CITY OF PRINCETON
Planning Commission
Agenda
March 19th, 2018
7:00 P.M., City Hall

1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

2. Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting on February 26th, 2018 - Tab A

3. Agenda Additions/Deletions

4. Public Hearing:
   A. #18-04 Variance Rear Yard Setback at 201 11th Avenue South - Tab B
   B. #18-05 Variance for Zero Setback for Division of City Hall Building and School District – Tab C
   C. #18-06 Antenna Tower Overlay District and Conditional Use Permit in R-2 Zoning District at 705 2nd Street North – Tab D
   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 – See Memo from Tab D

5. 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
   B. #18-03 Variance for Tower & Building in Antenna Tower Overlay District in City Public Parking Lot

6. New Business:
   A. Administrative Boundary Line Adjustment for City Hall Building and School District – See Memo from Tab C

7. Communication and Reports:
   A. Verbal Report
   B. City Council Minutes for February, 2018 - Tab E

8. Adjournment
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, ERICKSON 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.

End of Staff Memo

**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 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 extend 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.

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

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, "O 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
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission Board
FROM: Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant
SUBJECT: Variance for Setback at 201 11th Ave. S.
DATE: March 19, 2018

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 201 11th Avenue South and zoned 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, 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 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.
DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SURVEYED: (PER DOC. NO. A404504)

An unnumbered tract in Block 1, Forest Park Addition described as follows:
Beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 8, Block 1, Forest Park Addition to the Village of Princeton,
thence East 60 rods, 16 links, thence South 8 rods, thence West 4 rods, 5 links, thence North 8 rods,
with the point of beginning, Mill Lakes County, Minnesota.

Also described as follows:
An unnumbered tract in Block 1, Forest Park Addition, described as follows:
Beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 8, Block 1, Forest Park Addition to the Village of Princeton,
thence East along a extension of the North line of said Lot 8, Block 1, 4 rods and 16 links to the
East line of the soils unnumbered tract in Block 1, thence South along the East line of the said
unnumbered tract in Block 1 a distance of 8 rods to the South line of the said unnumbered tract in
Block 1, thence West along the South line of the said unnumbered tract in Block 1, 4 rods and 5 links
to the Southwest corner of the said unnumbered tract in Block 1, thence North along the West line of
the said unnumbered tract in Block 1, 8 rods to the point of beginning.

I hereby certify that this survey, plan or report was prepared by me or under my
direct supervision and that I am a duly Licensed Professional Land Surveyor under
the laws of the State of Minnesota.

Charles R. Christopherson, W3 License No. 18420
02/26/18

LEGEND

- = Iron monument found
O = Iron monument set and marked with license No. 18420.

= Denotes sidewalk elevation
= Denotes proposed elevation
= Denotes drainage or
= Denotes offset iron

RUM RIVER
LAND SURVEYORS & ENGINEERS
1001 Main St. S.
Princeton, MN 55371
Telephone 763-324-0675
Fax 763-324-2276

Job No: F-4250.01
02/26/18 5:50pm addl
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 spend $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 1100 sq ft. within the city of Princeton. So this house with the mechanical room is just over 1200 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
Side yard view from Second Street South. The row of trees on the west of the lot is what will be the rear yard and will block view from the neighbor’s property.
This is the view that the house will front from 11th Avenue South
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: City Administration
SUBJECT: Variance for City Hall & School District Building
DATE: March 19, 2018

BACKGROUND
The City of Princeton has submitted an application for a variance to allow a zero setback 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. 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.
APPLICATION FOR PLANNING REQUEST
CITY OF PRINCETON

Street address of property: 705 2nd St. N.  Zoning: R-2

Legal Description: ________________________________________________________________

Applicant:
Name: City of Princeton  Phone #: 763-389-2040
Address: 705 2nd St. N.
City/State/Zip: Princeton, MN 55371

Property Owner:
Name: City of Princeton  Phone #: 763-389-2040
Address: 705 2nd St. N.
City/State/Zip: Princeton, MN 55371

Request Type: Variance X Rezoning ☐ Conditional Use Permit ☐ Interim Use Permit ☐
Plan Review ☐ Subdivision Plat ☐ Other ☐ __________________________________________

Description of request: Zero setback for subdivision along a building line and common wall of Princeton City Hall building
Existing use: City Hall

Is this a permitted use under the current zoning ordinance? Yes ☐ No ☐ If no, attach a copy of the conditional use permit, variance, or other document permitting use, or attach an explanation of why the use is permitted.

