THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON MARCH 19TH, 2018,
AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
*****************************************************************
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Dan Erickson. Members present were Victoria
Staff present were Robert Barbian (Administrator) and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assist).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON FEBRUARY 26TH, 2018
REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 2018.
UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. UPON THE VOTE, THERE
WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:
A. #18-04 Variance for Rear Yard Setback at 103 11th Avenue South
Community Development Assistant Memo:

BACKGROUND
Cindy Esler, has submitted an application for a variance for a rear yard setback of 21.8 feet from
the required 30 foot setback. The property site is located at 103 11th Avenue South and R-2
Residential District.

ANALYSIS
The subject parcel is located on the west side of 11th Avenue South and on the north side of 2nd
Street South. This is a corner vacant lot that would face the backside of Mille Lacs County
Historical Museum.

Ms. Esler has recently purchased the lot and intends to build a 24’ x 50’ single family home with
an attached two car garage, a total of 1,776 square feet. The Ordinance states for a single-
family dwelling, the minimum finished ground level area of a one story without a basement is
1,100 square feet. The main floor of this home without the attached garage will be 1,217
square feet. There will be an entry porch to the front door that has a depth of 8’ feet and 20’ in
length.

The R-2 Residential District minimum lot size is 9,800 square feet and this lot size is 9,927
square feet. Both side yard setbacks have been met. The Ordinance allows a reduction to the
25 foot front yard minimum setback to 20 feet when a front porch is attached. The only
setback that cannot be met is the rear yard of 30 foot minimum setback reduced to 21’ feet 8”
inches. A variance of 8’ feet 2” inches is requested. There is a row of trees on the rear property
line that will be a screening and reduce the visual impact of the home.

Variance Review Standards: According to Section 2 of Chapter IV of the Zoning Ordinance,
request may be made for variance 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 granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:

1. **Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?**
   
   **Comment:** One of the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to establish regulations to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the residents of Princeton, which is accomplished through regulating the location of structures. The proposed home would be 21’ feet 8” inches instead of the required 30’ foot setback from the rear property line. The row of trees along the property line will give adequate screening from the neighboring property.

2. **Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?**
   
   **Comment:** This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as residential improvements of neighborhoods and encouragement of residential growth.

3. **Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?**
   
   **Comment:** The focus of this review is whether the request of building a new home in the site is reasonable. Staff believes placing the proposed home closer to the rear yard setback is reasonable. The layout of the lot makes it difficult to meet the setback requirements.

4. **Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?**
   
   **Comment:** The Narrow shape of the lot makes the placement of the home unique where meeting all the setback requirements and still meet the single family home minimum size requirement difficult.

5. **Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?**
   
   **Comment:** The issuance of the variance appears that it will maintain the essential character of the locality. This is a residential neighborhood and the proposed single family home would keep with the surrounding area.

6. **Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?**
   
   **Comment:** Yes, the alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations as it makes a residential lot difficult to build on.

**CONCLUSION**

To approve the variance request, the City must find that the proposal uses the property in a reasonable manner, and that the applicant has demonstrated that there are practical difficulties, unique to the property not created by the property owner, that interfere in using the property in such a manner.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff would recommend approval of the variance for the rear yard setback of 21’ feet 8” inches for the proposed home, based on the findings:
1. The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. The property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.
4. There are circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner, with the shape of the lot.
5. The issuance of the variance will maintain the essential character of the locality.
6. The alleged practical difficulty does not involve economic considerations.

**Variance to construct a home with the rear yard setback 21’ feet 8” inches instead of the required 30’ foot setback.**

Based on the findings that the variance meets the listed variance review standards in the Ordinance, staff would suggest approval of the variance, subject to the following conditions:

1. A Building Permit and Water & Sewer Permit shall be obtained prior to construction.
2. A Digging Permit and deposit will need to be obtained for street excavation for sewer and water hook-up.
3. Sodding or seeding along with driveway completion must be completed prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy. If 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.

---

Letter from Cindy Esler, applicant:

Dear City of Princeton,

I am writing this to let you know that I really need this rear setback variance. I need 8’2” on the rear setbacks. I have spent $20,000.00 for this land. I have my house sold already, and I have paid out other monies to get this process going. The smallest sized house for a slab home is 1,100 sq. ft. within the City of Princeton. So this house with the mechanical room is just over 1,200 sq. ft. With that being said if I can’t build this house I don’t know what I am going to do. I have a piece of property I can’t use and a lot of money spent for nothing. So I am begging you please give me this variance.

Thank you very much, Cindy Esler

---

DeWitt gave a review of the variance request.

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

Cindy Esler, applicant is not sure what type of driveway she will put in, either asphalt or cement.
JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE ITEM #18-04 VARIANCE FOR A REAR YARD SETBACK FROM THE REQUIRED 30 FOOT SETBACK TO 21’8” FEET, PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 103 11TH AVENUE SOUTH, PID #24-280-0072, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
1. A BUILDING PERMIT AND WATER & SEWER PERMIT SHALL BE OBTAINED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
2. A DIGGING PERMIT AND DEPOSIT WILL NEED TO BE OBTAINED FOR STREET EXCAVATION FOR SEWER AND WATER HOOK-UP.
3. SODDING OR SEEDING ALONG WITH DRIVEWAY COMPLETION MUST BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO ISSUING A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY. IF 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.

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

The Planning Commission reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, shape of the lot.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.

B. #18-05 Variance for Zero Setback for Division of City Hall Building and School District
Robert Barbian, City Administrator Memo:

BACKGROUND
The City of Princeton has submitted an application for a variance to allow a zero setback from the subdivision along a building line and common wall of the Princeton City Hall building for the purpose of selling the southerly division to Princeton School District. The property site is located at 705 Second Street North and zoned R-2 Residential District.

ANALYSIS
The subject parcel is located on the east side of 8th Avenue North and one block north of First Street. This block consist of an interconnected building used for the City Administration, School Administration District Office, Family Center Pre K, and Transition Learning Center.

The renovations at the City Administration & School Administration Offices have been completed with the establishment of a common wall where the Police garage had previous
been, now renovated to District offices. A purchase agreement has been reviewed and is in place to complete the sale. The agreement is scheduled for action by the City Council and the School District Board. To complete the transaction and sale a property division with a 0 setback for the common wall is required.

**Variance Review Standards:** According to Section 2 of Chapter IV of the Zoning Ordinance, requests may be made for variance 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 granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:*

1. **Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?**
   **Comment:** One of the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to establish regulations to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the residents of Princeton, which is accomplished through regulating the location, height, and bulk of the buildings and other structures. The division of the City Hall building to accommodate the School District facility reduces the need for another structure to be built.

2. **Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?**
   **Comment:** The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to protect the best interest of the surrounding area or the City as a whole. The use of the building to house City Hall and the School District complies with the surrounding area.

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. The 0 setback has been addressed per building code and public safety.

4. **Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?**
   **Comment:** The Police Department moved to a new Public Safety building where their building was vacant and would house the School District needs.

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.

6. **Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?**
   **Comment:** Yes, because of the location of the old Police Department building that is centered between City Hall and the School District buildings, made it difficult to host another entity.

**CONCLUSION**

If the Planning Commission finds that the application for the variance of a 0 setback for division
of the City Hall building to the School District meets the review standards as outlined in the Ordinance, staff would recommend approval.

An approval will result in staff processing an Administrative Boundary Line Adjustment for the site allowing for the City Hall building and School District to complete the transaction.

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

Barbian explained the variance request. He said there is a common wall agreement between the City of Princeton and the School District. There is also an easement for a second exit where it meets building code procedure. This had been discussed at the proposed development review meetings.

Stoeckel asked if the parking lot is still the City Hall’s parking lot.

DeWitt explained that there has been a verbal agreement for many years that the School District can use the front row parking that is closest to their building. The City will continue to own the parking lot.

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 #18-05 VARIANCE FOR ZERO SETBACK FOR DIVISION OF CITY HALL BUILDING AND SCHOOL DISTRICT LOCATED AT 705 SECOND STREET NORTH, PID #24-360-0020. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.

C. #18-06 Antenna Tower Overlay District and Conditional Use Permit in R-2 Zoning District at 705 2nd Street North

Robert Barbian, City Administrator Memo:

REQUEST
The City of Princeton Administration is requesting an Antenna Overlay Zoning District to be
located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District, and the granting of a Conditional Use Permit, for the installation of communications equipment; consisting of a cell tower and equipment building.

The use is proposed to be on the northwest side of the City Hall parking lot. Depending upon the final design 3-5 parking spaces would be repurposed. The site is located east of 8th Avenue North and a block north of First Street.

