The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Victoria Hallin. Members present were Dan Erickson, and Jeff Reynolds. Staff present were Jolene Foss (Comm. Dev. Director) and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assistant).

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON JULY 17, 2017**

There was not a quorum for the August 21, 2017 meeting.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ERICKSON, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2017. UPON THE VOTE THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

**AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:**

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ERICKSON, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

A. #17-04 Rezoning 609 County Road #18 South to R-3 Multi-Family Residential District

Community Development Director Memo:

**REQUEST**

East Central MN Habitat for Humanity and the City of Princeton have come to an agreement regarding the sale of real property and the development of affordable residential single family homes on the site that HUD/NSP funds were spent to remove substandard housing. That circumstance has initiated the need to rezone the property at 609 Old County Road 18 from MN-1 Industrial to R-3 Multiple Family Residential. The property is described as: City of Princeton, TR “A” of 10/80 Survey #M-1285 in SW of SW, Lying W of County Road #18, PID #24-033-0361, Section 33, Township 36, Range 26.

**BACKGROUND**

Previously, this parcel had substandard housing and the home was demolished by the City of Princeton using Neighborhood Stabilization Funds administered through MN Housing Finance Agency.

**Applicant Request**

The Zoning Administrator is requesting the rezoning for the purpose of selling the property to East Central MN Habitat for Humanity for the sole purpose of constructing a single family home.

**ANALYSIS**

Existing Conditions: The neighborhood in which this parcel is located contains industrial parcels to the south and residential parcels to the north. This parcel is contiguous to R-3 Multiple Family Residential.
Future Land Use Plan (Comprehensive Plan): The City engaged in a Comprehensive Plan update back in 2009 that identified the long-range goals for development within the City. This rezoning is compatible with future land uses.

Review Standards: The Zoning Ordinance does not list review standards for rezoning applications. However, many communities utilize the following factors as review standards in rezoning request, which are being provided as information:

1. The proposed action has been considered in relation to the specific policies and provisions of and has been found to be consistent with the official City Comprehensive Plan.

2. The proposed use is or will be compatible with present and future land uses of the area.

3. The proposed use conforms to all performance standards contained in the code.

4. The proposed use can be accommodated with existing public services and will not overburden the city’s service capacity.

5. Traffic generation by the proposed use is within capabilities of streets serving the property.

CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION
City staff is in favor of providing affordable housing in the City of Princeton and supports investment in the housing stock in order to improve neighborhoods and the quality of life for residents.

Therefore, staff would recommend approval of the rezoning request from MN-1 to R-3, based on the following findings:

1. The request is consistent with the recent finding from the East Central Regional Housing Collaborative study and will provide an additional rental until where a demand has been identified.

2. The request to rezone this properly would not be greatly affect the integrity of the neighborhood as it is adjacent to R-3 Multi-Family Housing.

Hallin opened the public hearing. There was no one in the audience to speak on this.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ERICKSON, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.
ERICKSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL OF ITEM #17-04 REZONING OF 609 COUNTY ROAD #18 SOUTH, PID #24-033-0361, FROM MN-1 INDUSTRIAL TO R-3 MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the rezoning consistent with the Princeton Land Use Plan? Yes.
2. Have there been changes in the character of development in the vicinity? No.
3. Does the rezoning constitute spot zoning of the property? No.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Monument Sign at 903 & 905 West Branch Street

Community Development Assistant Memo:

Princeton Leased Housing Assoc. would like to install a monument sign at their 903 & 905 West Branch Street location. Only one monument sign is allowed at the entrance of the apartment site. There had been a sign on site and that was removed and this sign will be replacing it. The sign will not be illuminated. The sign size would be a total 34.51 square feet which falls under the maximum monument sign size of 40 square feet. The placement of the sign would be approximately 43 feet from the center of the road and 10 feet in from the entrance. This will be back from the tree on the property and should not inflict with the drivers view of entering the site or exiting. Public Works Director has no issues with the placement.

Monument sign – a sign where the extent of the sign surface is attached to the ground or a foundation in the ground; and where there are no poles, braces, or other visible means of support other than attachment to the ground.

Freestanding sign – any sign supported by structures or supports that are placed on, or anchored in, the ground and that are independent from any building or other structure.

