The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Dan Erickson. Members present were Scott Moller, Victoria Hallin, and Gene Stoeckel (Princeton Twsp. Rep). Staff present were Robert Barbian (City Administrator), Stephanie Hillesheim (Community Development Specialist), and Mary Lou DeWitt (Community Development).

Absent were Eldon Johnson and Jeff Reynolds.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON JUNE 17, 2019
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 2019. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO ADD TO NEW BUSINESS, ITEM B, APPROVAL OF DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:
A. #19-01 702 8th Avenue South Conditional Use Permit
Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Memo:

BACKGROUND
Chris Caskey has submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a detached garage in excess of 1,000 square feet and 15 feet in height. The property is located at 702 8th Avenue South in the R-3 Multi-family Residential Zoning District.

ANALYSIS
The subject parcel is located on the east side of 8th Avenue South in the middle of the block. The property contains a single-family home in the center of the lot and a detached garage south of the house.

The property owners are proposing to tear down the existing 24’ x 28’ (672 sq. ft.) detached garage and construct a new 28’ x 44’ (1,232 sq. ft.) detached garage in the same location. The new garage is proposed to match the color of the existing home along with asphalt shingles. The style of the proposed garage is shown on the attached photograph.

The property owner is requesting the larger size detached garage to store two vehicles, motorcycle, riding lawn mower, tools, and a camper. The height of the camper is the reasoning for the need for the additional height of two feet for the building.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
The proposed detached garage is 1,232 square feet and 17’ feet in height, which requires a conditional use permit in the R-3 Zoning District. The accessory building maximum square footage is 1,000 square feet and the maximum height limit in R-3 is 15 feet to the peak.
General CUP Review Standards
Subsection 3.B. of Chapter IV outlines the standards for review of a conditional use permit:

1. The proposed use does not violate the health, safety, or general welfare of Princeton residents.
Comment: No characteristics of the proposed use appear that they may violate the health, safety, or general welfare of the Princeton residents.

2. The proposed use has been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer in regards to erosion, runoff, water pollution, and sedimentation.
Comment: It does not appear that the proposed use will create any potential erosion, runoff, water pollution and sedimentation issues.

3. Adequate parking and loading is provided in compliance with the Ordinance.
Comment: The concrete slab provides adequate off-street parking for the home.

4. Possible traffic generation and access problems have been addressed.
Comment: No changes to the traffic generation or access are proposed with the CUP.

5. The proposed use can be accommodated with existing public services and will not overburden the city’s service capacity.
Comment: The detached garage does not create additional capacity to the city services.

6. The proposed use conforms to the City’s Comprehensive Plan and is compatible with present and future land uses of the area.
Comment: The act of updating to a new detached garage is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as it identifies on-going residential activities within the Vision and Plan portion, including the improvement of neighborhoods.

Staff Recommendation
It is City staff’s recommendation to approve the Conditional Use Permit to construct a detached garage where the total square footage would be in excess of 1,000 square feet and exceed the 15 feet in height, in the R-3 Zoning District with the following conditions:

1. The detached garage cannot be utilized for a business.

2. A building permit shall be obtained prior to construction.

3. The CUP shall be subject to the expiration terms of the Ordinance.

4. All siding and roofing used in residential construction shall consist of building materials in common use in residential construction and match the exterior of the principal structure.

End of Memo
Memo from Chris Caskey, applicant:

Princeton Planning Commission,
I’m requesting to construct a detached garage that is larger in square footage and taller than the normal size and height.

I’m requesting this because I have a camper which would require a tall door to get inside and would raise overall height of the garage taller than the normal maximum height of fifteen feet. The overall height of the purposed garage would be just under seventeen feet. So I’m requesting approval for seventeen feet.

The square footage increase I’m requesting is due to the large size of the camper combined with my other two vehicles. I would like to get all of these inside the garage. Both vehicles have sustained hail damage from sitting outside in the past. The square footage of the purposed garage would be 1,232 square feet.

I also have a motorcycle, riding lawn mower and tools that I would like to get inside the garage as well.

Thank you, Chris Caskey

Second memo from Chris Caskey:

Princeton Planning Commission,
The garage will look like this picture but the roof will have less of a pitch to keep the overall height lower.

I will be replacing the shingles on the house so everything will match.

The siding will be LP Smart Side lap siding that will match the house in appearance and color.

Fascia and trim will be painted to match the house.

The garage doors will be painted to match the front door of the house.

DeWitt gave an overview of the conditional use permit request. She then introduced Chris Caskey to the Planning Commission Board.

Chris Caskey, applicant said the reason he needed the larger detached garage is so he can store all the stuff that is sitting outside. It will clean up his property. The current garage sits low to the ground and with this new one he wants to build it up. A couple storm sewer drains were put in the street a few years back because of issues with the street flooding, but there is still problems when the snow melts that his garage floods and the garage door freezes shut. He will
make sure the driveway slopes to the street like it should. His work is where he sells new tires and the customer contacts him, he orders them, and goes to their home to put them on. There is no business use at his home. No one comes to him. His service area is mostly the Twin Cities area. All installation of tires is done at their location. The tires are ordered per job, and he has to pay for them right away so he cannot afford to have tires on hand, plus there are about 50 different tire selections.

Moller asked if this new construction will solve the issue with the water.

Caskey said when they built the school across the street they must have built the street higher. When the storm drains were added in the street that helped a lot with flooding.

Hallin asked if the current garage slab will be removed and a new cement slab will be built up.

Caskey said yes.

Stoeckel suggested that instead of the smaller door as shown in his photo, he might want to make that one a little taller like the other door.

Caskey said he will have wood siding on this garage. The larger garage will help very much for storage and will work well. The new garage will be sufficient from the property lines. The garage will go closer to the house and back further on his property.

Barbian asked how far back it will be from the neighbor and would the water flow be going into his neighbor’s property with this new garage.

Caskey said the neighbor does not have an issue with this new garage and the water will not shift to the neighbor’s property. The neighbor’s property is built up.

Erickson opened the public hearing.

Tim Doyle, 608 8th Avenue South, is the neighbor to the north of this site and he supports this new garage.

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

MOLLER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO APPROVE ITEM #19-01 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A DETACHED GARAGE IN EXCESS OF 1,000 SQUARE FEET AND 15 FEET IN HEIGHT LOCATED AT 702 8TH AVENUE SOUTH, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE DETACHED GARAGE CANNOT BE UTILIZED FOR A BUSINESS.

2. A BUILDING PERMIT SHALL BE OBTAINED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
3. THE CUP SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE EXPIRATION TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE.

4. ALL SIDING AND ROOFING USED IN RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONSIST OF BUILDING MATERIALS IN COMMON USE IN RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION AND MATCH THE EXTERIOR OF THE PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE.

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

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Does the proposed use violate the health, safety or general welfare of the Princeton residents? No.

2. Has the proposed use been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer in regards to erosion, runoff, water pollution, and sedimentation (if applicable)? Yes.

3. Is adequate parking and loading provided in compliance with the Ordinance? Yes.

4. Have possible traffic generation and access problems been addressed? Yes.

5. Can the proposed use be accommodated with existing public services and not overburden the City’s service capacity? Yes.

6. Does the proposed use conform to the City’s Comprehensive Plan and is compatible with present and future land uses of the area? Yes.

Are there conditions that could be attached to the granting of a permit that would mitigate any potential the adverse impact? No.

The Planning Commission approves the Conditional Use Permit, based on the Findings of Fact, with the noted conditions.

B. #19-02 Variance, Vacation, and Re-plat of Meadow View Estates First Addition
Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Development Memo:

REQUEST
Adam Price, Developer has submitted the Meadow View Estates 8th Addition Preliminary and Final Plat application for review. The plat involves the creation of four (4) twin home lots from the platted six (6) townhome lots as currently described as Meadow View Estates First Addition, Block 1, Lots 13-18. See attachment.

