

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING – MONTICELLO PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, February 3, 2026 - 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: Mayor Lloyd Hilgart
Council Liaison Absent: Councilmember Kip Christianson
Staff Present: Angela Schumann, Steve Grittman, Bob Ferguson, Tyler Bevier

1. General Business

A. Call to Order – 6:00 p.m.

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

B. Roll Call

Mr. Tapper the roll.

C. Consideration of Additional Agenda Items

None

D. Approval of Agenda

TERI LEHNER MOVED TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 3, 2026 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA. ANDREW TAPPER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

E. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- **Regular Meeting - December 2, 2025**
- **Regular Meeting - January 6, 2026**

MELISSA ROBECK MOVED TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 2, 2025 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

RICK KOTHENBEUTEL MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 6, 2026 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES. ANDREW TAPPER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

F. Citizen Comment

None

2. Public Hearings

A. Consideration of Preliminary Plat and Development Stage Planned Unit Development of Twin Pines Apartments, a 96-unit multi-family residential project in a Planned Unit Development district, and amendment to a

Conditional Use Permit for Planned Unit Development.

Applicant: Brick by Brick Development, LLC

City Planner Steve Grittman explained the proposal included three decisions for consideration including the preliminary plat, the development stage of the Twin Pines planned unit development (PUD) district, and an amendment to the conditional use permit (CUP) for a PUD in the noted development. He explained the series of prior approvals dating back to the initial 2020 applications for anticipated commercial buildings with shared parking and roadway access to School Boulevard. The applicant returned to the City in late 2025 with a concept review of an updated plan where, at workshop on December 2, City officials agreed that the plan continued to meet the expectations of the City and its PUD Zoning. It was also noted that the absence of both direct access and visibility from School Boulevard diminished the potential of the Twin Pines site as commercial property.

Mr. Grittman said the consensus of Council and Commission shared at the December 2025 workshop was that the revised concept plan meets the mixed land uses described within the Comprehensive Plan designation to support the proposed development on the remaining PUD land.

Mr. Grittman explained the ordinance requirements and flexibility within the PUD for parking, roadway access, and circulation while the applicant seeks flexibility from the 2.25 spaces per unit standard. He spoke in detail to the number of bedrooms to decipher units and parking spaces assigned; the estimated 1.1 parking spaces proposed should suffice overall parking for owners and tenants. Mr. Grittman spoke of reciprocal easement recordings involving driveway and maintenance for a portion of the sixth addition and parking and access as part of the fifth addition.

Mr. Grittman explained the proposed landscaping plan exceeded the minimum requirements of the code and recommended improvements to the lighting plans to City standards. The applicants have provided an extensive landscaping plan for the site, exceeding the minimum requirements of the code. He explained the building plans and the grading and elevation plans to accommodate a lower-level parking garage access at the east boundary of the site.

Mr. Grittman provided context regarding internal residential trash handling and externally enclosed commercial use as designed and is currently in use.

Mr. Kothenbeutel addressed a concern raised at workshop regarding pedestrians and traffic flow; asked how to mandate and govern speed bumps. Mr. Grittman explained the parking lot maintenance component is factored into the owner agreement written into the PUD. He said the layout of the forked entrance also

encourages traffic flow for commercial patronage along the naturally-placed eastern driveway.

Mr. Kothenbeutel said he conducted a site visit and noted the narrow traffic divider from School Boulevard. Mr. Grittmann said amendments and additions to the proposed conditions are subject to the Commission's discretion. He said along with the driveway, Staff also noted conditions for traffic directional signage for review.

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

- Scott Cutsforth, Hunters Crossing development (8634 Fairhill Lane), suggested not allowing commercial traffic access into the proposed parcel.

Mr. Kothenbeutel said concern was for emergency access, to ensure fire trucks can maneuver through the drive and lot.

- Scott Jacobson, owner of Jacobson Veterinarian Properties dba Monticello Pet Hospital at 4134 School Boulevard, said to have concerns for additional vehicles entering the property to potentially affect his business and the neighboring special needs school within the existing building to the east and said speed bumps were ineffective for slowing traffic. Dr. Jacobson said that he is not opposed to the development but encouraged careful consideration to the proposal as it affects the surrounding businesses.
- Cheryl Michelson stated that she patronizes the Monticello Pet Hospital and commented on the shared entrance and parking area's small scale and concern with potential construction traffic; she suggested considering an alternate entrance into the proposed development.
- A resident asked if signage to indicate "Emergency Vehicles Only" may be implemented.

Mr. Tapper noted that the suggestion is factored into Item 9. of Exhibit Z. as part of the proposed conditions of approval.

- Christina Johnson-Koshiol, 2485 Briar Oakes Boulevard, stated that she is a client of the Pet Hospital and works closely with neurodivergent individuals who patronize the school, she expressed concern with traffic within proximity to the students and staff. She said to not encourage additional traffic through the subject parking lot.
- Bill Sevil, 310 Vine Street, inquired as to the setbacks from the development to existing utility lines south of the project.

Mr. Tapper closed the public hearing portion of the agenda item.

Mr. Grittmann clarified that the R-4 zoning standard is a 20 foot setback from the rear property line. He said the power lines extend into the utility easements an additional 55 feet and estimated approximately 70 feet from structure to utility lines.

Mayor Hilgart said the property will be developed, and regardless of whether developed for residential or commercial use, the access is already established. He then asked if traffic frequency may be more intense than anticipated if reserved for commercial. Without a definitive answer, Mr. Hilgart discouraged the traffic standpoint as a sole factor for denial.

Mr. Tapper commented on parking in commercial and residential developments and traffic fluctuation for patrons and tenants.

Mayor Hilgart inquired as to the original layout of the development when first proposed. Mr. Grittmann said three commercial buildings were depicted for this area, with intent to loop along a proposed southerly-curved parking lot. Mayor Hilgart said additional studies based on original commercial buildings may assist a review of the traffic considerations.

Mr. Kothenbeutel noted that utility line corridors are regulated by the state, energy provider, and public utilities commission (PUC), noting the referenced power lines are closer to the easterly existing homes on Orchard Circle than the proposed apartment building.

Mr. Kothenbeutel then asked about Harvest Court as a potential access to the development and if additional parking beyond 1.1 spaces might be captured and reserved. Mr. Grittmann said the roads into the neighboring development are private as part of the townhome covenants and limit public access.

Mr. Tapper referred to the previous project approval discussion, stating a similar outcome on that potential.

Mr. Kothenbeutel concurred with the Mayor's comments on traffic.

Mr. Tapper referenced the earlier approval and stated that while the development pattern is not typical to what Monticello usually reviews, it is not an impossibility when compared to other communities with heavy density on compact sites.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2026-05 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT Z AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2026-06 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A DEVELOPMENT STAGE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT Z AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2026-07 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT Z AND BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION. ROB STARK SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

Mr. Bevier indicated that the matter will move forward for City Council consideration on the February 23, 2026 Consent Agenda.

3. Regular Agenda

- A. **Consideration of an Amendment to the Monticello City Code, Title XV, Land Usage, Chapter 153: Zoning Ordinance, Sections 153.012 Definitions, 153.045 Industrial Base Zoning Districts, 153.046 Overlay Zoning Districts, 153.090 Use Table, 153.091 Use-Specific Standards, 153.092 Accessory Use Standards and any other related sections of text necessary to define and regulate data center and technology campus land uses within the City**
Applicant: City of Monticello

Community Development Director Angela Schumann reviewed the history of public hearings and reviews of the draft DCPUD ordinance. She explained that a public hearing on the DCPUD ordinance was opened at the regular December 2, 2025 meeting and closed that evening. Commission postponed action on a recommendation for the ordinance to January 6, 2026, and then further postponed at the January regular meeting to allow for a joint workshop with City Council as requested by the Commission, which was held on January 15, 2026.

She noted that the ordinance included for Planning Commission review included both a clean and redline format. The redline version illustrated revisions from the December ordinance draft, which were based on additional research, response to the public comments received, and legal recommendations. Ms. Schumann noted the drafted ordinance continues to be evaluated relative to the comments received, and that staff may recommend additional revisions to the proposed DCPUD ordinance as part of the future Council review.

Ms. Lehner referenced the potential for long-term DCPUD construction activities and if timeframes are established for hours of operation.

Ms. Schumann explained that the DCPUD ordinance includes a set of regulations for temporary construction activities, including time restrictions for site lighting.

While these temporary construction standards are proposed in the DCPUD ordinance, it was noted in a prior joint Council and Commission workshop that the City may also need to evaluate general noise standards for construction activity. General noise standards for construction activity are in the City Code.

Ms. Schumann also indicated that the base zoning ordinance and city code is applicable unless modified by the language in the DCPUD.

Ms. Robeck asked about temporary construction for data mining, an inclusion noticed since the previous meeting.

Ms. Schumann noted that the ordinance provides specific language for temporary construction as noted and that outdoor storage is otherwise prohibited. Additionally, the language was strengthened to restrict data mining including cryptocurrency.

Mr. Robeck read the subject text for data mining and sought clarification on whether data mining would be allowed.

Ms. Schumann explained that the proposed ordinance first defines what the City proposes to consider “data mining”, which is the section referenced, and then prohibits data mining uses as defined within DCPUD in a later section.

Mr. Kothenbeutel drew attention to the language concerning backup generators under Section 2.(F)(8)(i). He referenced electrical off-peak and usage during heavy-usage periods. He indicated that there are state regulations which may influence generator use. He also suggested adjusting the wording to read with better clarity.

Mr. Tapper noted that there are also other state environmental compliance requirements that may be applicable to this type of development.

Mr. Kothenbeutel noted that specific language may need to be added as related to specific development proposals and inquired as to the status of an electrical power utility study addressed at a previous meeting.

Ms. Schumann stated that the draft ordinance is intended to consider and regulate a variety of data center development, not a single project. She indicated that for power use, the local power provider completes a study for power feasibility for availability and service requirements. These studies are initiated and paid for by a proposer.

Mr. Tapper addressed the ordinance language for back-up power generation and suggested that the language be revised to not only require submission of an annual generator testing schedule, but also City approval. He also suggested that

the Commission make revisions to the proposed DCPUD ordinance amendment via formal motion.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO AMEND THE LANGUAGE ON PAGE TEN, SECTION 2.(F)(8)(i)j. TO ADD AN ADDITIONAL SENTENCE TO INCLUDE TESTING SCHEDULE OF GENERATORS MUST BE FILED AND APPROVED ANNUALLY WITH THE CITY NO LATER THAN JANUARY 15 OF EACH YEAR. MELISSA ROBECK SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

Mr. Tapper asked Commissioners if they recalled whether state noise standards are effective during generator testing periods.

Mr. Stark inquired how the 500-foot setback number was established.

Ms. Schumann explained that setbacks are provided via a table within the proposed ordinance and are proposed in the interest of managing potential impacts on surrounding properties. She stated that setbacks for principal structures in the DCPUD are reduced when mechanical equipment is located interior to a building, wall or site. The setbacks are also based on the adjacent land uses, with reduced setbacks allowed when adjacent to other industrial uses.

ANDREW TAPPER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. PC-2025-41 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE MONTICELLO CITY CODE, TITLE XV, LAND USAGE, CHAPTER 153: ZONING ORDINANCE, ESTABLISHING A DATA CENTER PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING AMENDMENT TO SECTIONS 153.012 DEFINITIONS, 153.045 INDUSTRIAL BASE ZONING DISTRICTS, 153.046 USE TABLE, 153.092 ACCESSORY USE STANDARDS AND ANY OTHER RELATED SECTIONS OF TEXT NECESSARY TO DEFINE AND REGULATE DATA CENTER AND TECHNOLOGY CAMPUS LAND USES WITHIN THE CITY, BASED ON FINDINGS IN SAID RESOLUTION AND INCLUDING THE PREVIOUS MOTION FOR RECOMMENDATION. TERI LEHNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

Ms. Schumann explained that additional research and review time for the DCPUD ordinance may influence the final date for Council review and action. She indicated that those interested should refer to the Council agenda information online or contact City Hall.

4. Other Business

A. Community Development Director's Report

Ms. Schumann highlighted the January Planning Commission matters considered for Council action at the January 12, 2026 meeting.

Ms. Schumann highlighted the summary of 2026 fees related to Planning, Building, and Economic Development, approved by City Council on December 8,

2025. Regarding City staffing, she explained the Senior Planner tentative hire is anticipated in April 2026.

She highlighted the department update by the Chief Building Official presented at the January 26, 2026 City Council meeting.

Ms. Schumann stated that the Monticello Industrial AUAR and Mitigation Plan was approved at the January 26, 2026 Council meeting and is posted online.

Ms. Schumann stated that the EDA had approved an agreement with Bolton and Menk to review and amend the 2017 Downtown Small Area Study Plan. She explained the goals included further work on future development and strategies for Downtown core planning, notably for the east side of MN TH25. Ms. Schumann indicated that re housing-related discussions are slated to continue in workshop in March 2026.

5. Adjournment

TERI LEHNER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 3, 2026 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. ANDREW TAPPER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:12 P.M.