Signs Requiring Planning Commission Approval: The Planning Commission may, in its discretion, issue a permit authorizing construction of freestanding signage. The replacement of an existing sign shall require Zoning Administrator approval. The granting of a permit will be subject to the following conditions:

The signage requested falls under the monument signs restrictions.
E. Residential and Business Monument Signs – General Provisions:

1. Only one permanent residential entrance ground sign shall be allowed per each entrance to a residential subdivision or other residential development, including townhome, condominium, apartment, and manufactured home developments.

2. Only external illumination shall be permitted for residential entrance ground signs. Neon and internal illuminations are prohibited. Internal illuminations are allowed only if approved by the Planning Commission as part of a Planned Unit Development for a multi-family development (rev. 11-08-07; Ord. 608).

3. The Sign shall be located on the property where the business or organization advertised is located.

4. There shall be no more than one monument sign per lot, except as provided in Section 1.

5. The maximum allowable sign areas and sign heights for business monument identification signs and residential entrance monuments are regulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Area, Single Site</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Height, Single Site</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Area, Multi-Tenant Site*</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Height, Multi-Tenant Site*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>40 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>6 Ft.</td>
<td>40 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>6 Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Planning Commission is in approval of the signage, the following conditions should be considered:

1. The sign height cannot exceed 6 sq. ft. and the maximum sign area cannot exceed 40 sq. ft.

2. The placement of the sign should not be any closer to the road then what is shown on the diagram.

3. The sign request is for non-illuminating signage.

4. Gopher One needs to be contacted prior to digging.

5. A Building Permit must be picked up prior to installation.

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

ERICKSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE MONUMENT/FREESTANDING SIGN AT 903 & 905 WEST BRANCH STREET FOR OAKWOOD COURT APARTMENTS, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
1. THE SIGN HEIGHT CANNOT EXCEED SIX SQUARE FEET AND THE MAXIMUM SIGN AREA CANNOT EXCEED 40 SQUARE FEET.

2. THE PLACEMENT OF THE SIGN SHOULD NOT BE ANY CLOSER TO THE ROAD THEN WHAT IS SHOWN ON THE DIAGRAM.

3. THE SIGN REQUEST IS FOR NON-ILLUMINATING SIGNAGE.

4. GOPHER ONE NEEDS TO BE CONTACTED PRIOR TO DIGGING.

5. A BUILDING PERMIT MUST BE PICKED UP PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.

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

B. RM-1 Residential Manufactured Housing Review
The intent of the RM-1 Residential Manufactured Housing District is to promote health, safety, order, convenience, and general welfare by enforcing minimum standards for mobile home parks, the location and use of mobile home parks, and the design, construction, alteration, and arrangement of homes on said lots, authorizing the inspection of mobile home parks, the licensing of operators, and fixing penalties for violations. No building or land shall be used and no building shall be erected, converted, or structurally altered, unless otherwise provided herein.

Foss said there is an interested Developer that is looking at a site south of Princeton. When she had spoken with them they had mentioned that some of the regulations in the RM-1 Residential Manufactured District seemed excessive and were asking if they could be modified.

Last week there was a preliminary meeting where the Developer proposed what he is considering for a manufactured home park. The City Engineer suggested that a Planned Unit Development may be possible for this development where they could make some changes from what the Ordinance requires.

Foss said they could still go through the Ordinance tonight and discuss any changes that may need to be changed. One item that was brought to her attention was the open space requirement of a minimum of 400 square feet per mobile home for play areas and open space within the mobile home park. There also needs to be 100 square feet per mobile home shall be provided to be used for compound parking space within the mobile home park. Foss believes this is unnecessary to have both restrictions. There is going to be parking at a club and a storm shelter is needed so may be it is needed to have it left as is.

Erickson said that 20’ x 20’ is two stalls at each mobile home and 100 square feet per mobile home is one stall for every other mobile home.
Reynolds said if they have 100 units they would need 50 additional parking spaces.

Foss said they are trying to avoid on street parking. Just keep it on site.

Erickson said the cost for parking is expensive.

Reynolds said with black top it does get expensive.

Foss said 100 square feet is for parking and how the Ordinance explains it, they would use their two spots upfront and cannot park on the street.

Erickson said a small parking stall would be around 9’ x 18’ and nicer size is 10’ x 18’. There might be some studies for a Planned Unit Development where parking is written in it.

Foss will leave the numbers as is.

Reynolds said these numbers can be a bit high.

Hallin said see what the Legion of MN Cities says on the parking for Mobile Home Parks.

Reynolds said he seen a Mobile Home Park in Otsego and it has less parking. Dayton has one where there is one parking spot per house and that is a nightmare.

Foss will look at the League parking requirements and what other areas have for compound parking. Foss mentioned that the Ordinance does not allow pole-type construction and wonders if they should be allowed with certain type of buildings. She could draft up a different paragraph for that.

Reynolds said a car port would be nice that has the overhang where nothing is outside.

Erickson said it is less costly also.

Hallin said the storage dumpsters need to be addressed. Should we request that they are enclosed.

Reynolds said he has seen in Mobile Home Parks where they have garbage cans at each mobile home.

Foss said she will look at the Ordinance and see if we need to have the dumpster areas screened.

Erickson said in the section of “Insect and Rodent Control” it speaks of screening, but that is about exterior openings in or beneath any structure shall be screened.
Foss will look into that one also and see what wording change if any is needed. She will bring this back next month for review.

C. Mini Storage in MN-1 District
Community Development Director Memo:

The Planning Commission made an adjustment to the Zoning Ordinance in December of 2016 to make Mini Storage an allowed use with a Conditional Use Permit rather than an Interim Use Permit in B-3 General Commercial District.

At that time, there was a discussion regarding where mini storage may be an appropriate land use. The Ordinance already prohibits mini storage facilities with 1,000 feet from another mini storage facility. The Planning Commission looked at the locations that mini storage could not go due to existing facilities.

There are B-3 Districts where mini storage could with a Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission approval. The City Council and EDA made certain criteria for the development of the B-3 Aero Business Park lots so that mini storage would not be encouraged and would not meet the requirements. That eliminates the North/West locations.

The B-3 zoning to the south is right along Rum River Drive near Princeton Auto, and not a likely spot for mini storage. The site next to Sterling Point is a location that could have mini storage.

A recent inquiry regarding ability to put mini storage in MN-1 Industrial caused Staff to refer to the Zoning Ordinance and found mini storage is not an allowed use with or without a Conditional Use Permit.

Staff is requesting the Planning Commission consider the definition of MN-1 Industrial: The intent of the MN-1 Industrial District is to provide a district for the development and operation of manufacturing, storage, and distribution type business. This district shall encourage the development of industrial uses which promote high-tech quality uses more likely to be compatible with existing uses and which shall be free of hazardous or objectionable elements such as noises, odor, dust, smoke, glare, or other pollutants.

Staff is requesting the Planning Commission consider the allowance of mini storage in MN-1 Industrial and adhered to the 1,000 foot buffer. If the Planning Commission would like to allow this type of development in MN-1 Staff will draft an Ordinance Amendment for review.

End of Staff Memo*

Foss said a few months back we discussed allowing mini storage in the B-3 District. It is not allowed in MN-1 District and the Planning Commission said they would not want it allowed in the MN-1 District. She thought it would be good to bring back with the definition of MN-1 District and the intent for that district. Look at the map provided outlining where mini storage
units could be with the 1,000 square feet buffer. For Aero Business Park the criteria is where they are not allowed. The area by Princeton Auto she does not see them going there. There is a site by the area we just rezoned that they could be allowed. Over by Plastic Products is an area that is MN-1 District and then along Crystal Cabinets area that ECM owns and also by Sylva.

Erickson commented that there are storage units in the Industrial Park that he had own and sold. Why is there that 1,000 buffer.

Foss was not aware of those storage units. She is not sure, maybe to limit the number of storage units is the reason for the 1,000 foot buffer.

Hallin said check with the League of MN Cities on why there would be that 1,000 foot buffer.

Erickson said he would be okay with eliminating the 1,000 foot buffer if it is not necessary.

Hallin would like to keep the 1,000 foot buffer so we are not using land that could be a job created area.

Reynolds said if there is a need for Industrial land the mini storages units are easy to take down. They can sell it and someone else can tear it down if they have a more profitable use.

Erickson said you want to be closer to residential for mini storage and not a business.

Foss said the site in question is by residential. It seems like a logical place for mini storage. Foss will check it out. She thinks to eliminate the 1,000 foot buffer would create too many mini storages. Foss will get back to the Planning Commission on their questions.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS
A. Verbal Report
There was no verbal report.

B. City Council Minutes for August, 2017
The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY ERICKSON, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:47 P.M.

ATTEST:

_________________________________________  __________________________________________
Victoria Hallin, Chair                      Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant