple lot subdivisions, simple lot consolidations and boundary line adjustments, that meet specified criteria and for the waiver of standard platting requirements specified elsewhere in the City of Princeton's Subdivision Ordinance. It is intended largely to facilitate the further division of previously platted lots, the combination of previously platted lots into fewer lots, or for the adjustment of a lot line by relocation of a common boundary.

(B) *Definitions.*

- a. Simple Lot Subdivision. The division of one platted lot of record into two lots, each of which complies with all zoning and subdivision requirements of the City of Princeton.
- b. Simple Lot Consolidation. The consolidation of multiple platted lots of record into one lot, which complies with all zoning and subdivision requirements of the City of Princeton.
- c. Boundary Line Adjustment. The division of one or more lots of record for the purpose of combining a portion or portions thereof with other lots of record, without creating additional lots and provided that all resultant lots comply with all zoning and subdivision requirements of the City of Princeton.

(C) *Application for administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation / boundary line adjustment.* Any person having a legal or equitable interest in a property may file an application for administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment. Any such application shall be filed with the Zoning Administrator on an approved form and shall be accompanied by an accurate boundary survey and legal description of all parent parcels prior to any simple lot subdivision/simple lot

consolidation/boundary line adjustment, as well as a survey and legal description identifying the resulting parcels after any simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment, as well as any other such exhibits or documents and deemed appropriate by the Zoning Administrator. Said surveys must clearly identify all rights of way boundaries as well as any and all utilities in existence on any affected properties.

(D) *Review of administrative simple lot subdivision / simple lot consolidation / boundary line adjustment.* The Zoning Administrator shall review all applications for an administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment to determine compliance with the standards identified in this section and all other pertinent requirements of the City of Princeton. Upon written approval of the request, the applicant shall be responsible for any and all expenses for the preparation of all documentation required and to complete the recording of the same with the appropriate Count Recorder's office. Should the request be denied, the Zoning Administrator shall notify the applicant, in writing, of the reasons for the denial. Any appeal of city staff's decision shall be made to the Planning Commission in accordance with the procedures specified in the City of Princeton's Subdivision Ordinance.

(E) *Findings required for approval.* In order for the Zoning Administrator to grant approval for a proposed administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment, each of the provisions shown below must be met.

- (1) A simple lot subdivision of land will not result in more than two lots. A simple lot consolidation will result in only one lot. A boundary line adjustment will result in no new lots being created.
- (2) All necessary utility and drainage easements are provided for.
- (3) All lots to be created by the simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment conform to lot area and width requirements established for the zoning district in which the property is located.
- (4) The simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment does not require dedication of public right-of-way for the purpose of gaining access to the property.
- (5) The property has not been divided through the provisions of this section within the previous five years.
- (6) The simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment meets all design standards as specified elsewhere in the City of Princeton's Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances.

(E) *Conditions of approval.* The City may impose the conditions on any proposed administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment that are deemed reasonable and necessary to protect the public interest and to ensure compliance

consolidation/boundary line adjustment, as well as a survey and legal description identifying the resulting parcels after any simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment, as well as any other such exhibits or documents and deemed appropriate by the Zoning Administrator. Said surveys must clearly identify all rights of way boundaries as well as any and all utilities in existence on any affected properties.

(D) *Review of administrative simple lot subdivision / simple lot consolidation / boundary line adjustment.* The Zoning Administrator shall review all applications for an administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment to determine compliance with the standards identified in this section and all other pertinent requirements of the City of Princeton. Upon written approval of the request, the applicant shall be responsible for any and all expenses for the preparation of all documentation required and to complete the recording of the same with the appropriate County Recorder's office. Should the request be denied, the Zoning Administrator shall notify the applicant, in writing, of the reasons for the denial. Any appeal of city staff's decision shall be made to the Planning Commission in accordance with the procedures specified in the City of Princeton's Subdivision Ordinance.

(E) *Findings required for approval.* In order for the Zoning Administrator to grant approval for a proposed administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment, each of the provisions shown below must be met.

- (1) A simple lot subdivision of land will not result in more than two lots. A simple lot consolidation will result in only one lot. A boundary line adjustment will result in no new lots being created.
- (2) All necessary utility and drainage easements are provided for.
- (3) All lots to be created by the simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment conform to lot area and width requirements established for the zoning district in which the property is located.
- (4) The simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment does not require dedication of public right-of-way for the purpose of gaining access to the property.
- (5) The property has not been divided through the provisions of this section within the previous five years.
- (6) The simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment meets all design standards as specified elsewhere in the City of Princeton's Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances.

(E) *Conditions of approval.* The City may impose the conditions on any proposed administrative simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment that are deemed reasonable and necessary to protect the public interest and to ensure compliance

with the provisions of this chapter including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The applicant shall provide required utility and drainage easements for all newly created lots and be responsible for the cost of filing and recording written easements with the County Recorder's office; and

(2) The applicant shall pay parkland dedication fees for each lot created beyond the original number of lots existing prior to the simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment, except when the fees have been applied to the property as part of a previous simple lot subdivision/simple lot consolidation/boundary line adjustment.

SECTION 2: The remaining sections of the City of Princeton's Subdivision Ordinance remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 3: EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall take effect upon its summary publication in the City's official newspaper. Said publication shall read as follows:

Ordinance # _____ amends the City of Princeton's Subdivision Ordinance by adding Chapter XVIII allowing for administrative simple lot subdivisions, simple lot consolidations and boundary line adjustments.

A copy of the full ordinance is available for review at City Hall.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Princeton this ____ day of _____ 2015.

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor

ATTEST:

Mark Karnowski, City Administrator

Duluth**50-27.4 Illumination Standards**

The following illumination standards apply to on-premises signs. Illumination of billboards (offpremises) are regulated separately in Section 50-27.7. Additional illumination requirements for electronic message signs are found in Section 50-27.7.

A. Any sign illumination, including gooseneck reflectors, external illumination and internal illumination, must be designed, located, shielded and directed to prevent the casting of glare or direct light upon roadways and surrounding properties, or the distraction of motor vehicle operators or pedestrians in the public right-of-way.

B. The sign face of internally illuminated signs must function as a filter to diffuse illumination. The sign face must cover all internal illumination components so that no exposed bulbs are visible.

C. All external illumination of a sign must concentrate the illumination upon the printed area of the sign face.

D. No sign illumination may exceed one (1) footcandle of illumination at the property line.

E. The use of neon lighting as a sign material or sign accent is permitted for signs within the mixed-use, form-based and special purpose districts, with the exception of the MU-N and MU-B Districts where it is prohibited. Neon lighting is subject to the following:

1. When lit, neon lighting must be continuously illuminated. Flashing neon is prohibited.
2. Neon lighting cannot be combined with any reflective materials (e.g., mirrors, polished metal, highly-glazed tiles, or other similar materials) that would cause glare and increase the spread of light.
3. Neon lighting to outline doors and windows is prohibited.

F. The use of LED lighting as a sign accent is permitted, subject to the following:

1. LED lighting as an accent is only permitted for non-residential uses in the mixed-use, form-based and special purpose districts where electronic message center signs are permitted. LED accent lighting is prohibited in any residential district.
2. LED lighting as an accent must comply with all illumination requirements of an electronic message center sign.
3. The addition of LED lighting as an accent to an existing sign requires a zoning permit.
4. When lit, LED lighting must be continuously illuminated. Flashing LED is prohibited.
5. LED lighting cannot be combined with any reflective materials (e.g., mirrors, polished metal, highly-glazed tiles, or other similar materials) that would cause glare and increase the spread of light.
6. LED lighting to outline doors, windows, and automobile and filing station gas canopies is prohibited.
7. LED lighting to outline billboards, free standing monument signs, and free standing pole signs is prohibited.

MILACA

All the City of Milaca has is in the Nuisance Standards (E) Glare and Heat. Any use requiring an operation producing an intense heat or light transmission shall be performed with the necessary shielding to prevent the heat or light from being objectionable at the lot line of the site on which the use is located. Lighting in all instances shall be diffused or directed away from R Districts and public streets.

Not much in ours.

Marshall Lind

City of Milaca

CAMBRIDGE

We don't specifically state anything about neon lighting in the gas canopy area of the code. We have a general statement in our "Prohibited Signs" section of the code that will hopefully address any complaints we receive about the lighting. So far, we have not received any complaints, but if we did, we would use the section below to have the business remove or reduce the lighting.

(D) *Prohibited signs.* The following signs are prohibited by this section:

(1) Signs that by reason of position, shape or color would interfere with the proper function of a traffic sign, signal or interfere with or are be misleading to vehicular traffic;

(2) Signs that by reason of illumination or brightness disturb the peace of any neighboring residential property.

Hopefully this helps. Good luck!

Marcia Westover

City Planner

City of Cambridge

300 3rd Ave. N.E.

Cambridge, MN 55008

Phone: 763-552-3207

Fax: 763-689-6801

E-mail: mwestover@ci.cambridge.mn.us

ZIMMERMAN

Sorry...nothing here either. Only language close prohibits flashing, moving, or animation on signs, but get this...it does NOT apply to commercial zoned property. Revision has been on my to-do list since about 1997.

Randy Piasecki

City Administrator

763.856.4666 x 24



MEMORANDUM

TAB G



TO: Princeton Planning Commission
FROM: Jolene Foss, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: **EDA UPDATE**
DATE: August 17th, 2015

- Rezoning request for 200 acres, Last step for DEED Shovel Ready Certification
 - Planning Commission Approved Aug 3rd, 2015
 - Intro to Council Aug 6th, 2015
 - Final Reading Aug 13th, 2015

- Great River Energy Data Center Site Assessment Program
- Discussion of upcoming Data Conferences
- DEED FAM (Familiarization) Tour September 14th – 15th 2015
 - East Central: Mille Lacs County, Mille Lacs Band, Isanti County, Chisago County, Pine City, North Branch, Mora, Milaca, Isanti, Cambridge, Princeton
 - Princeton is donating a pilot and jet fuel for our portion of the contribution
 - Contacted Jill Crandall/Crystal Cabinets for request to host lunch Tuesday noon-2pm.
 - North Metro: Anoka County, Sherburne County, Brooklyn Park, Blaine, Coon Rapids, Elk River, Princeton
 - Contacted Jill Crandall/Crystal Cabinets for request to host lunch Tuesday noon-2pm.

- Chamber Promotional Video
- SherBand-Partnering for Broadband Promotional Video

Mayor Paul Whitcomb called the meeting to order. Council members present were, Thom Walker, Dick Dobson, Jules Zimmer and Victoria Hallin. Staff present, Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Community Development Director Jolene Foss, Clerk Shawna Jenkins and Police Chief Todd Frederick.