BACKGROUND
The subject property is located east of 11th Avenue South and north of 3rd Street South. The site is in Meadow View Estates First Addition that was platted in 2001 with R-3 Multiple Residential Zoning. The current plat is a high-density townhouse area and with the availability
of re-platting Lots 13-18 to twin homes.

**ANALYSIS**
Meadow View Eighth Addition proposes Lots 1-4, Block 1, on what is currently known as Meadow View Estates First Addition, Lots 13-18, which is located on the south end of Meadow View First Addition plat, north of 3rd Street South.

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/final plat must be reviewed and approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council. The necessary public hearing notices have been sent to the property owners 350 feet from the site.

The Planning Commission & City Council reviewed the Concept Plan of this Meadow View Estates 8th Addition plat. There are a few conditions that will need to be met and those will be listed in the conditions of approval.

**ZONING**

**Lot Size & Width:**
The Developer wanted to utilize the site for twin homes rather than the traditional townhome consisting of three or more units attached to one another. Staff checked with legal counsel and it was determined acceptable to use the townhome regulations for twin homes where more than one set is in a row.

The minimum lot area is 5,000 square feet for townhome end lots and all four lots meet the requirement. The minimum lot width for end lots is 50’ ft. and Lot 1 is 45’ ft, short 5’ ft. The end lot width minimum is 40 ft. and Lots 2 and 3 are 37’ft., short 3’ ft.

**Variance for minimum Lot Widths:**
The applicant has submitted a variance application for Lot 1 for the minimum lot width for end lot requirement of 50’ ft., short by 5’ ft. and Lot 2 and 3 minimum lot width requirements of 40’ ft., short by 3’ ft. each. A public hearing will be held by the Planning Commission prior to the Preliminary & Final Plat review. If the review standards are met, the Planning Commission can approve the variance with the condition of the Final Plat approval.

**General Variance Review Standards**
Subsection 3.B of Chapter IV outlines the standards for review of a Variance:
1. Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?
   **Comment:** Yes, the general purpose and intent of the R-3 District is to create multiple family residents.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?
   **Comment:** Yes, the Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Traditional Residential to provide more land suitable for creating new residential neighborhoods which includes upscale housing.
3. Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?
Comment: Yes, this site is zoned R-3, multiple residential and is in a neighborhood of mixed townhomes and twin homes.

4. Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?
Comment: Yes, because of the unique shape of this property and large utility & drainage easement, a variance is needed to get the full use of the site.

5. Will issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?
Comment: Yes, the issuance of a variance to allow twin homes built on the site maintains the essential character of the area.

6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?
Comment: Yes, the request for this variance is do to the unique shape of the lot. Granting the variance will allow the applicant to maximize space and is appropriate land use.

**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. The applicant will provide documentation from townhome association neighboring this proposed plat whether it will be joining the association and what they propose for lawn care. If sprinkler irrigation is installed, the PUC requires separate meters. No landscaping in the clear view area at the corner of 3rd Street and 11th Avenue South.

**Other Regulations:**
The propose twinhomes shall meet all regulations, including setbacks, height, type, minimum floor area, driveway, etc. If the driveways are not finished, and the builder is requests a certificate of occupancy, an escrow will be required. Verification that the proposed development will be in the association where the private driveway access and maintenance is included.

**Sanitary Sewer and Water Services:**
There are currently six (6) existing sanitary sewer and water services that were installed for original lot configuration. Princeton Public Utilities requires the Developer in a replat to abandon all unused laterals at the main. The PUC has approved the Developer to vacate the two water services on Lots 3 and 4, at the driveway connection. The Public Works Director stated the two extra laterals for sewer do not need capping.

**Vacation of Easements:**
The Meadow View Estates First Addition original plat has drainage & utility easements that will need to be vacated. There is also a 100’ ft. Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency Power Line Easement that SMMPA will give written release approval to reduce this to 96’ ft. Keith Butcher, GM of Princeton Public Utilities has indicated that SMMPA granting the reduction of the easement by 4’ ft. will also reference the specific drawings submitted showing on Lot 4 the encroachment of the eve overhanging in the SMMPA easement by 1’6” ft.
The applicant has submitted a vacation application and the City Council called for a public hearing July 25th.

New drainage and utility easements are to be dedicated in the plat of Meadow View Estates 8th Addition and are shown on the final plat. In addition, it is recommended that a pedestrian trail easement be included.

The City Council has final approval of the Final Plat. If the Planning Commission approves the Preliminary and Final Plat they will recommend approval to the City Council contingent upon the Council’s vacation of easements.

CONCLUSION
If the recommended conditions are met, the Variance, Preliminary Plat and Final Plat meet the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance standards, therefore, the Planning Commission would recommend approval to the City Council of the Drainage and Utility Vacation Easements and Final Plat, subject to:

1) Abandoning the two unused water service laterals in the driveway on Lot 3 & 4.

2) Separate meter for sprinkler irrigation if installed.

3) Provide association documentation subject to legal review approval.

4) SMMPA provide documentation for releasing 4’ ft. of the 100’ ft. Southern MN Municipal Power Agency Power Line Easement with reference of the encroachment of the 1’6” ft. eve overhanging in the SMMPA easement.

5) If due to weather conditions the sodding and/or seeding and driveway asphalt installation is unadvisable an escrow deposit be submitted prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

6) No landscaping in the clear view area of 3rd Street and 11th Avenue South.

7) All necessary building permit applications need to be submitted and approved by the Building Inspector prior to building.

DeWitt gave an overview of the Variance, Preliminary Plat & Final Plat then introduced Adam Price, Developer.

Adam Price, said that nothing has really changed from the concept plan. He is working with SMMPA and will get the paper work along with the documents from the Townhome Association. There will be a little bit of landscaping around the twin homes, otherwise
everything will stay the same.

Barbian said until we have the documentation, we cannot allow the building to begin.

DeWitt said we will need the documentation prior to recording of the resolutions and final plat.

Erickson opened the public hearing.

Carol Smith, 202 11th Avenue South is a resident of the townhome association. She said it is the same property that this new plat is going to be part of. She likes the plans for that land and just had a few questions that had been answered while listening to the overview.

Barbian told Price that they do need to establish the 14’ foot pedestrian trail in the plans.

Smith said they still need dialogue on redoing the bylaws for the Townhome Association. They will have their attorney involved.

Barbian commented that Price’s attorney could make a proposal and documentation where it could be simpler.

Smith said they have spoken to their attorney and he has plans to work on it, it could be costly for him with the attorney’s involved. They welcome more members in the association. She asked Price how much he intends to sell the twin homes for.

Price said $200,000.

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

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE FOR THE RE-PLAT OF MEADOW VIEW ESTATES FIRST ADDITION, LOTS 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, AND 18, BLOCK 1, PID’S #24-550-0130 THRU #24-550-0180, IN THE R-3 ZONING DISTRICT, TO BE PLATTED INTO MEADOW VIEW 8TH ADDITION, LOTS 1-4, BLOCK 1, WHERE LOT 1 MINIMUM LOT WIDTH FOR END LOT REQUIREMENT OF 50’ FEET., SHORT BY 5’ FEET, AND LOT 2 AND 3 MINIMUM LOT WIDTH REQUIREMENTS OF 40’ FEET, SHORT BY 3’ FEET EACH, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE VACATION OF EASEMENTS REQUEST AND FINAL PLAT OF MEADOW VIEW ESTATES 8TH ADDITION PLAT. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
A variance may be granted with 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.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, new layout for twin homes.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.
The Princeton Planning Commission approved.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF ITEM #19-02 PRELIMINARY & FINAL PLAT FOR MEADOW VIEW ESTATES 8TH ADDITION CONTINGENT THE COUNCIL APPROVE THE DRAINAGE AND UTILITY VACATION EASEMENTS ALONG WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
1) ABANDONING THE TWO UNUSED WATER SERVICE LATERALS IN THE DRIVEWAY ON LOT 3 & 4.
2) SEPARATE METER FOR SPRINKLER IRRIGATION IF INSTALLED.
3) PROVIDE ASSOCIATION DOCUMENTATION SUBJECT TO LEGAL REVIEW APPROVAL.
4) SMMPA PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION FOR RELEASING 4’ FT. OF THE 100’ FT. SOUTHERN MN MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY POWER LINE EASEMENT WITH REFERENCE OF THE ENCROACHMENT OF THE 1’6” FT. EVE OVERHANGING IN THE SMMPA EASEMENT.
5) THE 14’ FT. PEDESTRIAN TRAIL EASEMENT BE INCLUDED ON THE PLAT.
6) IF DUE TO WEATHER CONDITIONS, THE SODDING AND/OR SEEDING AND DRIVEWAY ASPHALT INSTALLATION IS UNADVISABLE AN ESCROW DEPOSIT BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
7) NO LANDSCAPING IN THE CLEAR VIEW AREA OF 3RD STREET AND 11TH AVENUE SOUTH.
8) ALL NECESSARY BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS NEED TO BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE BUILDING INSPECTOR PRIOR TO BUILDING.

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

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:
A. Comprehensive Land Use Plan
Barbian said this is a broad scope of what we could have for influence of the area and in the
township. Princeton Township is here and can review it. Look at the transportation area. Most properties ends up for housing. Hwy 169 is a heavy collector with lots of use.

Stoeckel said the airport fly zone showing on this map is the old one.

Barbian said yes, we will have to wait until we go to the airport and have a joint powers meeting with the two townships and such. He is not sure on all the brown area and has to look at it more. Zone A is right off the runway and Zone B allows quite a few different uses. A six plex condo could be allowed. Six unit apartment would be allowed. Increasing the reserve area in Zone A and B. Someone is looking at the 40 acres for a use to accommodate a housing development. Zone A will have to be changed where it is not industrial.

Erickson asked on the 40 acre parcel.

Barbian said they are looking at TIF for the infrastructure to bring out to the 40 acres. It would be good to have the revised Comprehensive Plan approved.

Moller asked if the townships will have any points of view on this.

Barbian said he would like the Planning Commission and Council to approve it and then bring it to the townships. Let us know if you see any modifications. Barbian mentioned urban reserve zoning. Some areas outside residential and do a ghost plat. For example, 40 acres with a road entrance would be set up on one site and then establish two other sites, but only can build on one. So now take an 80 acre parcel and split it into ¾ lots with sewer and water. With the ghost platting idea, one house can build with having sewer and water and once they sell lots those will help pay for the lots. Another example is 75 acres and reserve an outlot 1 and when sewer and water are brought in, then the other lots can be sold. There is a reserve on the larger pieces. This would be subdivided for when sewer and water are able to connect. This is an example of helping an area grow without making them into two acres sites.

The Planning Commission Board liked the idea of the ghost plat.

**B. Downtown Guidelines**

Hillesheim asked if the Planning Commission have reviewed the guidelines. We have to set them in place to be able to use them.

Erickson said there was a little misconception of what it is and thought we were telling the property owner what they had to do. This is just a way to use the grant funds for the downtown. We are not forcing them to do anything.

Hillesheim said it would be used for direction that we would like, but not forced to use unless using the funding.

Barbian commented that there is not much funds for this.
Moller liked the concepts, but it is not enough grant funds to help them make the changes to their building.

Barbian said he is working on something that might have a small amount available.

Erickson said piece by piece maybe they could do to update their buildings. He would like to wait until they have the other two Planning Commission members are at the meeting. Put on as old business for the next meeting.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:
A. Verbal Report
   1) Building Permits
   DeWitt gave an overview of the June 2019 Building Permit list.

B. City Council Minutes for June, 2019
   The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:50 P.M.

ATTEST:

___________________________________________________________
Dan Erickson, Chair                                                 Mary Lou DeWitt, Community Development