Has a variance, conditional use permit, or rezoning been applied for previously? Yes ☐ No ☐
When? __________________________________________

When the City is required to get outside review, such as legal, engineering, etc., or there are direct costs for processing the application, such as publishing required notices, the costs are billed to the applicant and the applicant, by signing this request, agree to pay such fees.

Robert Barbier  Date: 3-1-18
Applicant Signature

Application Received by:
Mary Lou DeWitt  Date: 3-1-18

__________________________________________________________
Princeton Planning Commission

FINDINGS OF FACT
SUPPORTING OR DENYING VARIANCE

Name of Applicant: City of Princeton
Hearing Date: March 19th, 2018

Variance Requested: Variance for zero setback for division of City Hall Building and School

District in R-2 Residential District.

The Planning Commission may issue variances from the provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance. A variance is any modification or variation of official controls where it is determined that by reason of unique circumstances not created by the owner, there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance.

VARIANCE EVALUATION

1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance?
   
   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?

2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?

A variance may be granted when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance. A determination that "practical difficulties" exist is based upon consideration of the following criteria:

3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner?

   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?

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

   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?
Planning Commission Board/Findings of Fact

5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?
   Yes ( )    NO ( )    Why or why not?

6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?
   YES ( )    NO ( )

   If all answers are YES, the criteria for granting the variance have been met.

Facts supporting the answer to each question, above, are hereby certified to be the Findings of
the Board of Adjustment.

The Princeton Planning Commission Decision:
APPROVED ( )    DENIED ( )

DATE: ____________                               Chairman, Princeton Planning Commission
PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION MEMO

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Robert Barbian, City Administrator
SUBJECT: Antenna Overlay Zoning District in R-2 Residential Zoning District and Conditional Use Permit for the installation of a cell tower and building for communications & Variance
DATE: March 19th, 2018

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 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 be 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 will 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. **Area 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 recommendation that proceeds to the City Council and requires City Council action.

An approval of the Conditional Use Permit 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.
APPLICATION FOR PLANNING REQUEST
CITY OF PRINCETON

Street address of property: 705 2nd St. N. Zoning: R-2
Legal Description

Applicant:
Name: City of Princeton / Robert Barbian (Administrator)
Address: 705 2nd St. N., Princeton, MN 55371
Phone #: 763-389-2040 Email: RBarbian@PrincetonMN.org

Property Owner:
Name: City of Princeton
Address: 705 2nd St. N., Princeton, MN 55371
Phone #: 763-389-2040 Email: RBarbian@PrincetonMN.org

Request Type: Variance ✗ Rezoning ✓ Conditional Use Permit ✓ Interim Use Permit ☐
Site Plan Review ☐ Subdivision/Plat ☐ Ord. Amendment ☐ Other ☐

Description of request: AT Antenna Tower Overlay with a C.U.L.P and Variance for Zero Setback and removing 8' foot Chain link fence requirement.
Existing use: parking lot for City Hall

Is this a permitted use under the current zoning ordinance? Yes ☐ No ☐ If no, attach an explanation (ex: lawful non-conforming use).

Has a variance, conditional use permit, or rezoning been applied for previously? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, attach a copy of approval(s).

When the City is required to get outside review, such as legal, engineering, etc., or there are direct costs for processing the application, such as publishing required notices, the costs are billed to the applicant. The applicant, by signing this request, agrees to pay such fees.

Robert Barbian Date: March 1st, 2018
Applicant Signature

Application Received by:

Mary L. DeWitt Date: 3-1-18
Princeton Planning Commission
FINDINGS OF FACT
SUPPORTING OR DENYING
VARIANCE

Name of Applicant: City of Princeton          Hearing Date: March 19th, 2018

Variance Requested: Variance for Antenna Tower and Building for Zero Setback and Removing
the required 8’ foot chain link fence requirement in R-2 Residential District.

The Planning Commission may issue variances from the provisions of the City’s Zoning
Ordinance. A variance is any modification or variation of official controls where it is determined
that by reason of unique circumstances not created by the owner, there are practical difficulties
in complying with the zoning ordinance.

VARIANCE EVALUATION
1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance?
   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?

2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?
   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?

A variance may be granted when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are
practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance. A determination that "practical
difficulties" exist is based upon consideration of the following criteria:

3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner?
   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?

4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner?
   Yes ( ) NO ( ) Why or why not?
Planning Commission Board/Findings of Fact

5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?
   Yes ( )  NO ( )  Why or why not?  

6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?
   YES ( )  NO ( )

If all answers are YES, the criteria for granting the variance have been met.

Facts supporting the answer to each question, above, are hereby certified to be the Findings of
the Board of Adjustment.

The Princeton Planning Commission Decision:
APPROVED ( )  DENIED ( )

DATE: _____________________  

Chairman, Princeton Planning Commission
MINUTES OF A STUDY SESSION OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON FEBRUARY 1, 2018 4:30 P.M.

Mayor Paul Whitcomb called the meeting to order. Council members present was Thom Walker, Jack Edmonds, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Staff present, Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Public Works Director Bob Geroid, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Liquor store manager Nancy Campbell, Wastewater Plant Manager Chris Klinghagen and Fire Chief Ron Lawrence.

Fire Department Grass 6 Replacement

Lawrence advised that part of the apparatus replacement program that was designed three years ago, the grass 6 is in need of replacement. This is a 1991 Ford F-250 with over 50,000 miles. This truck is 27 years old.

The truck usually remains in Blue Hill Township at one of the officer's homes for a quick response in the southwest portion of the coverage area. It has been beneficial for getting to medicals, grass fires and other calls quickly.

Last year they did a tune up on the motor which helped but now the motor is in need of a major tune up. The floor boards are rusting through. The steering is loose and almost considered dangerous to drive. He said he has elected not to fix any issues on it right now until a discussion with council has been achieved. They do have some options for replacement. The DNR has some slightly used trucks, and they would like permission to spend up to $10,000, although it likely would not be that much.

Walker questioned the average age of the trucks that are for sale. Jerry Rud responded that most are in the 2008-2013 range, and come from a variety of Federal Agencies. The nicer ones usually come from the Department of Health, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Lawrence added that most of the used trucks can probably be bought for about $3000-4000, but they are located around the country so many times they would need to be shipped here, adding a bit to the cost.

Walker asked if it would be better to purchase the truck new so it would last a long time and we would not have to worry about fixing another person's problems. Rud stated if they went to a One Ton truck, they would be looking at approximately $33,000. Then if you are going new, you might as well put in the new lighting, then decals, etc. it would end up being in the low $40,000 range. Walker stated that downtime on a rig is really not what you want, so a good reliable truck is important. Lawrence thinks there is about $180,000 in the Equipment fund, but he has some of that earmarked for grants they have applied for.

Rud said these used vehicles usually don't stick around long, so they need to jump on a good one quickly. Being it is only Federal Agencies that can buy from the site, they also have to go through the MN DNR for the purchase.

Barbian suggested trying to get one of the trucks from a Health Services division, and from down south where they don't use salt on the roads.
Zimmer moved to approve the purchase of a truck for up to $10,000 and the approval to disposition the old one. Edmonds seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Fire Department Computer and Server Replacement

Lawrence reported that as part of the CIP for this year, it was approved to purchase new computers for the fire department. The purchase will include 5 new computers, a new server, and a new laptop for the training room to be shared by fire and police. The price comes in just under the approved amount for CIP.

They currently have 8 computers, but the captains have agreed to share.

Walker moved to approve the purchase the 5 new computers and server for the fire department, and a new laptop for the training room to be shared by the fire department and police department. Zimmer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Aero Business Park Land Pricing

Barbian asked the council for input on the land pricing for the Aero Business Park.

In reviewing various materials, agreements and after a variety of discussions it is not clear what the City Council wishes to sell lots at the Aero Business Park for. The following is what has been concluded:

The City has an Exclusive Listing contract with Coldwell Banker Commercial Real Estate on all sales.
- The terms call for a $5,000.00 payment for all sales.
- The contract is a year expiring on June 26, 2018.

The City Council wishes to get the assessed amount for past public improvements on each lot sale. This amount is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Assessed Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>$29,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 thru 4</td>
<td>$14,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>$14,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>$14,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>$14,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the City’s intent has been stated in Resolution 17-18 adopted April 7, 2017:
- The City intends to obtain a minimum value of $400,000 per 1 acre lot.
- The City intends to obtain employment of at least 2 FT employees per acre lot.

The amounts listed above do not include the City capital investment for the land purchase. The purchase price is not available at this time, although approximately 350,000.

Barbian said he is asking for what the sales price should be, and if any considerations are to be given when potential purchasers which to proceed. There are a variety of methods to establish a pricing which offers opportunities to recoup amounts listed above.
Walker said the Eda has talked about this land extensively.

Barbian commented that a TIF district may be another good way to recoup some of these funds.

Walker stated that the EDA has had these lots for sale for a while, with no interest so they decided to list them with a Real Estate company. He doesn’t feel a TIF is something the EDA would be interested in. But, if someone is interested in buying a lot, they don’t want to turn anyone away. He does not know what the political ramifications would be to setting up a TIF.

Walker said they have tried to get away from TIF’s over the past 15 years. Barbian replied that it was just an idea so the city could recoup some of the money spent on those lots, as a TIF collects and School and City portion of the taxes. Some of those funds could be used for improvements to the downtown façade, or towards the roundabout.

Council was in agreement to sell them for the cost of the assessments.

Community Solar Project – Princeton Utilities

Wangen advised that she presented a proposal to Barbian and Jackson a couple weeks ago. SMDA is looking to set up a solar garden here in Princeton, but would like 25% of the panels subscribed to before building.

Barbian commented that if the rates stayed the same, there would be a slight loss after the 10 years. However, it is likely that the rate would increase at some point, so you could break even or maybe make a little. This is more to promote that the city is environmentally friendly.

Wangen stated that the PUC has subscribed to a few panels, and if the city wishes to as well, she will begin to talk to residents and businesses about the program.

Whitcomb said when he spoke to people about it, they were only seeing that it would be a slight loss. The other question people had, was if they got a benefit when the subscription time was up. Wangen replied that they would need to renew a subscription to continue to receive that monthly credit.

Walker commented he would like to look at the program a bit more, and does not want to make a decision tonight.

Barbian said it was discussed that if the City and PUC both purchased some panels, it would be something that would show support to the businesses and residents.

Wangen added that she isn’t pressuring anyone, but just letting people know it is available. They currently have about 10% of the panels subscribed to.

Barbian asked if the council would like it on an upcoming council agenda. Walker suggested having it done for Earth Day, as that would be a very good tie in and press release.
ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE STUDY SESSION AT 5:19PM. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

______________________________  ________________________________
Shawna Jenkins                ATTEST:
City Clerk                     ________________________________

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2018 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, Jack Edmonds, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Others present: Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Wastewater Plant Manager Chris Klinghagen, Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, and Attorney Damien Toven and Kelli Bourgeois. Absent was Fire Chief Ron Lawrence

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes of January 25, 2018
B. Study Session Meeting Minutes of February 1, 2018

EDMONDS MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2018 AND THE STUDY SESSION MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 2018. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses
B. Personnel
   1. Liquor store clerk Debbie Applegate Step 2 Increase effective 1-29-18
C. Donations/Designations
   1. Resolution 18-08 – Donation by from Princeton Used Clothing Center
   2. Resolution 18-09 – donation by Dylan Leiding

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

OPEN FORUM

PRESENTATIONS / PUBLIC HEARINGS

REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

A. Fire Advisory Board minutes of January 2, 2018
B. Airport Board minutes of January 8, 2018

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Aero Business Park Land Sale Policy

Barbian advised that the City of Princeton primary economic development investment has been in the development of lots in the Aero Business Park. Over approximately 13 years, the
City has invested over $1.1 million for the purchase of the property and installation of Public Infrastructure.

The sale proceeds from these lot sales as well as additional tax revenue was planned to be used to recoup the original investment as well as fund additional economic development efforts. This has not worked out as planned.

The lack of lot sales has created a shortage for funding other economic development efforts. In an effort to reinvigorate the City of Princeton economic development effort, a new lot sale policy is proposed.

The lot sale policy is to make lots available at a reasonable market price, requiring a minimum assessed valuation, jobs, and combine with a small cities tax incremental financing district as qualified.

The sale price on fully improved lots is to be $130,680 for lots 2 thru 5 and $280,600 for the corner (lot 1). This to be accompanied by an agreement for the construction of a facility with a minimum valuation of $400,000 with 2 full time equivalent positions for lots 2 thru 5 and $600,000 with 4 full time equivalent positions for lot 1. The agreement will also include a small cities tax incremental financing district supplementing up to 85% of the buyer's land purchase price.

Consideration:

There are three key advantages to revising the lot sale policy. They are:

1. The revised formula for the sale of lots will enable past expenditures to be recouped by the City.
2. The revised land sale policy maintains a very reasonable market entry for many types of commercial developments.
3. The revised land sale policy will enable additional economic development programs to be funded with the proceeds of lot sales. For example, the creation of a downtown incentive program for façade renovations and similar programs.

Recommendation:

Barbian asked the council to consider the creation of a land sale policy as outlined. To act to approve, deny or table the requested land sale policy in order to recoup past economic development efforts and fund future economic development efforts.

Walker said he would like the policy to be brought to the EDA for review and approval as well.

Barbian stated that he will bring it to the EDA for review and approval, then bring the policy to the Council for approval.

WALKER MOVED APPROVE THE CREATION OF A LAND SALE POLICY, WITH THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY THE EDA. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
NEW BUSINESS

A. Boy Scout Proclamation for Pioneer Park Donation

Gerold reported that Dylan Leiding's Eagle Scout Project was to rebuild the exercise stations and Pioneer Park. The Park Board wanted to honor Leiding with this Proclamation.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MAYORAL PROCLAMATION. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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 $94,118.23 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 769077 TO 76981 FOR A TOTAL OF $156,231.83. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business:

ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:10 PM. REYNOLDS 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 FEBRUARY 22, 2018 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, Jack Edmonds, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Others present: Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Wastewater Plant Manager Chris Klinghagen, Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell, Fire Chief Ron Lawrence, Engineer Andy Brotzler, and Attorney Kelli Bourgeois.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes of February 8, 2018

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 8, 2018. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses
   1. Gambling permit for Christ Our Light Bingo and Raffle September 2018
   2. Garbage Haulers License for Vanderpoel Disposal

B. Personnel
   1. Accept Liquor Store Clerk Resignation of Nichole Swenson effective 3-1-18
   2. Approve hiring of Liquor Store Clerk Angela Sherwood effective 2-14-18
   3. Approve hiring of Liquor Store Clerk Katlyn Hovde effective 2-13-18

C. Donations/Designations

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

OPEN FORUM

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Establish Development and TIF Districts
   1. Resolution 18-11 Development District 8, TIF District 8-1 (Kwik Trip)

Barbian advised that he has worked with Tammy Umdahl at Northland Securities over the last couple of months on these Development and TIF districts.

WHITCOMB OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:02PM

Umdahl stated that TIF 8-1 is for the proposed Kwik Trip.

A TIF District is a geographic area that the council is able to establish that collects the increased local property taxes which are captured by the city for a certain time frame. What is proposed is an economic development district. It usually needs to be for Manufacturing and Warehousing, but there is an exception for Small Cities that Princeton qualifies for. The TIF can be for 9 years. The collected TIF funds must be used within the district, which includes the adjacent roads and right of ways.
TIF District 8-1 will capture an estimated $385,000. The School and County received notice and the TIF plan for these districts. The city did receive a letter in support from Sherburne County.

Edmonds commented that the turn lanes the Sherburne County letter speaks to may have some validity. Barbian responded that he did share the letter with the city engineer.

Brotzler added that the majority of traffic comments in the letter are in regard to the proposed Casey's store. They have asked the applicant to do a traffic study.

Edmonds stated that the intersection is busy for about 15-20 minutes in the morning, but otherwise it should not present a big problem.

Walker said he is in favor of the TIF district, and his only concern would that those funds be spent only in that area. Barbian responded that any consideration on improvements, studies, enhancements, or other projects would come to the Council for review and approval.

Zimmer asked for clarification on how long those funds are collected. Umdahl replied that it is 8 years after the first year collected. The city would have 5 years to spend those funds or be under contract. Zimmer asked what would happen if the City did not spend those funds in that time frame. Umdahl responded that the funds would be returned to the county, and then redistributed to the city, county and school district.

ZIMMER MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:17PM. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 18-11 APPROVING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT NO. 8, ADOPTION OF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM THEREFORE, ESTABLISHING TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICT NO. 8-1 THEREIN, AND APPROVING THE TAX INCREMENT FINANCING PLAN THEREFORE. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Resolution 18-12 Development District 8, TIF District 8-2 (Casey's)

Umdahl reported that TIF 8-2 is for the proposed Casey's and will collect an estimated at $190,000 over the TIF period.

ZIMMER MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:19PM. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 18-12 APPROVING A MODIFIED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT NO. 8, AND ESTABLISHING TAX INCREMENT FINANCING PLAN. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Wine and Spirits Grant Request for Relay for Life
Walker stated that this does not just affect Princeton Residents, but it is a great program that the Council has approved in the past.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE WINE AND SPIRITS GRANT REQUEST FOR THE RELAY FOR LIFE OF $500. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

A. Resolution 18-10 – re-approval of land sale to Habitat for Humanity

Barbian advised that Home Security Abstract is doing the closing on this and they wanted a notary section on the resolution, so they asked us to reapprove this.

REYNOLDS MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 18-10. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Resolution 18-13 – call for easement vacation public hearing for Pondview Estates 2nd

Barbian reported that Pondview is requesting the easements be vacated, so a public hearing will need to be held.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 18-13 CALLING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE EASEMENT VACATION. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Resolution 18-14 – call for easement vacation public hearing for Arcadian Estates

Barbian advised that the city is requesting the easements on the Arcadian Homes site be vacated, so a public hearing needs to be held.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 18-14 CALLING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE EASEMENT VACATION. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

A. Scott Bruce Satisfaction of Mortgage

Jackson advised that this was a loan through The Small Cities Development program and Scott Bruce will be paying off his mortgage, so the loan will be repaid.
EDMONDS MOVED TO THE SATISFACTION OF MORTGAGE FOR SCOTT BRUCE. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) for Sewer Backups

Barbian advised that the City of Princeton participated with Lakes & Pines Community Action Council, to obtain a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) from the State of Minnesota for the purpose of creating a loan improvement fund. The funds were lent to home owners and businesses to make improvements to their properties. Since this program was set up the City has received repayments. In discussing the reuse of the repayments of these funds with Lakes & Pines they have indicated that reusing in a similar matter would be appropriate. They further explained that there is more latitude in the recirculating funds in that some of the regulatory requirements drop off. For example, compliance to Davis Bacon Wages Rates is not required.

The Economic Development Authority (EDA) discussed utilizing loan repayments to provide assistance to those that experienced sewer back up damage. This is an acceptable use of the funds according to Lakes and Pines. Staff has explored this and how the funds could be utilized. In reaching out to the property owners impacted by the backup there is interest. It looks like half of the six owners may fit qualifications.

The qualifications as well as repayment terms are very similar to the original CDBG loans. The qualifications discussed and established are: insurance denial, reimbursement of out of pocket expenses to restore to similar condition, income/debt limit, maximum eligible amount of 5,500.00, and owner occupied forgivable loan at 8th year with a 75% repayment for commercial property.

Analysis & Recommendation:

The City sewer collection system had a main break that impacted a number of city property owners. The City is aware of a half dozen owners impacted. After investigation of the main break it was found that the break occurred at no fault of the City, although city residents were impacted.

In an effort to provide resident assistance the City can utilize an existing resource created by the Community Development Block Grant. Staff has determined that there is interest by some of the impacted property owners.

It is recommended that the City Council authorize Staff to extend the use of the CDBG dollars for the purpose of assisting those parties impacted by the Sewer Collection System main break under the terms and conditions covered above. This assistance to be in the form of forgivable loans utilizing the CDBG repayment funds.

Jackson added that this is the form of a loan, but after 7 years they would no longer have to repay that loan if they remained in their home.

Whitcomb said he really feels this is a good use for these funds. It doesn’t cost the taxpayers any money, and we are able to help these people out if they need it.

Walker said this is really a gesture of goodwill, and that we are trying to assist the homeowners.
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Edmonds asked if you could put a requirement that there not be any future litigation against the City. Whitcomb said he isn’t sure he would want to see that language in there. Jules agrees that he doesn’t want to see that in the agreement.

ZIMMER MOVED TO THE SMALL CITIES DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FOR THOSE INTERESTED AND AFFECTED BY THE SEWER BACKUPS. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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 $127,637.07 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 76985 TO 77050 FOR A TOTAL OF $224,321.96. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business:

ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:36PM. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk

ATTEST:

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor