



DRAFT

**THE MEETING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON OCTOBER 19, 2020 AT
7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Dan Erickson. Members present were Eldon Johnson, Victoria Hallin, Jeff Reynolds, and Gene Stoeckel (Princeton Twsp. Rep). Staff present were Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Zoning Specialist) and per Zoom were Stephanie Hillesheim (Com. Dev. Specialist) and Robert Barbian (Administrator).

Absent was Scott Moller.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2020

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2020. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:

DeWitt added to New Business, Item B, Erdman Replacement Monument Sign.

REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO ADD TO THE AGENDA UNDER NEW BUSINESS, ITEM B, ERDMAN REPLACEMENT MONUMENT SIGN. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Concept Plan for First Street Apartments

Developer's Memo:

Project Narrative: 1st Street Apartments (working title)

Request for Concept Plan Review of a multifamily development located on 1st Street between 21st Avenue and 97th Avenue in the City of Princeton on approximately 15 acres of land currently zoned A-1 Agricultural.

Proposed use is a multi-phase two 75 unit, 3 floor multi-family buildings with 1 level of underground parking located on the southern 10 acres off 1st Street. The first phase will consist of site improvements and the construction of a single, 75 unit building with the second phase to construct a similar 75 unit building adjacent to the first. Each building will consist of a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom units with final breakdown based on an in process market study. The northern 5 acres development plan has currently not been established.



DRAFT

Based on the estimated costs of the project and market demographics, applicant shall be requesting TIF funding to complete the project.

About the Developer:

Broadway Investors II, LLC is owned by Erik Winegarden and David Lundy, both residents of the Twin Cities. Erik and David have worked together for 10+ years in the real estate field, successfully developing both residential and multi-family projects in Minnesota. Most recently the team development the NOVO apartment project in Richfield, MN, a 192 unit market rate multi-family building. The NOVO project is currently under construction with an anticipated fall 2021 opening.

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

Dave Lundy and Todd Olin were present via Zoom. Lundy said he wanted to present this exciting project to Princeton. Todd Olin has been working on a project in Princeton and they thought this property site would be a good area for their concept plan for an apartment site. The project would be a multi-family apartment with two mirror buildings with 75 units each. It would be a multiphase project. It would be three stories with an underground garage. The site plan shows how the proposed buildings would layout. They are waiting for a full market study. They wanted to hear what the Planning Commission Board has for comments or questions on the proposed project.

Johnson said his issue with the project is there is another 50 plus apartment site that will be building across First Street. These will be two competing projects that would not fill up. More research needs to be done to see what Princeton needs and what capacity we would need. There is a sixteen unit apartment site that just has been completed and operable for two months that is not filled yet. Zimmerman and south of there are filled up before completion. Princeton has been at 4,700 population for fifteen years and we need more jobs like manufacturing here so we can grow. We need to bring people in who are gainfully employed.

Lundy said he appreciates Johnson's concerns. He has done research and seen Sherburne Counties survey that shows a demand for this type of project and is having his own study done. He is aware of the project to the south of this site. He understands not to overbuild a community.

Johnson said there is a major development going on in Zimmerman right now.

Lundy said is he aware of that.

Johnson said we need to do our own research to see what we come up with for a need here. Moller is out of town and has texted Johnson saying that he is trying to connect to the Zoom invite to be part of the meeting and make some comments, but has not been able to connect.

Hillesheim said she attended a Sherburne County EDA meeting and rural area are not dying, but being absorbed by urban communities. It is not jobs creating housing, it is the way people

commute and their life styles. The way people move and choose to live is not what was in the past. Jobs do not bring people only. It is the community and living in a rural community.

Hallin agrees, people are moving out of the twin cities. They are moving more to the rural area. Several studies have been done and affordable housing is on the top of the list. She thinks the concept plan is wonderful and this concept would be utilized and filled. She likes the Developer is doing his own study also.

Stoeckel said last month at the Planning Commission meeting was the apartment complex and having these two separate sites would be over 300 units.

Hillesheim said the predictions of Sherburne County Housing Study is we need housing here. We need to grow with housing.

Barbian likes to see the market working and we may or may not have a Developer that is moving on their project so this new project would be good.

Erickson said it could flood the market and be bad for everyone if both built.

Barbian said the one project has not gone to the development stage and the Developer had done this five years ago where he got to the TIF point and backed off on developing.

Johnson said that happened in 2007 when the Developer started the project and the market tanked so he backed out.

Barbian said that when we went through the first project for one TIF Program for two projects. Perhaps there is something from this project that could make it work. There was a comment tonight from the Planning Commission about there being quite a few units. Would Lundy be interested in putting up one building.

Lundy said one building is good, but two would be better for cost. The market will determine the units and pace they are built. They will see what the market study shows.

Reynolds asked what percentage is market rate.

Lundy said market rate and then what is necessary with TIF Financing. TIF will be necessary for them to develop this area.

Barbian said they talked about utilizing TIF and they do require a percentage of apartments to be low income and the rest of them can be market rate. The Developer would need to meet the TIF supplement. If they do not meet the requirements, they would lose the TIF Financing. One building could be used with the Tax Increment Financing and the second one that would be built down the road may not need it. Hard to predict the future.

Johnson proposed to have a hold on this until the next Planning Commission meeting where we can get some background on this. He is concerned with the amount of apartment we will have here. We might not need all of them.

Barbian said that single family housing is needed and TIF can be used for that also.

Johnson said either way there is only so much housing you can absorb. Cambridge grew like crazy and Princeton has to prepare first. He does not want Princeton to become a bedroom community. We need work force also. The TIF financing does not contribute to the schools and there could be children in the apartments and schools will need an income from this. Another month will not make a difference for them to wait and see what the study says.

Erickson asked when they will have their future study done.

Lundy said 45-60 days out for the affordable and market housing study. There is a backlog on the studies.

Hillesheim said that the previous studies show that Princeton has an even amount of those that work and live here and some that leave to work outside. Housing is the one area we do not see growing here much.

Barbian said this is on the agenda for the Planning Commission for them to comment on the project and if they want to make a recommendation to the City Council they can.

Johnson said his point is if we have not had any major construction here for some time and now we have a couple 50 plus unit apartment sites wanting to build at the same time. Now we could be over built with apartment sites. We cannot handle the buildings not being filled up. Building one at a time, not two.

Barbian said we do not have a development agreement right now with the first proposal.

Erickson commented that he owns large apartment buildings that are market rate and he has had full capacity for three years. We do not want to saturate the market it should be first come first serve. One project should go.

Stoeckel said last month the other apartment site was brought to the Planning Commission that was asking for the TIF funding and it was discussed how this will put hardship on the School District to not get any taxes for a number of years.

Johnson was on the School District Board for years and understands the school side when TIF funding is used and the schools would have more children with no extra funding.

Erickson asked Lundy if his study shows how many school age children would occupy the units.

Lundy said yes.

Johnson said rental housing is the starting point for most families. They do not live in an apartment their whole life.

Erickson said people are not having children as early in life anymore either.

Lundy said people with active life styles where they are not tied to their homes and the maintenance that goes with it, this project would be great for also.

Johnson said this is not a 55 plus concept plan project.

Reynolds said there are market rate mixed developments and believes there is a demand right now and if we do not meet it, someone else will.

Hallin supports this project.

Barbian said the Planning Commissions comments are mixed. Sounds like they do not support two apartment buildings, but would support one. Maybe other products for other land.

Erickson said to proceed with caution and first come first serve.

Johnson said a study is needed.

Hillesheim said we have three fairly recent studies. She will email them to the Planning Commission Board. They were done by different companies.

Johnson said his standpoint is he would like to see each place with a 50 unit apartment. We should get the concept and other Developer get his stuff in and we decide which way to go. We do not want to jump in this from going to nothing to way overboard.

Lundy said he understands Johnson's concerns. He read what Princeton had for their market studies and is doing his own study. He would like to move forward with this.

Stoeckel asked how long of a TIF funding they are looking for.

Barbian said there is an analysis for TIF financing and we have different ways to provide that. It is the City who determines the amount of time for the TIF financing. The financials will be based on that.

Lundy said they would desire a shorter TIF term and will have to see what the dollar amount would be to make the project viable. He cannot put the TIF length out there yet, but would like less than 25 years.

Stoeckel said last month at the Planning Commission meeting they were told about the other

apartment site that is requesting TIF funding. The Planning Commission made a motion to only do a 15 year TIF.

Barbian said they did request a 25 year TIF financing, but we have not gotten to that point yet to determine what will happen.

Erickson thank Lundy and Olin for attending the meeting.

Lundy said he knows Scott Moller wanted to make some comments tonight and if staff could email those to him he would appreciate it.

B. Erdmans Replacement Monument Sign

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Zoning Specialist Memo:

Erdman Automation would like to replace their current monument on-site sign with a new one. The sign will be in the same landscaped area by their main office building. The new sign will have the Erdman text internally lit and will have an exterior light to only illuminate the flag pole. The site is located in the MN-1 Industrial District and internal illuminations is permitted. With the addition of having an external light on the top corner of the sign, directed at the 25 foot flag pole, staff wanted the Planning Commission's input for approval. Please see the diagram.

MN-1 District maximum sign area is 100 sq. ft. and the proposed sign is 48 sq. ft. Maximum sign height is 10 ft. and this sign will be 8 ft. in height.

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 multifamily 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



DRAFT

signs and residential entrance monuments are regulated as follows: Maximum Sign Area, 100 Sq. Ft., and maximum sign height 10 Ft.

Johnson and Hallin liked the new sign and the light directed at the flag.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE REPLACEMENT OF THEIR CURRENT MONUMENT SIGN FOR ERDMAN AUTOMATION LOCATED 1603 14TH STREET SOUTH, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE SIGN HEIGHT CANNOT EXCEED 10 SQUARE FEET AND THE MAXIMUM SIGN AREA CANNOT EXCEED 100 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 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: MAXIMUM SIGN AREA, 100 SQUARE FOOT, AND MAXIMUM SIGN HEIGHT 10 FEET.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report

DeWitt passed out the September, 2020 Building Permit list. Mostly remodels.

B. City Council Minutes for September, 2020

The Planning Commission Board has no comments.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:59 P.M.

ATTEST:

Dan Erickson, Chair

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Zoning Specialist