THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON FEBRUARY 26TH, 2018, AT 7:00 P.M.,
AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Victoria Hallin. Members present were Dan Erickson, Jeff Reynolds, Eldon Johnson, and Scott Moller. Staff present were Robert Barbian (Administrator) and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assistant).

OATH OF OFFICE:
Eldon Johnson and Scott Moller took the Oath of Office.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:
JOHNSON NOMINATED DAN ERICKSON FOR PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR. JOHNSON MOVED, HALLIN SECOND, TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS. UPON THE VOTE FOR DAN ERICKSON FOR PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

REYNOLDS NOMINATED VICTORIA HALLIN FOR PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIR. REYNOLDS MOVED, JOHNSON SECOND, TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS. UPON THE VOTE FOR VICTORIA HALLIN FOR PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIR, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

HALLIN NOMINATED JEFF REYNOLDS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY. HALLIN MOVED, ERIKSON SECOND, TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS. UPON THE VOTE FOR JEFF REYNOLDS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON DECEMBER 18, 2017
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 18, 2017. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:
There were no additions or deletions.

PUBLIC HEARING:
A. #18-01 Preliminary & Final Plat for Pondview Estates 2nd Addition
Community Development Assistant Memo:

REQUEST
AX Holding Co., on behalf of Tim Smith, has submitted the Pondview Estates Second Addition Preliminary and Final Plat applications for review. The plat involves the creation of ten (10) twin home lots from the platted twelve (12) townhome lots as currently described as Pondview Estates Addition, Block 1, Lots 5 thru 16. See attachment.

BACKGROUND
The subject property is located west of Rum River Drive North and north of 15th Street North.
The site is in Pondview Estates Addition that was platted in 2001 with R-3 Multiple Residential Zoning. This plat is a high density townhouse area with a mix of twin homes.

ANALYSIS
Pondview Estates Second Addition proposes Lots 1-10, Block 1, on what is currently known as Pondview Estates, Lots 5-16, which is located on the southwest corner of the Pondview Estates plat, on the west side of 16th Avenue North.

The subdivision does not meet the requirements for a Short Plat by our Subdivision Ordinance standards, and so it must follow the Preliminary and Final Plat procedures. The preliminary plat must be reviewed and approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council. The necessary public hearing notices have been sent to property owners 350 feet from the site.

ZONING
Lot Size & Width: The minimum lot area is 6,000 square feet for twin home lots, and the minimum lot width is 40 feet; both requirements are met with the proposed lots.

Landscaping: Sodding or seeding must be completed prior to issuing a temporary certificate of occupancy. If because of weather conditions sodding and/or seeding is unadvisable, a temporary certificate of occupancy may be issued subject to an escrow deposit to assure compliance by no later than July 1st of the following year.

Other Regulations: The proposed twinhomes shall meet all regulations, including setbacks, height, type, minimum floor area, driveway etc. If the driveways are not finished, and the builder is requesting a Certificate of Occupancy, an escrow will be required.

Vacation of Easement: The Pondview Estates original plat has drainage & utility easements that will need to be vacated. The applicant has submitted a vacation application and the City Council will call for a public hearing for the vacation request at their February 22nd meeting. The Council will hold the public hearing on March 8th.

If the Planning Commission approves the Preliminary and Final Plat, the Commission can make the recommendation for approval to the City Council contingent upon City Council vacation of easements is approved.

ENGINEER COMMENTS
Based on the proposed re-platting, modifications to existing infrastructure will be required as follows:
1. The existing hydrant shown adjacent to Lot 7, Block 1, will need to be relocated to the lot line between Lots 8 and 9, Block 1.
2. There are twelve (12) existing sanitary sewer and water services that were installed for the original lot configuration. From the south, the sixth and tenth water service will need to be
removed to the corporation stop at the watermain. The excavation for the removal of the
tenth water service from the south will coincide with the above-noted hydrant relocation.
3. An engineering plan, details and specifications signed by a licensed engineer should be
provided to detail the above-noted utility system modifications.

CONCLUSION
If the recommended conditions are met, the Preliminary Plat and Final Plat meet the Zoning
and Subdivision Ordinance standards, therefore, staff recommends the Planning Commission
recommend approval to the City Council of the Preliminary and Final Plat, subject to:

1) Applicant shall address the City Engineer’s three comments outlined above.
2) The City Council approve the vacation of easements.
3) All necessary building permit applications need to be submitted and approved by the
Building Inspector prior to building.
4) A Digging Permit and $2,000 deposit will be required prior to each street excavation for the
two water service removals and relocation of the hydrant.

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

Tim Smith, applicant said they bought the 12 lots that were forfeited. They were originally
platted for townhomes and he would like to build twin homes. The plat would have to be
changed to meet the Ordinance requirements for setbacks so the new plat will be reduced by
two units.

There were no other questions from those present.

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

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO APPROVE ITEM #18-01 PRELIMINARY & FINAL PLAT
FOR PONDVIEW ESTATES SECOND ADDITION AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE
FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
1) APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS THE CITY ENGINEER’S THREE COMMENTS OUTLINED IN HIS
MEMO.
2) THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE VACATION OF EASEMENTS.
3) ALL NECESSARY BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS NEED TO BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED
BY THE BUILDING INSPECTOR PRIOR TO BUILDING.
4) A DIGGING PERMIT AND $2,000 DEPOSIT WILL BE REQUIRED PRIOR TO EACH STREET
EXCAVATION FOR THE TWO WATER SERVICE REMOVALS AND RELOCATION OF THE HYDRANT.
UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.
B. #18-02 Antenna Tower Overlay Zoning District and Conditional Use Permit to allow a City Cell Tower & Building in B-1 District in City Public Parking Lot

Robert Barbian, Administrator Memo:

REQUEST
The City of Princeton Administration is requesting an Antenna Overlay Zoning District to be located in the B-1 Central Business District; the granting of a Conditional Use Permit, for the installation of communications equipment consisting of a cell tower and equipment building; and the granting of variances to the minimum lot size, setback, and fencing requirements to allow for establishment of the tower and equipment building.

The use is proposed to be on the east side of the city owned public parking lot. Depending upon the final design 3-5 parking spaces will be repurposed. The site is located west of 6th Avenue North and a block north of First Street. The paved parking lot is 13,939 square feet.

BACKGROUND
The City of Princeton has been considering the placement of a tower to improve communication capabilities in the Princeton area for a number of years. The primary reason for this consideration is to improve public safety communications. The City has a deficiency in emergency communications for public safety, see attached letters from Todd Frederick, Police Chief and Ron Lawrence, Fire Chief.

The tower will also serve the communication needs of the public works, public utilities, and SCADA related data transmissions. In July of 2017 the City Council considered establishing a partnership with the Mille Lacs County Sheriff Department to build a tower. The site being considered was the Public Safety Building. The effort failed in July primarily due to excessive costs. Shortly after that time it was also determined that the Public Safety building site was not able to accommodate the necessary height due to Federal Aviation Administration regulations.

Improving the Emergency Communications capabilities is currently a concern both locally and regionally. Locating a suitable site for the tower was continued by previous City staff.

The preliminary tower height is 190’ monopole with an equipment building designed to be approximately 20’ x 25’ meeting downtown architectural code. The building may be phased.

ANALYSIS
The Antenna Tower Overlay District (ST) is an overlay zoning district; land zoned into the AT also maintains its original zoning classification. All permitted accessory and conditional uses allowed in the underlying zoning district will continue to be allowed on land rezoned to AT, subject to all restrictions and requirements applicable in the underlying district. In addition to the uses allowed in the underlying district, the following uses shall be allowed as a conditional use in AT:
Antenna arrays, including radio, television, commercial wireless telecommunication, microwave transmitting and receiving equipment, supporting towers, buildings, and enclosures accessory to the tower and antennas.

No new commercial wireless telecommunication service tower shall be approved unless it can reasonably be documented by the applicant that the telecommunications equipment planned for the proposed tower cannot be accommodated on an existing or approved tower or building within a one mile radius.

Staff has researched the possibility of using water towers, other buildings, and sites, but in order to accommodate emergency government, utilities, public works and be in a position to co-locate additional private sector users the type of communications tower needs to be on its own site. In review of various sites prioritizing the communication needs if a tower with site size, surrounding compatibility, available of utilities, ownership and to limited extent costs the 6th Avenue North parking lot ranks high.

In the B-1 Central Business District public buildings and facilities are an allowed use with a conditional use permit. The communications tower and accessory building will be owned by the City of Princeton.

**VARIANCE REQUEST**

The variances requested to allow for the installation of the tower and building in the Antenna Tower Overlay District are: a variance to the minimum lot size to allow the tower and accessory building to be located on a 13,939 square foot site which is under the minimum one acre lot size; allowing a 0’ setback, and removing the required 8’ foot chain link fence requirement in lieu of other safety measures around the antenna and supporting equipment.

The AT Overlay District Design Standards requires the minimum lot size of one acre. The City is requesting the tower be allowed on 13,939 square foot parcel of land located on a paved City parking lot. This location is one of the largest clear sites and will provide ultimate frequency for public safety communications. Note it is problematic to locate a tower in a flood plain.