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 in July failed 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 location for the tower was continued by previous City staff.

The preliminary discussed tower is 190’ feet with an equipment building designed to be approximately 20’x25’, meeting downtown architectural code.

ANALYSIS
The Antenna Tower Overlay District (AT) is an overlay zoning district; land zoned into the AT 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.

New commercial wireless telecommunication service tower shall not 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 a water tower or building and because of the type of communications tower that is needed, it will need to be on its own site.

In the R-2 Residential Zoning District, public buildings and facilities are an allowed use with a conditional use permit.

**VARIANCE REQUEST**
The variance request is to allow a 0 setback for the installation of a tower and building in the R-2/AT Districts and removing the required 8’ foot chain link fence in lieu of other safety measures to be taken around the antenna and supporting equipment.

The requirement for the antenna tower setback to 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 the decrease fall zone. The tower design will be required to be within the fall zone of all existing structures.

Tower designs have changed. Current measures have combined anti-climb measures with aesthetics measures which allow for goal accomplishment while minimizing impact. This be included in the final design allowing for a more condensed area of placing a structure in an urban setting.

**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 granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:

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

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. The 0 setback and removing the 8’ foot fence requirement and have been addressed where all public safety is met.
4. **Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?**

   **Comment:** Yes, the site is currently used as a City Hall parking lot and will be continued in that use. Approximately 3 – 5 spaces will be used.

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.

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**

If the Planning Commission finds that the application for the rezoning adding the AT Overlay District, granting the Conditional Use Permit for installation of a Public Building & Facility and Variance for the 0 setback meets the review standards as outlined in the Ordinance staff would recommend approval.

An approval for the AT District is zoning action and is a Planning Commission determination and proceeds to the City Council for informational purposes only.

The approval for the Variance is a Planning Commission determination and proceeds to the City Council for informational purposes only.

The Planning Commission will need to make a separate motion for each item.

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

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

Barbian gave an overview of the Antenna Overlay Zoning District along with the Conditional Use Permit and Variance. The tower would be in the northwest corner of the City Hall parking lot. It would take approximately 3 -5 parking spaces. The building would house a simulcast system. The tower would satisfy a number of uses for the public need and the private need. A search of location was done by City staff and the center of downtown was the best location. The simulcast would transmit the best here and be able to transmit into the buildings. The setback would be near the lot line for the tower and building. The design phase would have to be reviewed. The Zoning requires an 8’ foot chain link fence and the Variance requested is removing the fencing in lieu of other safety measures to be taken and allowing a 0 setback for the installation of the building and tower. If we did an L shaped building, there would not be a need for a full fence. The newer towers are designed differently from those you see where they have three or four support legs. This tower would be an anti-climb tower and we could also install barb wire 15 – 20 feet high on the tower.
Don Hubbard, 802 Second Street North, asked if this tower will interfere with the reception at home with his television and internet service. What will be the height of the tower.

Barbian said 190 feet the height will be. There should not be interference with the homeowners reception of television and internet service.

Erickson advised those for the public hearing that all comments will be taken first and then staff will respond to them.

Mary Berry, 31835 124th Street, asked what the position of the building and tower will be and if they will be cutting down any trees.

Dyann Berg, 806 Second Street North, asked if this is for the Police transmission, why it is not placed by the Police Station.

Dylan Howard, 13613 299th Avenue, said he likes the placement of it at the City Hall parking lot better than the public parking lot that was discussed at last month’s meeting. He would like to see a map of where they have looked and where the tower best placement would be. If the City is renting a position on the tower, will there be a reduction of tax dollars to residents. The residents should be aware what the rental amount will be. Have they looked at Baldwin Townships tower and how they acquired it.

Mary Berry thanks the City staff for looking into this more. They did work hard on looking at this.

Barbian responded that at this time, he is not aware of any trees that will be removed except for the corner tree. This will be in the design phase. The intent is to make sure there is buffering and greenery planted. The primary issue to be addressed is for emergency responders are able to transmit into the schools and other buildings. The area of concentration has been centered two blocks north and south of Rum River Drive from 4th Street South to 6th Street North.

Hallin mentioned that last month there were a few people that mentioned they could not get service in KBob restaurant.

Erickson said the Fire Chief mentioned the tower had to be placed somewhere between the Princeton Middle School and Princeton High School for the best transmission.