Resolution 15-35 – Agreeing to CSAH no 29 Street Improvement Plans

Karnowski advised that the County needs City Council approval to proceed with the reconstruction of County State Aid Highway 29. They are going to resurface the road and fix the one problem intersection.

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 15-35 AGREEING TO THE RECONSTRUCTION OF COUNTY STATE AID HIGHWAY 29. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Walker asked if they are going to mill this off and lay it back down. Karnowski said that was his understanding.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Co-location discussion with School District

Karnowski reported since the June 25th Council meeting, Mayor Whitcomb, Council Member Walker and staff have had a few meetings with some of the Princeton School District officials to discuss the possibility of co-locating the School District's management staff with the city's management staff at City Hall.

The Council was advised that those conversations were going on at the June 4th Study Session.

At this point, it appears there's agreement that there is sufficient space at City Hall to house the School District's Administrative Staff. In order to make that happen, there would have to be significant remodeling of the eastern portion of the building. It would be anticipated that the School District's entrance would continue to be on the east side of the building with the City Hall entrance staying where it is.

The latest sketch of the proposed floor plan has been provided, but it is just a sketch and would need some significant final adjustments.

The School District's has also provided a very preliminary budget. It is noted that it's a conservative budget and the actual cost for the remodeling would probably be less than noted.

At this point, one of the items under discussion would be to agree to a lease rate (monthly cost per square foot) for the space the district would need. We would then draft a lease such that the final cost of the remodeling (which is deemed an enhancement of the city hall's value) would be divided by that lease rate and the district would then have a credit for that many months. The utility costs could be divided according to the square footage percentage each entity would occupy with the common areas being split by that same percentage as well.

Again, this is all very preliminary, but the Mayor and Councilman Walker want the balance of the Council to discuss the information we have at this point and then provide some feedback as the discussion continues.

They are looking at purchasing the old police department space to use as well. For whatever its worth, the superintendent suggested they would offer \$32,500 for the old police department. Zimmer asked if it the purchase of the old Police Department was contingent on the

lease agreement. Walker was under the impression was that it is not. If we can get \$32,500 and not have any additional fees associated with the purchase, he thinks that is something we can do.

Hallin asked how much square footage of office space is in the old police department. Staff was not sure on that, so they will report back to the Council.

Dobson asked if we would be able to use the back conference room on evenings if needed. Walker replied that yes, it can be used and there will be several doors to access that room.

Dobson asked for clarification that there will be an office for the building inspector. Karnowski responded there is an office for him in the preliminary sketch.

Zimmer asked if a set time frame could be written in the lease agreement and if it could be changed if needed. He said he does not want to back us in a corner. The employees currently have room to work now, but does not want to give that up and not be able to get it back.

Hallin asked if the garage is heated and insulated. Karnowski responded that it was, and that as he understands, the garage will be used for a gym for the kids.

Karnowski added that the Chamber has space in City Hall as well. Staff has been looking at doing something with them jointly in the future, so, if push came to shove, that space could be available as well.

Zimmer said he is not opposed to this, but he wants to make sure the employees are happy.

Zimmer asked if it would be an option to sell the entire building to the District and build a new City Hall. Karnowski said the District had inquired about purchasing the entire building, but they only have about \$100,000 for a purchase. Which of course would not build a new City Hall.

Karnowski and Walker stated that lease rates are between \$6-8 per square foot for prime rental rate. Zimmer asked how many years the lease would be no charge because of the renovation costs. Karnowski added that we have an obligation to our tax payers to charge a fair rate, and there are still a lot of details to hammer out. Walker stated that they are asking the Council if this should be looked at further or if the Council wanted to stop any further discussion and research. Whitcomb added that they are looking to see if we can move forward with having someone look at the site and determine which are load bearing walls, etc.

Foss asked if the remodeling will increase the value of City Hall.

Walker said the lease term would likely last about 20 years. If the city wanted to terminate the lease before the renovation costs were covered, we would likely need to buy back the amount spent.

Hallin added that the Electric, Water and Sewer rates will go up a large amount, so a fair way of splitting up the utilities would need to be determined.

Walker stated that he does not think the School District is planning on only remodeling the section they would be using.

Zimmer asked if the space we would have will be enough. Karnowski responded that we should go through a lot of the documents we keep and follow the retention schedule for those items. There are some things that can be disposed of according to the retention schedule. However, we do need to keep what we access on a regular basis upstairs.

Zimmer questioned if the remodeling is estimated to cost about \$417,000, why do they say they only have \$100,000 to purchase City Hall. Karnowski responded that he believes the funds they do have is a grant for remodeling an existing building. Walker added that the Police Department also needs extensive remodeling.

Hallin asked if both buildings are currently on separate electric meters. Jackson replied he is not sure where the exact separation is, but the Police and City Hall are currently on separate meters. If they were to share offices with us, where that separation is would probably need to be looked at.

Hallin said the electric would triple with the people they will be adding to the offices.

Dobson asked how disruptive this would be to city staff. Karnowski replied that when you take a look at the preliminary sketch, the only person moving would be the building inspector. Walker added that the maps and files would likely need to be moved temporarily.

Karnowski commented that Hallin had a good point with the electric usage. It may work better to use a number of employees' verses square footage to divide the utility costs. Walker suggested adding a meter to separate the City and School District so each would be on their own meter.

Hallin said she would like to get an appraisal on the old police department to determine its worth. Whitcomb added regardless of what an appraisal says, it is still only worth what someone wants to pay for it. Karnowski agreed and said that the cost of an appraisal would likely be a cost that we would not be able to recover at the sale. The county does appraisals on tax exempt buildings for their records, so we can find out an approximate number that they have on that space. Hallin said she is okay with that.

Walker stated that the Fire Station is much more desirable than the old police station and we are not getting many offers on that which is priced much lower than what the County has as an estimated market value.

Zimmer asked if the Council Chambers would be jointly used and how many meetings does the School Board have. Karnowski said many of the meetings the district have are smaller and would be held in the back conference room. The School Board meetings are on Tuesdays, so they should not interfere with City Meetings

Walker added that DeWitt brought up a few good points about developers meetings happening during the day and held privately, so a good calendar would need to be kept for a back conference room.

Zimmer questioned what would happen if we did need more space down the road. He would be more comfortable if there was a term added to the lease. Whitcomb mentioned the district is also working under the same issue if they were to need more space down the road.

Whitcomb said the option is there to pay them back for the balance if the City needed the entire building back.

Karnowski advised that he is not trying to push this, but he thinks it will work well. However, if the council isn't comfortable doing it, we can tell the school district we are not interested.

Zimmer is comfortable with the option, if we are in control. He does not think the remodeling cost is fair, as the City does not need remodeling done. Hallin likes the option of sharing the building for now, but her hope is that the City can eventually build a new City Hall, Public Works and Chamber building. Jackson responded that this may be a stepping stone towards that. Hallin said we may have more tax base in 20 years, so a new City Hall may be affordable at some point in the future.

Walker said if we are thinking in terms of needing more space for employees, the School District may need that sooner than the City and want to terminate the lease.

Karnowski agreed and said if we get to the point where we need to add additional staff, the school district would likely need to add staff as well. He thinks it would be a good idea to have something in the agreement that addresses that issue. It is better to work out the possible issues now and address them in the lease agreement.

Walker commented that he understands where everyone is coming from, but unless the City population doubled, we would probably not need additional space.

Karnowski stated that having both the City and School District in the same building may allow some collaboration. For example, if they have an HR person and we needed some help in an HR matter, we could possibly utilize that person if needed. Maybe there are some other staff that could be shared as well. Frederick mentioned IT and stated that the system they would be bringing to the Council Chambers would also be beneficial to the City meetings.

Zimmer added he wanted everyone to be clear that he is not against a shared office, but he is just trying to foresee any possible issues that may occur in the future.

Hallin does not agree with the cost of remodeling covering the lease fees until balanced, as the City does not need the space remodeled.

Walker said the Heating and Cooling could stay the same as they are now as that is calculated more by space, but would like to see the electric be metered separately.

Zimmer asked what the next phase would be if the council agreed to move forward. Karnowski said staff now has some ideas about how the Council feels about this option, so a lease can be started on.

Whitcomb said it wouldn't be a bad idea to take Zimmer's suggestion and have a review in 10 years.

Karnowski stated they have not crunched the numbers yet, so staff does not yet know how long the lease would be before the remodeling cost was paid.

Dobson commented that at this point, discussion isn't costing anything. Whitcomb added the school district is under a time crunch, so they need to know soon. Walker said their time line would probably look at construction over the winter.

Dobson said drafting a contract still won't cost much. Whitcomb liked Walker's idea on basic bullet points for the School District as a start to see if they can live with the base requirements.

Karnowski questioned if the Council was okay with the \$32,500 offer on the old Police Station. Jackson felt the offer should be a little higher. Hallin stated she would like to check with the county first before putting a number on it. Walker said we are trying to give them something in terms of office space in City Hall, so he feels they could pay a slightly higher amount for the old Police Department.

Karnowski replied that he will check with the County Assessor's Office and staff will come up with a number.

Walker asked what some of the bullet points may be. Some sort of exit strategy? Time frame? Whitcomb and Hallin said they are in favor of a review in 10 years.

Zimmer suggested running it past the attorney first. Karnowski replied that his plan was to write a rough draft, then run it past the Attorney to see if it would work. An exit strategy will need some thought, as he does not know of anyone else who has done something similar. Zimmer thought the League of MN Cities may be able to provide some assistance as well. Karnowski added that emailing the Administrator's and Clerk's List Serve is also an option.

Walker quickly ran the numbers and at even \$4 a square foot, the rent vs remodeling would be covered in just 4-5 years.

Zimmer said one of the bullet points should be the sale of the old Police Dept.

Walker added that if the payback is in a shorter time frame, the lease could be revisited after that amount is covered. What is looked at in the review would need to be determined.

Karnowski will put something together and he hopes to have something in rough draft for the meeting next week.

Jackson added that we need to keep in mind that what the County's idea of a value is going to be very different than what the actual value is.

Whitcomb asked if staff will run the suggested bullet points by the School district as well. Karnowski responded that he will review what was discussed with Julia Espe and let her know some of the suggestions that were brought up.

DOBSON MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 5:39PM. HALLIN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk

ATTEST:

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON
JULY 9, 2015 7:00 P.M. IN THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Mayor Paul Whitcomb called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Council members present were, Thom Walker, Dick Dobson, Victoria Hallin and Jules Zimmer. Staff present, Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Community Development Director Jolene Foss, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Fire Chief Jim Roxbury, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Attorneys Damien Toven and Kelli Bourgeois, and Engineer Mike Nielson.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

None

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

- A. Regular Meeting Minutes of June 25, 2015
- B. Study Session Minutes of July 2, 2015

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 25, 2015 AND THE STUDY SESSION MINUTES OF JULY 2, 2015. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses

- 1. Gambling Permit for Immanuel Lutheran – October Raffle
- 2. Carson and Barnes Circus – July event

C. Donations/Designations

- 1. Resolution 15-37 accepting donations to the Fire Department
- 2. Resolution 15-38 – accepting donations for the Princeton Fireworks

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

OPEN FORUM

PUBLIC HEARING

- A. Resolution 15-36 – hearing to consent to the sale of Fairview Hospital Bonds

Karnowski reported that Fairview is requesting approval to sell Hospital Bonds. The Council has also gone through this process for the Elim Home in the past.

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 15-36, APPROVING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS BY THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS ON BEHALF OF FAIRVIEW HEALTH SERVICES. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

- A. Planning Commission Minutes of June 15, 2015
- B. EDA Minutes of June 18, 2015

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Princeton Fireworks donation

Karnowski stated we received a letter requesting a donation for Fireworks that had been misplaced. In the past the City has contributed \$1,000 towards Fireworks, and this request is to do the same this year.

DOBSON MOVED TO APPROVE A \$1,000 DONATION FOR THE PRINCETON FIREWORKS. HALLIN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. City Hall / School Co-Location Update

Karnowski advised that at the July 3rd Study Session, the full City Council discussed the proposal to co-locate the School District management staff in the Princeton City Hall building.

Generally, the conversation was very favorable to the idea, but there were some concerns expressed regarding the cost/benefit to the city. The City Council asked that staff put together a 'bullet point' memo on some of the criteria suggested by the Council. Those points include:

1. **Utilities:** It was noted that while the HVAC cost and Sewer/Water for a building remains pretty much constant regardless of the number of people in the building so splitting that cost on the square footage basis outlined below seems reasonable to the City Council. But the cost of electricity can vary significantly because of personal computer usage, photocopying, etc. Accordingly, the City Council suggests that as part of the remodeling project, the electrical wiring be split and a second meter be added that would measure each entities electrical use. Each entity would be responsible for their own electric bill. The HVAC and S&W cost would be split according to the square footage calculation:

Total City Hall building: 5,040
Dedicated to City & Chamber: 1,520 (45.2% of unshared space)
Dedicated to School District: 1,840 (54.8% of unshared space)
Shared space: 1,680 (split 45.2%/54.8%)
Total City & Chamber: Dedicated space: 1,520
Shared space: 759 (45.2% of shared space)
2,279 ft² (45.2%)

Total School District: Dedicated space: 1,840
Shared space: 921 (54.8% of shared space)
2,761 ft² (54.8%)

(Note: the numbers above could change depending on final space alignment)

2. **Lease Rate:** The city acknowledges that city hall space is not 'prime'. So we believe the lease rate be based on a monthly lease rate of \$2/ft².

The School District suggested that the District's cost to remodel the City Hall building such that it will accommodate both the City Hall Staff and the School

District Administrative Staff be addressed by giving the District credit against the proposed lease for the money the District spends on remodeling. The City Council agreed to that concept. Given the District's consultant's space split (outlined under #1 above), the monthly lease rate for the District would be \$5,552. At that rate, the lease credit means the district would occupy the 2,761 ft² for a total of 76 months (\$417,000/\$5,522) or 6+ years

3. **Lease Duration:** The proposed lease would be for seven years at the rate agreed to above. After 7 years the lease would be subject to renegotiations with the understanding that the default position of the city would be to extend the lease at least another 7 years at a rate agreed to at the end of the first seven years.

Purchase of former Police Department Space: The District tendered a verbal offer of \$32,500 for the old police department building and the adjacent heated garage. The city acknowledges that space has some cosmetic issues that would need to be addressed by a new owner but that the roof was recently replaced and, structurally, the building is in good shape. The County Assessor's Office places the value of that building at \$148,500 for the office portion of the old police building and \$21,000 for the garage portion of the building or \$169,500 for both (not including the land under it). It's the city's experience that the Assessor's Office values are often significantly higher than what, historically, the results of an arm's length sale turns out to be. That being the case, the city's counter offer to the District's \$32,500 would be \$50,000.

4. **Parking:** It should be noted that when the city purchased the current city hall/police department property, the purchase included all of the parking area located north of the District's building. It's the city's intention that the city hall co-location lease and/or purchase of the former police building include an accommodation for a portion of the parking lot (amount to be determined).
5. **Storage:** The city would agree to provide a storage area in the City Hall basement for use by the District. The exact amount of space would be subject to negotiations.

Karnowski added that he spoke to School District Superintendent Julia Espe this afternoon and she stated they said they have reviewed the memo and stated it seems like a good proposal. If there are no changes the Council would like to see, this will go to the school board next week at a special meeting.

Dobson said it includes all the points we discussed. Hallin said she likes the inclusion of the \$50,000 cost for the old police department.

Zimmer asked why the 10 year review suggestion was not added. Karnowski said when he calculated the lease rate and the estimated cost of the repair it would work out to be about 6 or 7 years, so thought it would be a good time to review it.

Walker asked if they were fairly receptive about price of \$50,000 for the police dept. Karnowski said Espe did not seem to have an issue with anything that had been highlighted in the memo.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE STAFF TO CONTINUE MOVING FORWARD ON THIS WITH THE SCHOOL DISTRICT. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. West Branch Project Change Order #2

Nielson reported that the contractor began the pavement reclamation on 3rd Street N and West Branch Street. Unfortunately the bituminous material was predominately seal coat and will not be re-useable as an aggregate base for the street as anticipated.

He is recommending that the quantity of Class 5 Aggregate Base from the 900 cubic yards to 2458 cubic yards to replace the reclaimed material that was anticipated for re-use. This will provide a 6" class 5 base.

The additional 1558 cubic yards of Class 5 Aggregate Base at the unit price of \$24.00/CY will increase the project cost by \$37,392.00.

At a cost saving measure, 3rd Street North could be narrowed from 48' to 38' from the West edge of the Hy-Tech Tire Building to 7th Ave. North or approximately 500'. The 38' width would still allow parking on both sides of the street. By narrowing the road by 10', we could reduce the project cost by approximately \$9,392.00. If the Council would chose to narrow 3rd Street N. the total estimated project overrun would be approximately \$28,000.

In addition when bituminous calculations are done, typically a 10% contingency is added to allow for possible overruns caused by variability in pavement thickness. This amounts to \$21,000 if there are no overruns in planned quantities.

Nielson said his recommendation is to approve Change Order #2 for the additional Class 5 Aggregate Base in the amount of \$37,392.00 and discuss the narrowing of 3rd Street North by 10' with the adjacent property owners. This decision could not have to be made for at least 3 to 4 weeks.

Nielson said since that is his mistake, and there is any additional costs, they will deduct that cost from the engineering fees.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE CHANGE ORDER #2 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$37,392.00. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

A. Elim Fest Event Request

Karnowski advised that the Elim Care and Rehab Center is going to hold their 29th Annual Elim Fest on Sunday, August 16th. They would like the ability to close off 8th Ave from about 11am to around 8pm. As they have done in the past, they will gladly keep a path open on the north side of the street for Ambulance and other emergency vehicle access.

Hallin asked what time the event was. Dobson said they usually need a little set up time, so he would estimate the event likely starts at noon.

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE CLOSURE OF 8TH AVE FROM 11AM TO 8PM ON SUNDAY AUGUST 16TH. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. 8TH Avenue South Drainage improvements

Nielson advised that residents along 8th Avenue S between the High School and 6th Street S have filed a petition for storm water drainage improvements. Currently there is a low spot in the roadway at the home of Chris Caskey where water ponds during rain events. During larger rain events the water backs up into his driveway and threatens his home and garage.

A map was created from the Drainage GIS mapping available and shows the drainage basins discharging to the area. The existing storm sewer is shown as well. The actual low spot indicates an elevation of 975.00. Record drawing information is not available for this storm sewer system and therefore survey information will be required to evaluate options for solving this situation.

In addition, drainage improvements have been made to the school parking lot directly to the west of 6th Avenue S. The record drawing information for these improvements is not available, but the general location of the storm sewer piping is shown. Discussion with the school engineer creating plans for the proposed high school gymnasium addition improvements have indicated that the elementary school and parking area will be removed when the new elementary school is opened on the north end.

At this time, he said he believes there are 3 potential solutions to this drainage problem as follows;

1. Regrade the roadway to drain north to the existing catch basins on 6th Avenue.
2. Install a drain pipe on the east side of 6th Street to the existing catch basins on 6th Avenue.
3. Install catch basins at the low point of the roadway and connect to the school drainage system located in the parking lot.

The petitioners have acknowledged that these improvements may result in assessments to their parcels. To complete these improvements as an assessment project a feasibility report and public hearing must be completed prior to ordering the improvements.

WSB is proposing to complete a feasibility report and prepare a preliminary assessment roll in accordance with the State Statute Section 429.

If the project moves forward, meeting with the affected property owners, a public hearing and assessment hearing will be required. The costs to provide these services are estimated at \$6,000 and would be included in the final design costs.

Due to the pending site changes proposed by the school, he said he would recommend meeting with the petitioners to see if they would be willing to wait until the school changes are completed in 2017 to see if the reduction in impervious area will reduce their flooding potential. This option would eliminate any cost to the petitioners.

At this time staff is looking for direction on meeting with the petitioners to discuss postponing any improvements or moving forward with these drainage improvements and authorization of the attached resolution to complete a collect all available data, prepare a feasibility study and prepare a preliminary assessment roll at an estimated cost of \$5,520.

At this point he does not recommend approving a feasibility study, as the cost of the study may exceed the cost of the repairs. He would like to talk to the residents and the school to try to work with them.

Nielson will call the residents that petitioned for the drainage repair to discuss options.

WALKER MOVED TO TABLE RESOLUTION 15-39 AUTHORIZING A FEASIBILITY STUDY BE DONE 8TH AVENUE SOUTH DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS. HALLIN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Paint Striper Purchase

Gerold advised that the departments Paint Striper is becoming cost prohibitive to use and repair.

Public Works is asking for permission to purchase a new Graco Paint Striper, not to exceed \$3,500. The truck recently purchased was less than what was budgeted for in the CIP, so staff would like to use those remaining funds to cover the cost of this Paint Striper.

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF THE GRACO PAINT STRIPER, NOT TO EXCEED \$3,500 AND TO DISPOSE OF THE CURRENT ONE AT AUCTION. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Fire Department Vehicle Purchase

Karnowski reported that Chief Roxbury advises that the PFRD truck committee is recommending that the city replace the Fire Chief's vehicle (a 2006 retired Princeton PD squad with 130,000 miles) with a 2011 Tahoe that the Blaine PD is taking out of service.

The Tahoe in question is has 90,000 miles on it. The 2-wheel drive vehicle would come with the lights, siren package etc left on it. The truck committee has evaluated the unit and review the maintenance records and recommends to purchase. The cost of the unit is \$10,000. It is almost identical to the Tahoe the Princeton PD has that is used as our K-9 unit.

The Fire Advisory Board reviewed the proposed purchase at their July meeting earlier this week and voted unanimously to recommend the Council approve the purchase.

Roxbury suggests that the funding would come from the fire department truck and equipment fund.

If the Council concurs with the recommendation of the truck committee and the Fire Advisory Board, a motion to purchase the 2011 Tahoe from the Blaine PD for use as a PFRD Chief's Vehicle and declare the old Chief's Vehicle to be surplus and authorize its sale at auction would be in order.

Dobson asked if the radio in the current vehicle can be used in the new one. Roxbury replied that he is hoping that the old one sells for enough to cover the cost to transfer the radios and graphics. Whitcomb added that even if it does not, there are enough funds in the truck and equipment fund to cover those costs.

DOBSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF THE 2011 TAHOE FROM BLAINE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSITION OF THE OLD CHIEF'S VEHICLE AT AUCTION. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MISCELLANEOUS

Karnowski reported that the Civic Center open house is on August 12th, so the planning should get started. He has talked with the Legion as well about some preliminary ideas.

BILL LIST

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE BILL LIST WHICH INCLUDES THE MANUAL CHECKS AS LISTED ON THE MANUAL BILL LIST FOR A TOTAL OF \$188,007.62 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 72079 TO 72158 FOR A TOTAL OF \$674,705.14. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business:

HALLIN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:22PM. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk

ATTEST:

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON
JULY 23, 2015 7:00 P.M. IN THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Mayor Paul Whitcomb called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Council members present were, Thom Walker, Dick Dobson, and Jules Zimmer. Staff present, Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Community Development Director Jolene Foss, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Fire Chief Jim Roxbury, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Attorney Damien Toven, and Engineer Mike Nielson. Absent was Victoria Hallin.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

None

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

- A. Regular Meeting Minutes of July 9, 2015

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 9, 2015. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses

1. Gambling Permit for Princeton Lion's – October Raffle
2. Transient Merchant License for Southwestern Advantage – Adrien Michel Kulatre

B. Personnel

1. Amanda Oehman Resignation effective July 21, 2015

C. Donations/Designations

1. Resolution 15-42 accepting donation to the Fire Department

D. Other

1. Renewal of Mutual Aid Agreement with the City of Isanti

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Special order of business – Kvisto Recognition

Chief Fredrick and Officer Cederberg recognized Kvisto Veterinary Clinic for being partners in the Princeton Police K9 Program. They have provided excellent care to Skar since he has been with the City.

OPEN FORUM

REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

- A. Fire Advisory Minutes of July 7, 2015
- B. PAVC Minutes of June 8, 2015
- C. PAVC Minutes of July 13, 2015

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Mama Grace's Pregnancy Shop First Street Closure Request

Foss reported that Faith Goenner, Owner of Mama Gracie's Pregnancy Shop, is requesting a street closure on September 7th, 2015 from 10am until 3pm. The Grand Opening Event is scheduled that day and Ms. Goenner would like to barricade 1st Street in front of her store.

She will be inviting a food truck to be set up there. She is planning to set up tables, a kid's area and a space to watch demonstrations and Meet the Experts

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE CLOSING OF FIRST STREET IN FRONT OF HER STORE ON SEPTEMBER 7 FROM 10AM TO 3PM. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Whitcomb asked if she has informed the surrounding businesses. Goenner responded that she was waiting for approval from the council before letting everyone know.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Greater Life Tabernacle Riverside Park Event on August 15

Karnowski advised that the Greater Life Tabernacle will be hosting their fourth annual back to school and Celebration of Jesus Party at Riverside Park from 11am to 3pm. They expect to have a kids program, kid's games, balloons, live music and a lunch will be served. They will also be distributing free bread and local establishments are contributing prizes for drawings and backpacks filled with school supplies will be given away.

C. Fairview Northland 5k Run September 19, 2015

Karnowski reported that this event was held last year with the same route.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE FAIRVIEW'S 5K RUN ROUTE FOR SEPTEMBER 19. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

A. Resolution 15-39 – Accept 7th Ave Feasibility Report and call for hearing

Nielson reported that the project is a proposed utility extension that involves the construction of 4 – inch and 8 – inch sanitary sewer and a 12 – inch watermain. The extended sewer would benefit 8 homes on the West side of 7th Ave North as well as the School.

This proposed schedule is aggressive, with the construction to be estimated to begin in September, with substantial completion in November 2015. Final completion including the final court of bituminous pavement is June 2016. If the Council wanted the project done this year, the assessment hearing may need to be held after the project. However, the School would be okay with the project happening next year.

The PUC cost share would reduce the overall assessable cost for the project to \$383,590.00

Whitcomb asked if this would affect the school buses in the fall. Nielson responded in that case, it would likely be better to wait until next year when school was out for the summer.

Karnowski commented that if his memory serves him correctly, when Shady Acres was looked at, looping the water was desired. This project will shorten that long route by about 2/3.

Nielson said there are always properties with very old septic systems and some that are pretty new, so those with newer septic systems should be discussed as to how that will be handled.

Walker said he would like to see some sort of deferral mechanism. Dobson agreed. Walker asked if the septic is usually in the back of the house. Whitcomb said if he recalls, several of the homes had asked about water and sewer several years ago, but the cost was too much.

Dobson said they had a PUC meeting Wednesday and they would be willing to discuss ideas to make things easier on the homeowners.

MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 15-39 ACCEPTING THE 7TH AVENUE FEASIBILITY REPORT AND CALLING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Resolution 15-40 – Accept Northland Drive feasibility report and call for hearing

Nielson advised resurfacing of northland drive from rum river to just past the hospital

Dobson asked how it will affect traffic into the businesses. Neilson said genuinely, mill and overlay usually takes just 2 days. Mark added it is usually done around traffic.

Walker said eventually, this would be covered in our street CIP fund.

MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 15-40 ACCEPTING THE NORTHLAND DRIVE FEASIBILITY REPORT AND CALLING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Resolution 15-41 – Airport Grant Acceptance
a. Resolution 15-42 – award 2015 Crack Sealing for Airport

Karnowski advised that the FAA Grant decided to fund the grant. It is a 90-10 grant. Mark said the main runway has developed some cracks that need to be repaired. One of the issues is the high ground water table and that we keep it plowed so the frost goes deeper, causing a few issues which requires crack sealing more often

MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 15-41 ACCEPTING THE AIRPORT GRANT. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 15-43 AWARDING THE 2015 AIRPORT CRACK SEALING TO STRUCK AND IRWIN PAVING INC, NOT TO EXCEED. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Main Street Lift Station bid results

Karnowski advised that the city only received one bid for the main lift station rehab project (to be covered by USDA-Rural Grant funding).

Although, there were nine plan holders, only one bid was received, that of LS Black Constructors, Inc. Their bid of \$686,000 was substantially over the engineer's estimate of \$448,600.

The engineer contacted two of the plan holders that he expected to submit a bid to inquire why they didn't bid. They both had the same response that they were simply too busy to meet the specified completion dates of January 31, 2016 for substantial completion and May 31, 2016 for final completion.

He suspects that if he called more of the plan holders, he would hear the same thing.

In addition to the bid price, there will be \$54,578.14 in additional project costs increasing the construction cost of the project to \$740,578.14.

We understand there is approximately \$500,000 in grant money available for construction which would leave a shortfall of approximately \$250,000 if the project were awarded to L S Black.

The engineer has contacted USDA and requested an extension of the grant availability. The local USDA office is checking to see if that's an option.

Accordingly, the recommendation is for the Council to adopt a motion rejecting the lone bid if the city is advised that it can still access the USDA grant funding next year and re-bid the project for spring construction.

It is the engineer's belief is that lower, more affordable bids would be received if we did so.

The recommendation at this time is to have the council reject the bid as submitted, unless it could be negotiated to a lesser rate. He has drafted a letter to the USDA requesting an extension. If that is granted the plan would be to rebid the project in the winter, for a spring project.

Nielson asked if it would be better to table the bid instead of rejecting. He said he talked to the contractor today, and he just hasn't had time to look into it further. He can tell the contractor that unless

Mark added in talking to Roshar, since that station was put in, the electrical code has greatly changed. Tom is looking if since we are rehabbing and not putting in new, so that may cut the costs down.

Walker asked if it is on its last legs now. Bob said there are some issues, but him and Chris have been working through some of those issues.

Nielson said new electrical code requires a separate building, which increases the cost greatly.

MOVED TO TABLE THE LOAN BID UNLESS IT CAN BE NEGOTIATED TO AN AFFORDABLE PRICE. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

A. Police Sergeant vacancy

Karnowski advised that the City has received a letter of resignation from Sergeant Joe Backlund who, Monday night, accepted the Chief of Police position with the city of Hawley. Backlund has

served the citizens of Princeton admirably for 19 years and will be sorely missed by all who worked with him or knew him.

Chief Fredericks is advising that there are several current Princeton Police Officers who the Chief feels have the necessary training, background and experience to serve the Department as Sergeant. He is, therefore, recommending that the City Council authorize an internal posting for the position of Sergeant and, concurrently, advertise for a new police officer.

As we approach the coming school year, the city needs to quickly get our police department fully staffed.

If the council concurs with the recommendation of Police Chief Frederick, then the Council should:

1. Adopt a motion to accept Sergeant Backlund's resignation, and THOM, DICK UNAN Dick, happy to see Backlund be able to further his law enforcement career.
2. Adopt a motion authorizing an internal posting for the Police Sergeant vacancy, and
3. Adopt a motion authorizing the PD to advertise to fill the anticipated Police Officer vacancy once a new Sergeant is appointed. THOM, JULES

MOVED TO ACCEPT SERGEANT BACKLUND'S RESIGNATION, AUTHORIZE AN INTERNAL POSTING FOR THE SERGEANT VACANCY AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO ADVERTISE FOR THE ANTICIPATED POLICE OFFICER VACANCY ONCE A NEW SERGEANT IS APPOINTED. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Lot split at 707 10th Street North

FYI – no motion needed

C. Conditional Use Permit for Princeton High School Addition and Renovation

Foss FYI – no motion needed

Walker asked if the portables will be gone. Ryan said they will be gone by the time construction is done. Walker asked if there would be any issues with emergency exits. Ryan said they will work through

MISCELLANEOUS

BILL LIST

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE BILL LIST WHICH INCLUDES THE MANUAL CHECKS AS LISTED ON THE MANUAL BILL LIST FOR A TOTAL OF \$122,680.88 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 72162 TO 72221 FOR A TOTAL OF \$245,020.70. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business:

MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT PM. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk

ATTEST:

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor

draft