The requirement for the antenna tower setback is established within the AT Overlay District as the height of the tower from property lines is to accommodate tower failure. Since the writing of this ordinance a number of tower construction standards have changed. Design engineering enables a collapse of a tower to be within the structure itself allowing for a decreased fall zone. The tower setback will be established to ensure a clear fall zone of all existing structures.

Tower designs have changed making it anti-climb. This can be done through a combination of techniques which will be worked into the final design allowing for a more condensed area of placing a structure in an urban setting. The City is also planning to put in place a design that is able to aesthetically blend into the downtown.
**Variance Review Standards:** According to Section 2 of Chapter IV of the Zoning Ordinance, request may be made for variances from the literal provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in instances when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the Zoning Ordinance. A variance shall not be granting by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:

1. **Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance?**  
   **Comment:** The purpose of the ordinance is to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare through various means such as regulating the location, height, and bulk of the buildings and other structures. The proposed antenna tower will be for the public safety and welfare for the entire community to address public safety communications. The tower and building will be designed to meet the architectural standards and blend in as well as they can with neighboring properties.

2. **Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?**  
   **Comment:** The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to protect the best interests of the surrounding area or the City as a whole. The antenna tower is necessary for the emergency responders to communicate inside public buildings.

3. **Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?**  
   **Comment:** The proposed use of the property is reasonable and allowed by the Ordinance. It is the property size, setback, and 8’ foot fence requirements that are difficult to be met due to frequency coverage, improved design standards, and aesthetics.

4. **Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?**  
   **Comment:** Yes, the site is currently used as a public parking lot and will be continued in that use. Approximately 3 – 4 spaces will be used. The City has analyzed sites throughout the City and this site is the best suited for a tower that provides adequate coverage for public safety and best fits in with the neighboring land uses.

5. **Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?**  
   **Comment:** The issuance of the variance will maintain the essential character of the locality with the design of the structures. The tower is a monopole design with as minimal a footprint as possible and the accessory building will be built in conformance with existing architectural standards.

6. **Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?**  
   **Comment:** Yes, the proposed antenna tower is to improve the communication issues for the emergency responders.
CONCLUSION/Recommendation:
The Planning Commission is to consider the three applications for:
1. The zoning request to establish an Antenna Overlay District,
2. Conditional Use Permit allowing a communications tower and accessory building in the B-1 Central Business District, and
3. Variances to the minimum lot size, setback, and 8 foot fencing requirements.

The Planning Commission will want to have three separate motions for each of the items.

The Planning Commission determines the issuance or denial of the Conditional Use and the Variance and informs the Council.

The Planning Commission is to make a recommendation on the zoning request with the City Council making the final determination.

Findings of Facts for the Variance have been provided.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Barbian said the request is to create an Antenna Tower Overlay Zoning District in a City owned public parking lot. The tower would accommodate emergency needs and serves four needs in one tower. You will not be able to tell that there will be three or four antennas on the tower. The base will be 3’ x 3’. We will not have a fence around it. These towers are made where they are anti-climb. It will save space without having a fence. We plan to make it as aesthetically pleasing to the surrounding area as possible. Barbian showed some examples on the overhead project where the building was made out of brick and landscaped. The equipment building would be approximately 20’ x 25’ with zero setback. He is not sure if it would have a flat roof or pitched. It would take about 3-5 parking spaces. The building would have to house all three vendors. The tower would be behind the building. This tower had been in the process prior to him joining the City of Princeton and different sites were looked at.

Michael, representative for Trinity Lutheran Church (413 3rd Street South) asked where the building was going to be placed and there is a daycare by there and worries about kids climbing the tower. Trinity has vandalism 3 - 4 times a year. How do we say a kid won’t do something to this tower.

Barbian said it will be on the northeast side of the City public parking lot and will take approximately three to five parking spots. The towers are designed where they are anti-climb.
Barbian suggest that the public ask their questions and the Planning Commission will address them after everyone has been heard.

Dan Howard, 602 First Street is their business address and home address is 33572 Xenon Drive NW, Princeton. There is a tower in city limits north of Hoffman Oil. He showed a photo of a sign that is on the fence around the tower and is about the radio frequency environmental guidelines. The proposed tower is a 190 foot tower. This does not seem fitting for our downtown. Is there other options. Is this for public safety and does it take 190 foot tower.

Nancy Howard, 602 First Street mentioned that this was first going to go by the Neighbors Bar and Restaurant. What are the requirements for the tower locations.

Jolene Foss, member and spokesperson for First Congregational Church said the Church members do not believe the tower is going with the historical look in the downtown area. It is not an appropriate area for a tower. The School District posted signs for no parking on 7th Avenue North for during the day and the parking lot is needed for extra parking.

Dylan Howard, 13613 299th Avenue NW, he owns 604 First Street and rents 602 First Street building sites and he has employees. He does not like the look of it and the health concerns. He referenced what is posted at the other cell tower site is his concern with health issues.

David Cook, 520 First Street owns the flooring store that is very close to this site. His concern is the property values going down from this cell tower. The City should concentrate on making the downtown looking better. He sees this parking lot seven days a week and it is always full. He opposes this cell tower location.

Craig Mitchell, 506 7th Street North. This cell tower is for the public safety building and who dropped the ball when that public safety building was being planned. They have a 30 foot tower out there and should have known if they needed this high of a tower that they should not have built next to the airport.

Michele, Director of Bright Child, 110 6th Avenue North is worried about the long term health risk. Health risk, long term. Nobody knows what the long term health risk is. She is not willing to gamble with kids risk on this. There are playgrounds and churches by this site. There are far better places than across from a daycare. There is a group that advocates no cell towers by schools.

Robert Peters, 903 6th Avenue North, commented what he has learned tonight is that we do not need cell towers as much as we need a communication tower. There is a radio tower by the aviation building and why is that not being used. They used that tower for weather and aviation and there is a building there. Why do we need this when there is a tower and building available. Check into it.
Mary Berry, 31835 124th Street, worries about the public health. Those working in a building around the proposed site like Bright Child Daycare and the three churches. The radio frequency affects she worries about.

Joyce Anderson, 206 12th Avenue North, has lived here for 50 years and seen the downtown go downhill. Businesses are not welcomed in this town and it is a bedroom community. Cell tower is where the only good parking lot in town. This site is next to a preschool and churches. We need this parking lot.

Nancy Howard said one concern is if a straight line wind or tornado came, where does the tower fall.

Will Vincent, 12837 302nd Avenue NW, said he supports this tower. There is some that look like trees. He lives across the street from a tower the same size. He understands the concerns, but those precautions are for if you are touching the antenna. There is not as much of a health risk and the American Cancer Society said there is not a risk. Modernize the town for business to come here.

Steve Milam, 8840 Deerwood Road, said just because information is not out there does not mean it should be okay. Taking 3-5 parking spots is a big deal and should be in a different location.

Paul Whitcomb, City Mayor, spoke that he is happy with seeing the turnout for public safety and the importance of it. When 911 happened is when the 800 megahertz. And this is why the City is coming up with this tower and will give us most access to the buildings in Princeton. He appreciates everyone’s concerns, but the tower will have to go up somewhere in town.

Pete Kleingartner 1009 6th Avenue North, he does not support this tower in the parking lot. Put the tower in the City Hall parking lot.

Ron Lawrence, Princeton Fire Chief said he sympathizes with what the public is saying and not knowing the health risk. He does a lot of training exercises along with the Police Department and he has gone to Bright Child and had no communication availability once they were inside the building. They have looked at different sites. This is the best site and they need something that protects fire fighters, police, and community. They need this tower in the center of town to give them the best coverage for all schools. The hospital and high school have to be protected where we have communication inside those buildings also. This is for the community and protection for the kids in all the schools. No matter where it goes, someone will oppose it.

Jolene Foss said she does understand the need for the tower, but is asking the Planning Commission for an area that is proper for this type of land use. This site is not the proper site for this land use. Study other locations.
Barbian said David Cook had a letter submitted to the Planning Commission, as did Melvin Kleingartner, and Joyce Anderson. Lee Steinbrecher had called and emailed the City. All the letters were against this cell tower location in the City public parking lot.

Dan Howard said he would like to pass on this information that the sewer line goes under that parking lot and by 6th Avenue North. That parking area use to be a lumberyard that was burnt down.

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

Barbian said he will address the questions. The City did look at the tower site on the west side of Hwy #169 by the auction site and that area is too far out and will not serve multiple uses. We tried to consider all options. We looked at the water tower on the north end of town, but the usage dropped off and then you have a flood plain area. Or the fall zone these towers are constructed differently where they collapse in half to 85 feet and then collapse. At this location with the fall zone, the tower would not hit any structure. It is unique where three churches share this parking lot, but I have not heard the lot is full. We cannot go south with the tower, otherwise the north end of town will not be covered.

Johnson asked if the City looked into the back corner of the north mall.

Barbian will look at that site.

Erickson asked if the City looked into City Hall parking lot.

Barbian said it is usable, but they thought the other site would be better.

Erickson asked on the health risk.

Damien Toven, City Attorney addressed the health risk. The legal standpoint is the Federal law states the City Council cannot deny the tower with the reasoning of a health risk.

Erickson asked if there is an area that is designated with Antenna Overlay District.

Barbian said the site on the north end of town along Hwy. #169 is in Antenna Overlay District, but this tower would not work there. If the community wanted a chain link fence with barb wire on top that could always be installed or barb wire 20 feet up on the tower. If a fence were installed it would take more space and right now they are looking at three to five parking spaces. Towers have changed where they blend in so well with the location.
The EDA Board will reviewed the variances to allow installation of the tower and building with a minimum lot size, zero setback, and removing the required 8’ foot chain link fence. Then they will make separate motions for each application.

C. #18-03 Variance for Tower and Building in Antenna Tower Overlay District in City Public Parking Lot.
See above memo for the Antenna Tower Overlay District which explains the variances.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Barbian explained there are three variances the City has applied for with the installation of the tower and building. The lot size requirement of an acre and zero setback for the tower and building. The third variance would be for removing the required 8’ foot chain link fence requirement. Removing the fence requirement would help preserve space, but not take away from public safety.

Dan Howard spoke that City owned the old railroad right-of-way. Is there a reason why the City wants to get into a tower development. What about the Great Northern Railroad site.

Dan Cook agrees with Mr. Howard. For Federal Law on how you cannot allow a tower because of possible health issues he cannot argue against. His building value will go down. The City will get lease payments on the tower rental, but will that lower our property taxes.

Jolene Foss said look at number five where it talks about keeping the character of the locality. What about the historical preservation and the potential for redevelopment.

Joyce Anderson, 206 12th Avenue North, asked why they don’t locate the tower where the Food Pantry is. They will be moving and the City can tear down that building and place the tower.

Mary Berry said this is not the look we want people who are going to church and visiting Princeton.

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

Barbian said we need simulcast for public safety and it is very expensive. We do not want to pay for a tower and this is the driving force of having a tower built on City land where AT&T builds it and we lease it for a number of years. He believes it would cost the City to have the tower and simulcast approximately $350,000. We have explored many sites and will look into ones that were mentioned tonight. The City would purchase the simulcast equipment.
Ron Lawrence, Fire Chief said Mille Lacs County would help pay for the simulcast.

The Planning Commission decided to table the Antenna Overlay District and the Variance applications so City staff can explore the other sites that were mentioned tonight.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO TABLE ITEMS:

1. #18-02 ANTENNA TOWER OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A CITY CELL TOWER & BUILDING IN B-1 DISTRICT IN CITY PUBLIC PARKING LOT; AND

2. #18-03 VARIANCE FOR TOWER AND BUILDING IN ANTENNA TOWER OVERLAY DISTRICT IN CITY PUBLIC PARKING LOT (VARIANCES FOR ZERO SETBACK, PROPOSED SITE UNDER THE ACRE LOT SIZE REQUIREMENT, AND REMOVING THE REQUIRED OF A 8’ FOOT CHAIN LINK FENCE).

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 1 NAY. (AYES: HALLIN, ERICKSON, JOHNSON, AND MOLLER, NAY: REYNOLDS). MOTION CARRIED.

Barbian said he will bring these items back to the Planning Commission on March 19th so those in the audience can attend that meeting if they like.

Scott Moller said whatever location is chosen someone will be opposed. Public safety has to be addressed.

Erickson suggested a subcommittee work with staff to check on possible sites.

Barbian liked that idea. He suggested two Planning Commission members so then there wouldn’t be a quorum. Johnson and Erickson said they would do it.

**OLD BUSINESS:**
**A. Comprehensive Plan Redraft Update**
Barbian said this is an update of the Comprehensive Plan. He would like the Planning Commission to look it over and it could be discussed at the next meeting. The community would be invited to see the final draft Comprehensive Plan and make any suggestions. The notice of the meeting will go out in the utility billing.

The Planning Commission should make comments on what they see as important for the town. The safety zone at the Airport will need to be released and that will take joint powers with the townships. We need to look at how to get more activity downtown. There are task identified
to do list in the draft. Industrial base we will be running out of land and that needs to be looked at. The transportation plans has to be looked at.

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:**

A. **Verbal Report**
   There were no verbal reports.

B. **City Council Minutes for January, 2018**
   The Planning Commission had no comments.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:13 P.M.

ATTEST:

______________________________________________________________
Dan Erickson, Chairperson                                   Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Director