Berg said what about by the library.

Erickson commented that area is in the Wild & Scenic land use so it would not work there.

Barbian said the approval of the Antenna Overlay District for in City owned land is a key step to funding. The private sector can build the tower and we would rent it to them. This would save
the City the cost of building the tower and they would get to use the tower for a number of years. There are key steps that need to be addressed such as a funding plan. The public will be aware of the cost factor and any open bids. He is not aware of the Baldwin Township tower and will have to look at it. As far as the fencing, we are not sure what will be needed for that, but the tower will be designed to look good for the neighborhood.

Hallin said we looked at the best location for sites where the transmission is best. Last month we were told from the Fire Chief they had no communication availability in the Bright Child building when they were doing a training.

Todd Frederick, Police Chief said that two years ago Princeton was listed as a priority with a tower at a property height and coverage where the signals will go through the building walls.

Don Hubbard asked Frederick how much of this inability to get the frequency inside a structure there is. Hubbard was a Police Officer in Princeton.

Frederick said the older the building is, the harder it is to transmit through. You can put boosters on the building, but that still does not mean it will transmit through. With the new tower they are hoping no boosters will be needed.

Erickson said when the City was looking at site and they did consider private property. He spoke to Chief Frederick and he said that if the tower was on private property and the lease ran out, the City would be looking again for another site. That would put the City in a tough financial position. Erickson believes the City owned property is the best alternative. He does not support the City being in a business, but does support this tower.

Mary Berry, said landscaping is to create a look that covers things that are not attractive. The roundabout she worried about and it turned out good. She looks forward to seeing what we could do with the landscaping here.

Bob Peters, 903 Sixth Avenue North, is not in favor of installing the tower at City Hall. What if the City sells City Hall building then what happens to the tower in the parking lot.

Barbian said that would be up to the City Council to separate out the area of the tower from the sale. The City would maintain the tower as public property.

Johnson asked if that could be in the motion.

Barbian said it could be suggested to the City Council to maintain the tower as City property if there was ever a sale of the City Hall building.

Dylan Howard, 33572 Xenon Drive North, would the County consider this commercial and tax this site differently.
Barbian is not sure on that.

Dave Cook, 8468 321st Avenue NW, said there is a tower NW of Hwy. #95 and Hwy. #169 and a few others around the perimeter, why do we need this one. Can this type of system be on one of those where we do not need it.

Hallin commented that those towers are full and cannot fit anymore.

Frederick said that the radio system is not covered by Mille Lacs County. Sherburne County has theirs already. The tower on the north by the schools would not work.

Bob Peter’s asked if we need that high of a tower.

Barbian said if we want to write a check for the whole tower it would not need to be that tall, but it would be over $300,000 that we would have to pay. The three users would maximize the tower and the final height would be in the design. It is reasonable to capture two private sectors maybe three. This would maximize the revenue for the city and that is why it is being looked at taller than what is necessary. The simulcast equipment will be expensive and hopefully we can get some grant funds.

Mary Berry asked if subcommittees would be needed.

Barbian said the tower would be an engineered feature. There would be a Site Plan Review. A neighborhood person would be welcomed informally.

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

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL ITEM #18-06 FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ANTENNA TOWER OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT IN R-2 RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT, ALONG WITH GRANTING OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A CELL TOWER AND BUILDING FOR COMMUNICATIONS, LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE CITY HALL PARKING LOT AT 705 SECOND STREET NORTH, PID #24-360-0020. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Findings of Fact:

Rezoning to Antenna Overlay District
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? No.
3. Does the rezoning constitute spot zoning of the property? No.
Conditional Use Permit
1. Does the proposed use violate the health, safety or general welfare of the Princeton residents? Yes.
2. Has the proposed use been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer in regards to erosion, runoff, water pollution, and sedimentation (if applicable)? No.
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 adverse impact? No.

D. #18-07 Variance for Antenna Tower and Building for Zero Setback and Removing Required 8’ Foot Chain Link Fence requirement at 705 2nd Street North

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

Barbian gave a review of the variance requested of a zero setback and removing the required 8’ foot chain link fence requirement. The building could be a 20’ x30’ foot building and the tower may be on the back of it so it may not need to be fenced. The tower will be anti-climb.

Dylan Howard likes the idea of an anti-climb tower.

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

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO APPROVE ITEM #18-07 VARIANCE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A TOWER AND BUILDING IN THE ANTENNA TOWER OVERLAY DISTRICT ALLOWING ZERO SETBACK AND REMOVING THE REQUIRED 8’ FOOT CHAIN LINK FENCE IN LIEU OF OTHER SAFETY MEASURES AROUND THE ANTENNA AND SUPPORTING EQUIPMENT. THE SITE IS LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE CITY HALL PARKING LOT, LOCATED AT 705 SECOND STREET NORTH IN R-2, RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT. PID #24-360-0020.

Chief Frederick said it would be good idea to have a fence so the Trespass Law would be in place. He would like the Planning Commission to research it more.

Barbian would work it through with Staff at the design process of the Site Plan Review.

Johnson said if there is a no trespassing sign located on the building site that establishes a perimeter that says stay out.
UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.

OLD BUSINESS:
A. #18-02 Antenna Tower Overlay District and Conditional Use Permit to allow a City Cell Tower & Building in B-1 District in City Public Parking Lot
This item was on the February 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting and the public hearing was closed after public input. The Planning Commission tabled the item so City staff could explore the other sites that had been mentioned at the meeting. On the agenda tonight was an alternative site at the City Hall parking lot in the R-2 Residential District for the Antenna Tower Overlay District to host the cell tower and building that was approved. Staff recommended denying this application.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO DENY ITEM #18-02 ANTENNA TOWER OVERLAY DISTRICT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A CITY CELL TOWER & BUILDING IN B-1 BUSINESS DISTRICT IN THE CITY PUBLIC PARKING LOT LOCATED AT PID #24-040-0370. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

B. #18-03 Variance for Tower & Building in Antenna Tower Overlay District in City Public Parking Lot
This item was on the February 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting and the public hearing was closed after public input. The Planning Commission tabled the item so City staff could explore the other sites that had been mentioned at the meeting. On the agenda tonight was an alternative site at the City Hall parking lot for the Variance for the tower & building in Antenna Tower Overlay District in R-2 Residential District to host the cell tower and building that was approved. Staff recommended denying this application.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO DENY ITEM #18-03 VARIANCE TO ALLOW A CITY CELL TOWER & BUILDING IN ANTENNA TOWER OVERLAY DISTRICT IN B-1 BUSINESS DISTRICT IN THE CITY PUBLIC PARKING LOT LOCATED AT PID #24-040-0370. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.
C. Comprehensive Plan Review
Barbian said that the Comprehensive Plan Review was discussed last month. He is looking for feedback from the Planning Commission if they would like to continue the Comprehensive Plan moving forward or look at other alternatives options they may like to see on it. The Transportation Plan and Infrastructure Plan need to be redesigned. Barbian suggest holding off a month or two before a public hearing on this. There is more work to do on the two before he would want to bring a public hearing. There should be more collector systems for the local and county roads. He could send them a sample of this by email.

Erickson said there are a lot of task that the Planning Commission members need to review.

Barbian said that is the main purpose of the Planning Commission to look through those for what is best for the community.

Erickson asked how those task are addressed.

Barbian said they should determine what is most important and collaborate with the City Council and staff. You need to know your land use. For example, 21st Avenue South and the Airport runway issues.

The Planning Commission would like to keep it on the Planning Commission agenda for further review.

NEW BUSINESS:
A. Administrative Boundary Line Adjustment for City Hall Building and School District
DeWitt informed the Planning Commission Board that this is in regards to the Variance that was approved tonight for the zero setback line for the subdivision along a building line and common wall of the Princeton City Hall building for the purpose of selling the southerly division to Princeton School District. Staff will be putting together an Administrative Boundary Line Adjustment for the City Hall building and School District. The Resolution will be recorded with Mille Lacs County.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO APPROVE STAFF TO PROCESS THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT FOR THE CITY HALL BUILDING AND SCHOOL DISTRICT. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:
A. Verbal Report
Barbian said things are going well. Next month will be more reports.

Eugene Stoeckel said to they need to get rid of the cross wind runway and have a committee on it.
Barbian said yes, there will need to be a committee for the process to be finalized. Land use also needs to be cleared up. A task force will be established. He is keeping the priorities in line and the City communications antenna is first.

B. City Council Minutes for February, 2018
The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:41 P.M.

ATTEST:

________________________________________  ______________________________________
Dan Erickson, Chairperson                    Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant