

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING – PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, February 4, 2025 – 6:00 p.m.
Mississippi Room, Monticello Community Center

Commissioners Present: Chair Andrew Tapper, Vice-Chair Melissa Robeck,
Rick Kothenbeutel, Teri Lehner, Rob Stark
Council Liaison Present: Councilmember Kip Christianson
Staff Present: Angela Schumann, Steve Grittman, Bob Ferguson, Tyler Bevier

1. General Business

A. Call to Order

Chair Andrew Tapper called the regular meeting of the Monticello Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Andrew Tapper called the roll.

C. Council Liaison Introduction

Andrew Tapper introduced Councilmember Kip Christianson as the 2025 council liaison.

D. Consideration of Additional Agenda Items

None

E. Approval of Agenda

ROB STARK MOVED TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 4, 2025 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION, MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

F. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- **Regular Meeting Minutes – January 7, 2025**
MELISSA ROBECK MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 7, 2025 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES. ANDREW TAPPER SECONDED THE MOTION, MOTION CARRIED, 5-0.
- **Workshop Meeting Minutes – January 7, 2025**
ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 7, 2025 WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES. MELISSA ROBECK SECONDED THE MOTION, MOTION CARRIED, 5-0.

G. Citizen Comment

None

2. Public Hearings

A. Consideration of an Amendment to the Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan (Comprehensive Plan), Chapter 3, "Land Use, Growth and Orderly Annexation" amending the Light Industrial Park, Employment Campus designations and any other related sections of text necessary to define various types of technology industry land uses within the City, identify considerations for their appropriate locations, and maintain consistency with other City land use goals and policies.
Applicant: City of Monticello

City Planner Steve Grittman gave an overview of the role and responsibilities of the Comprehensive Plan and introduced the proposed amendment. Planner Grittman explained that a Comprehensive Plan amendment is intended to attempt to address a mistake, error, or changing conditions that are driving the review. The changing conditions for review this evening are the industrial land use categories of the 2040 Plan.

Planner Grittman began with the Employment Campus industrial designation, stating that the Employment Campuses are industrial uses specifically intended to provide employment-based activities and can interact with commercial uses. These are often light industrial park uses or similar uses that speak to a higher employment count, although employment may not be the only factor for location within this designation.

The General Industrial Land Use designation is catered towards heavy industrial uses that may have additional demand for supporting outdoor infrastructure or storage and may have other impacts requiring mitigation.

Planner Grittman stated that the proposed amendment is to consider whether to incorporate data centers into the 2040 Plan's industrial land use designations and determine the appropriate designation.

Staff propose that the Light Industrial Park designation of the 2040 Plan is the most appropriate for this type of use. Light Industrial Park is generally lower in employment generation than Employment= Campus, yet may have high taxable value. He noted that the land use designations may have blended characteristics where they converge in uses and intensities. Staff is seeking Planning Commission input on what classification is best suited for data centers for the community long-term.

Steve Grittman spoke to the report discussion around data centers and reminded policymakers of past workshops and meetings that reviewed data center uses. These discussions noted aspects of high taxpaying land-use, yet low employment

generation. Steve Grittman spoke to the City's goals for a diverse tax base and high paying jobs. He indicated that data centers meet the goal of diverse tax base, yet often do not meet the goal of high employment count. This should be kept in mind in the amendment process to reserve land for other industrial uses that have high employment count in order to balance these factors and City goals.

Steve Grittman walked through the proposed modifications to the technology park language of the Plan in both the Employment Campus and Light Industrial Park designation and spoke to the difference between technologic manufacturing production compared to the processing of data only, such as a data center. Data centers would not be allowed in either the Employment Campus or General Industrial land use designations under the amendment.

Steve Grittman then reviewed the proposed language for data center allowance within the Light Industrial Park, which is intended to address the unique aspects of the use itself. The language proposed is intended that provide that proposed locations for data centers do not conflict with other land uses, especially residential; that they do not create shortages in land supply, utility services or electric generation, and that data centers are adequately serviced by local municipal utilities and infrastructure.

Andrew Tapper began with an overview of what was presented for consideration as a first step and spoke to the fact that future decisions would also be forthcoming as related to data centers uses.

Andrew Tapper verified that the amendment is intended to allow data centers coming within the community. He asked why staff did not feel that data centers were appropriate for the General or Heavy Industrial designation. Steve Grittman stated that staff feel that General Industrial land use is limited in the community, to manage impacts to the surrounding community. The classification as Light Industrial Park preserves the intended areas for aspects of less traffic generation and noise pollution than a General Industrial classification may allow, and cautioned against a more intense classification than Light Industrial Park should a data center not materialize.

Andrew Tapper asked if adding an overlay zoning in the future would mitigate specific issues and asked about a roadmap for the decision-making process. Steve Grittman agreed that there are more appropriate areas within the Light Industrial Park land areas for data centers than others and spoke to the potential for changes to the I-1 district and a potential overlay district, which would set additional standards to be met for data centers as a two-step process. This would provide for additional leverage for locating data centers in the appropriate locations.

Andrew Tapper opened the public comment portion of the item.

Andrew Tapper closed the public comment portion of the item, hearing no comment from the public.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-06 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE MONTICELLO 2040 VISION + PLAN (COMPREHENSIVE PLAN), CHAPTER 3, "LAND USE, GROWTH AND ORDERLY ANNEXATION" AMENDING THE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PARK, EMPLOYMENT CAMPUS DESIGNATIONS AND RELATED SECTIONS OF TEXT NECESSARY TO DEFINE VARIOUS TYPES OF TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY LAND USES WITHIN THE CITY, IDENTIFY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THEIR APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS, AND MAINTAIN CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER CITY LAND USE GOALS AND POLICIES, BASED ON FINDINGS IN RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-06. MELISSA ROBECK SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIES, 5-0.

Consideration of an Amendment to the Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan (Comprehensive Plan), Chapter 3, "Land Use, Growth and Orderly Annexation" re-guiding certain parcels from their existing Development Reserve designations to alternative Light Industrial Park.
Applicant: Monticello Tech LLC

City Planner Steve Grittman indicated that the application from Monticello Tech LLC is to request to re-guide an approximately 250 acre area of Development Reserve land use designation to Light Industrial Park. The area proposed currently abuts the current guidance as Light Industrial Park.

Steve Grittman spoke to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan which guides the land outside of the city, yet within the Monticello Orderly Annexation Area (MOAA). He referenced the subject area guided Development Reserve and adjacent to Light Industrial Park designated land. He spoke to the rationale behind Development Reserve, which reserves land for development. The applicant is requesting to extend the Light Industrial Park designation into the Development Reserve space in this area.

Steve Grittman stated that the Monticello Zoning Ordinance provides the standards for reviewing Comprehensive Plan amendments, including whether the proposed amendment corrects an error or addresses the need resulting from a changing condition, trend, or fact arising since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. In this case, that is reflected through the previous item for amendment of the 2040 Plan to allow data centers within the Light Industrial Park land use pattern, and factoring in the unique and changing trend of data centers as a use.

Steve Grittman referred to data centers as capable of generating stable and diverse tax base. They can also produce high quality employment.

Steve Grittman discussed the extent to which the proposed amendment addresses a demonstrated community need, explaining that the community is still dependent on the nuclear power plant for tax base and this proposed amendment to Light Industrial Park creates opportunity to continue to diversify the tax base. He also noted that the City should consider whether the proposed amendment will protect the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the public.

Steve Grittman stated that the ordinance criteria for impacts on the natural and built environments, including air, water, noise, stormwater management, wildlife habitat, water quality, vegetation, drainage, streets, and other engineering design or environmental factors; were also addressed and will continue to be addressed with any future land use application, as will whether proposed development can be served with existing or future infrastructure.

Also considered are criteria of whether the proposed amendment is compatible with existing and proposed uses surrounding the subject property and whether the proposed design and land uses are appropriate for the land. Planner Grittman stated that with review standards both in the amendment language and potential future zoning amendments, as well as current zoning standards, the City will address how any proposed use is compatible with existing rural land use.

Finally, Planner Grittman referred to the criteria of whether the proposed amendment will maintain or improve compatibility among uses and ensure efficient development within the city and whether the proposed amendment will result in a logical, orderly and predictable development pattern. He stated that the proposed amendment is consistent with the notion of predicable growth and investment, and how the City can adapt to new development patterns.

Steve Grittman stated that the criteria for the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the purpose for Comprehensive Plan amendment and staff believe it meets the standards set through the zoning ordinance criteria for update.

Andrew Tapper expressed concern with the portion of the area to be re-guided nearest the lake area and stated that Parks Department may have a use there in the future with a new park, trail or preserve.

Rick Kothenbeutel asked for clarification on the extent of the greenway corridor. Steve Grittman responded, explaining that the City's adopted Natural Resources Inventory identifies this area as a natural resource corridor, although its final extent and configuration are established with development.

Andrew Tapper opened the public hearing portion of the agenda item.

Andrew Tapper invited the applicant to the podium.

Andrew Tapper invited the public to the podium.

Andrew Tapper asked again if anyone would like to speak at the podium for public comment.

Andrew Tapper closed the public hearing portion of the agenda item, hearing no public comment.

Andrew Tapper stated that the amendment is a logical extension of the current map guidance and leaves the Highway-25 frontage portion for future commercial

development. He stated there was sufficient buffers between residential developments.

Teri Lehner agreed that it is a natural progression.

ROB STARK MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-07 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A REQUEST FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE MONTICELLO 2040 VISION + PLAN (COMPREHENSIVE PLAN), CHAPTER 3, "LAND USE, GROWTH AND ORDERLY ANNEXATION" RE-GUIDING CERTAIN PARCELS AS DESCRIBED IN THE RESOLUTION FROM THEIR EXISTING DEVELOPMENT RESERVE DESIGNATIONS TO ALTERNATIVE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PARK DESIGNATION, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT Z AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION. ANDREW TAPPER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED, 5-0.

B. Consideration for Amendment to the Block 52 Planned Unit Development District for landscaping, lighting and screening conditions of the PUD approval.

Applicant: Mark Buchholz and City of Monticello

Community Development Director Angela Schumann began with an overview of the proposed amendments which are to the PUD's requirements for site screening, lighting and landscaping.

Angela Schumann described the site screening requirement for the utility meters, which was intended to shield large-scale metering. In this case, the current utility metering is smaller in scope and the proposed screening without the amendment would obstruct the sidewalk. Staff is recommending eliminating the screening requirement.

Angela Schumann spoke to the lighting conditions of the amendment, with the applicant providing architectural façade lighting both upward and downward. The applicant's photometric plan along Broadway and Pine Streets exceeds the ordinance maximum footcandle at property-line at 3.7, which is above the code maximum of 1.0 at property line. Staff stated that the architectural lighting avoids the impact of glare and recommends the requests the flexibility.

Angela Schumann continued that the flexibility regarding landscaping is also recommended. She noted that the base landscaping plan had been amended from the original approval to match the City's public streetscape in terms of species and design. She also explained that changes to the landscaping plan related to the retention of green space along the existing building to the west were made to improve the stormwater drainage and improve pedestrian travel. Sidewalk has been constructed where greenspace had been proposed on west side of the parking lot to continue to offer pedestrian circulation and access. Additionally, raised planters that were proposed at Broadway and Pine Street are proposed to be eliminated as they would be too close to the right of way. Staff is recommending approval of the amendment, yet spoke to retaining the condition requiring planters near the entrances to the building along Pine Street.

Rick Kothenbeutel asked about the planters and watering in the summer. Angela Schumann spoke to the internal watering system for the planters.

Andrew Tapper opened the public comment portion of the agenda item.

Andrew Tapper called for public comment.

Andrew Tapper closed the public comment portion of the agenda item.

Melissa Robeck stated that the applicant appears to have met the conditions and agreed with the planters near the entrances on Pine and Broadway Streets.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-008 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE BLOCK 52 PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AMENDING LANDSCAPING, LIGHTING AND SCREENING CONDITIONS OF THE PUD PER EXHIBIT Z OF FEBRUARY 4, 2025, CONTINGENT ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE BALANCE OF THE EXHIBIT Z CONDITIONS AS APPROVED ON JULY 11, 2022, AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION., ROB STARK SECONDED THE MOTION, MOTION CARRIED, 5-0.

3. Regular Agenda

A. Consideration of Rezoning to Planned Unit Development, Development Stage Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat for a proposed single-family residential including attached and detached unit development in an R-1 (Single-Family) Residential district
Applicant: JBP Land, LLC

City Planner Steve Grittman introduced the continued review from the tabled agenda items from the January 2025 meeting. He provided an overview of the proposal to deviate from the base ordinance standards of the R-1 Single-Family zoning.

Steve Grittman spoke to the history of the project, noting that this area was originally a portion of the Hunters Crossing subdivision that was not completed due to the 2008 recession. The applicant is seeking to move forward with residential development in the area with changes and revival for consideration.

Steve Grittman walked through the proposed standards for housing, landscaping, and the overall goals which provide a mix and variety for a full range of housing types for the proposed neighborhood. As requested by the Commission at the January meeting, staff met with the developer to discuss flexibility of the PUD from the R-1 standards.

Steve Grittman addressed each of the proposed standards as noted in the staff report. He indicated that the applicant is planning to meet the setbacks required. He then gave an overview of the minimum building sizes of 1,050 finished square feet and a minimum of 1,585 finishable square feet, with the exception of not more than 25% of the detached single-family lots at 1,355 square feet of finishable square foot home plans.

Steve Grittmann spoke to the garage sizes proposed by the applicant, with staff being comfortable with the 476' garage proposed by the applicant, even though the general recommendation is 480'.

Regarding the features of the front facades, Steve Grittmann spoke to the proposed PUD ordinance standard of a maximum of 30% of all single-family units may meet less than a 10% brick or stone requirement when a combination of board and batten, corbels, shakes, garage windows or other façade features exceed 20% of the front façade. This was followed by discussion of the livable portions of the home exposed to the front street not less than 40% of the width of the structure, or in the alternative, the addition of usable front porches or expanded front entry patios or entry features. Steve Grittmann concluded that the applicant may want to speak on the two remaining variations from the noted conditions which include the 40% livable area.

Regarding the front entry doors, the proposed PUD ordinance standard requires front entry doors no greater than 6 feet farther back from the garage doors, or in the alternative proposed, the addition of usable front porches or expanded front entry patios or entry features. The goal is to improve the visual appeal of the homes. The condition requiring the development to be in compliance with an anti-monotony plan as included in the PUD plans also remain.

Steve Grittmann spoke regarding the townhomes on the site with unit designs condition requiring adding 2' of depth to the garages and/or adjusting the units and lots to increase the length of the driveways for interior units. This was followed with the front façade requirements that shall meet a requirement of 10% brick/stone in combination with board and batten, corbels, shakes or other façade features exceeding 20% of the front façade for the townhomes.

Steve Grittmann concluded regarding the memo from the City Engineer in regard to neighborhood traffic and the circulation of 87th as a connection to nearby neighborhoods, stating that the proposed pattern remains as recommended.

Andrew Tapper asked about the accommodation for the minimum building size for the Oxford and Augusta home designs. Steve Grittmann stated that these designs do not meet the 40% exposed livable space requirement for the three-car garage versions, yet there are ways to accommodate this with additional front yard space, and stated the applicant could speak to those concerns.

A brief audio interruption occurred with the feed.

Rick Kothenbeutel asked for clarification around the trail extension. Angela Schumann stated that the ordinance includes a requirement for sidewalks on one side of all public streets, including Park Drive. That sidewalk will remain but after discussion, is not

proposed to be extended east. Instead, staff have asked the applicant to research construction of a trail extension on the north side of the plat in the public right-of-way to Farmstead which will meet with existing sidewalk connections to Pioneer Park. The trail would be eligible for park dedication credits; the developer is currently short of the dedication threshold. After investigation, there were concerns of grading on the current developed portion of Park Drive for a new sidewalk.

A brief audio interruption occurred with the feed.

Andrew Tapper stated that the City Engineer's letter regarding circulation addressed circulation and connection and that it is best-practice to have multiple circulation points and connections, specifically regarding the 87th Street connection.

Andrew Tapper stated that the public comment section was closed from the public hearing in the prior month and thanked the applicant and staff for coming to more defined conditions.

Melissa Robeck stated these proposed conditions are closer to the expectations of the applicant from staff and Commissioners and she stated that she is satisfied with the progress made towards the unmet conditions.

Andrew Tapper concurred with staff's recommendation to have a livable front façade conditions, and the applicant's vision is not in step with the city's vision.

Andrew Tapper asked Commissioners if they had desire to hear from the applicant.

Teri Lehner spoke to not being in attendance at the January 2025 meeting, yet appreciated the summary from staff and the concessions on both sides and the remaining standards are sufficient.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-03 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF DEVELOPMENT STAGE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR MEADOWBROOK, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT Z AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED, 5-0.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-04 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF REZONING OF LAND TO BE PLATTED AS MEADOWBROOK AS MEADOWBROOK PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT Z AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED, 5-0.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-05 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAT OF MEADOWBROOK SUBJECT TO THE

CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT Z AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED, 5-0.

4. Other Business

A. Community Development Director's Report

Angela Schumann gave an update regarding the Council approval of the conditional use permit for the vehicle-sales for Rockstone Auto at Chelsea Road and Highway 25, and spoke to the planting in the spring for landscaping compliance. She also indicated that staff will be reviewing draft rules issues by the Office of Cannabis Management.

Angela Schumann gave a staffing update and spoke to a future agenda item for the capital improvement plans.

She spoke to the Economic Development Authority's award for economic development project of the year for Block 52 and spoke to the ongoing efforts from the Economic Development Authority regarding the redevelopment of Block 34.

5. Adjournment

TERI LEHNER MOVED TO ADJORN THE MEETING AT 8:01 P.M., MELISSA ROBECK SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 5 -0.

Recorded By: Tyler Bevier

Date Approved:

ATTEST:

Angela Schumann, Community Development Director