

**CHASKA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
OCTOBER 11, 2023**

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Brass called the meeting to order at 7 pm.

2. Roll Call

Roll call was taken. Members present: Commissioners Olson, Gaare, Aasen, Urbanski, Baswa, Purdy, Kerber, Campbell, and Chairperson Brass.

Members absent: None.

Also present: Nate Kabat, Community Development Director; Liz Hanson, City Planner, Ashley Cauley, City Planner.

3. Adopt the Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Urbanski, second by Commissioner Assen, to adopt the agenda as presented.

Motion carried.

4. Visitor Presentation

No one appeared under Visitor Presentation.

5. Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

- a. Approve the September 13, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Purdy, second by Commissioner Olson, to approve the minutes of the September 13, 2023 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion carried.

6. Consent Agenda

7. Action Items

- a. PUBLIC HEARING: Recommend Approval of the CUP for the Berm on Kelzer's Site/CloudHQ/PC #2023-23

City Planner Hanson presented the item to the Commission.

Commissioner Urbanski stated that there were plans to install 36 inch pipes for the temporary diversion of water and asked where that water would end up.

Trish Sieh, Kimley-Horn, referenced the drawings and explained that the water would overflow with rip rap to the natural contours of the field and will spread out for sheet flow in the interim, but in the future would be collected in the stormwater treatment system.

Chairperson Brass asked when the project would be completed and the buildings were on site whether CloudHQ would be responsible for the maintenance of the berm and stormwater.

City Planner Hanson explained that it was not anticipated that this would be on its own outlot and believes the intent is for it to be privately maintained.

Commissioner Olson stated that the CUP is coming through before the project which feels a bit like putting the cart before the horse as to who will ultimately be responsible for this. He stated that from his standpoint, he wants to think about what 'teeth' can be put into this to ensure that it is completed and not left half done. He asked what the City would be putting into place so residents that will be looking at this berm know it will be completed and not just as a big pile of grass.

Commissioner Gaare added that she would like to make sure it does not just stay as a big pile of dirt.

City Planner Hanson stated that there is always a 'what if' component, for example, 'what if they walk away', the intent would be that if operations stopped midway through there will be sureties put into place that the City can use to stabilize the berm.

Chair Brass stated that his understanding is that there would need to be a berm on this site regardless of what goes on the site.

City Planner Hanson stated that was correct.

Chair Brass stated that he would agree that it is a little odd to have that done beforehand, however, this is an expensive berm, so, in his opinion, they must be fairly confident that this will move forward.

City Planner Hanson agreed that they are very serious about moving forward with this project.

Community Development Director Kabat noted that whoever develops on this site will be required to build a buffer. He noted that the 'what if' possibility exists for any type of project but it is also why they have agreements that the City enters into with the developers. He noted that the goal with this site would be to get it to stability and not necessarily completion of the berm.

Commissioner Urbanski noted that one of the conditions pertained to 'security' and asked if that was a security bond.

City Planner Hanson stated that it was a security bond.

Commissioner Urbanski stated that would mean that if the project does not go forward, the City can step in and make it look nice.

Commissioner Gaare asked about enhancement for the haulage road to prevent backups

Brett Burnette, CloudHQ, stated that they do not want trucks backing up across the entire site, nor is it feasible, so they are happy to put in a loop.

Chairperson Brass stated that there may be 70 trucks a day if they were consistent.

Commissioner Olson stated that with that number of trucks that close to residences he asked what something like dust mitigation would look like that that many truck loads traversing the site.

Trish Sieh, Kimley-Horn, explained that was a hard answer to give because it will depend on the season and weather conditions. She noted that there are a lot of local and State regulations in place for this that they will have to comply with. She explained that she understood that she had given a somewhat vague answer, but it would be completely situational with what is going on.

Commissioner Olson explained that he was just trying to look forward to the middle of the construction process when there may be a dust problem shared by the residents. He explained that he wanted to take a look at the worst case scenarios so they can make sure it is covered because this site backs up to about 45 homes. He stated that he wanted to make it very clear what the expectations are so that if and when a concern is voiced that there is an answer.

Ms. Sieh stated that generally speaking, this is CloudHQ's start of a relationship with the City. She noted that there is an active e-mail address specifically dedicated to this project and this site. She stated that they are committed to active engagement with the neighbors and could foresee some regular cadence and communication avenues as well.

Mr. Burnette stated that the contractors that they have been talking to are all local site workers that are familiar with this type of work around existing residential properties. He noted that, as Ms. Sieh, stated this is the beginning of their relationship with the City and noted that they expect to be here for a long time. He stated that they have been involved in projects in other markets that are very close to residential and have been able to solve any issue that has arisen without any jurisdiction needing to step in.

Chair Brass noted that he believes the neighbors are going to have to expect that there will be some dust, even with mitigation efforts. He encouraged part of their approach to be honesty and admit that it may be dusty sometime but follow that up with the message that they will try to control it the best they can.

Mr. Burnette noted that it will primarily be a two part approach by using water to keep the dust down but also to have wash out stations in order to keep mud off the roads.

Chair Brass asked about specific feedback they had gotten at the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Burnette stated that there were questions mainly related to the timing of utility works, for example, a water line extension and if it would impact their services. He stated that a lot of their questions covered what was presented earlier in the meeting about what would happen if they

don't complete the entire berm. He stated that this is a very significant investment and noted that they committed, at the concept phase, to construct this berm before they moved forward with any building. He reiterated that they are committed to moving forward with the project and are doing this first to take advantage of the significant amount of construction projects that are happening around the site and explained that he did not see a scenario where they didn't complete the berm.

Chair Brass opened the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Michael Gilbertson, 1959 Schoolmaster Drive, stated that he has been around for all the discussions since they have been planning the berm. He stated that the elevation of his home on the north side is quite elevated from where they are taking the measurements from. He noted that what they have determined is that if you are at the fence at the bottom of the property line and you go out and have a berm at 30 feet, you may not be able to see over it, but when you are in the houses they see right over the top of the berm. He stated that the only way it would work from inside the homes is if the berm was much closer to the homes, which many people do not want. He stated that if the City gives permission for this to move forward he asked why they couldn't also give permission for the landscaping work to happen first. He gave the example of it taking just until this last year for the lights to be covered up from the power station because the trees are finally filling in. He stated that they do not have a problem with there being some dust because they live next to a farm, but would be supportive of mitigation efforts also. He stated the berm, in some areas, at 30 feet will be fine but those on the cul-de-sac and in the corner it will not.

Chair Brass asked if the line of site information was from the first floor or from the yard. He noted that when he saw this he thought it would be great for people on the first floor but not necessarily for the second story bedrooms.

Mr. Gilbertson reiterated that their measurements as they are being presented assume a flat field in the yard, and in many cases, that is not reality. He stated that he would prefer to have the berm wrapped up into the corner and brought in closer.

Community Development Director Kabat explained that the Comprehensive Plan has a requirement for a 30 foot buffer in width and the height can go up or down. He explained that the intent has been that the buffer would provide screening for the views. He stated that CloudHQ is really focusing on the main level living which is what is represented in the renderings. He noted that they understand that it will take time for the trees to grow in a bit.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that he wanted to make it clear that he was not against this project and feels that CloudHQ will make good neighbors, but would like them to take some of the actual elevations into account when planning the berm. He stated that what he would like to see is some flexibility in order to make this right. He noted that he agreed with the comments made earlier about the possibility that plans may fall through because they have seen it happen with other projects. He stated that he would like to see them build the berm and put in the landscaping on the front side of the project to give the trees more time to grow and fill in.

Chair Brass asked if there was a reason that the berm was not tucked up the way Mr. Gilbertson was recommending.

Ms. Sieh stated that she understands his concern and they can take a look at pushing a bit closer to see what could be done.

There being no additional comments, Chair Brass closed the public hearing at 7:54 p.m.

Commissioner Baswa asked if there was any way the berm could be changed.

Chair Brass asked if there was a height restriction.

City Planner Hanson stated that she thinks it will come down to working with the grading and drainage needs back and there and seeing what the ultimate limits will be. She explained that she thinks it will be Kimley-Horn's team working on it to see what will be feasible.

Commissioner Purdy stated that they may be able to plant areas of concern first in order to give them more time to grow.

Commissioner Urbanski confirmed that the landscaping plan would come with the Preliminary Plat which means they may be able to ask that more mature trees be planted in this mix.

Commissioner Olson stated that the problem with that is that it would be waiting until the Preliminary Plat phase.

Chair Brass asked if the initial plan was just for native grasses.

City Planner Hanson stated that was correct.

Commissioner Olson stated that if it is only natural grasses, he would question how that would not negatively impact the valuation of the property owners who will be looking at a half-built berm with just grass on it. He stated that one of the requirements on the CUP was that this would not have a negative impact on their valuations. He stated that if the City doesn't put in anything about landscaping then it would just be a 30 feet hill with grass on it which is most likely worse than what it is now, which is a farm field. He stated that with this CUP coming in before the Preliminary phase, he feels the City has to be able to put some things in that are tougher that would normally be addressed in later phases. He questioned why they wouldn't go ahead and build the berm with landscaping prior to the building.

Mr. Burnette stated that he understands what they are asking for is a bit unique, but if you look at other development projects, there is a reason why the landscaping always goes in last. He explained that if you put it in first, it becomes very challenging to maintain the viability and the aesthetic appeal during an active construction project. He stated that because they are proposing to do the berm first and stabilize it with native grasses, when they do build the building and come back to plant the trees and more robust landscaping, the ground will be much more receptive to growing those must larger plantings.

Commissioner Olson suggested he reframe his comments to the residential side of the 30 foot berm and noted that he didn't think that would have any impact on the construction. He stated that this is where he would hope that the construction wouldn't be going up and over the berm once it is in place. He stated that the trees planned for the berm are part of the screening for both site and sound and because it takes time to grow, it will not be an instant fix so the sooner they are in, the sooner they can start filling in. He stated that putting them in now rather than waiting until the data center is built means they will be in place two years sooner.

Chair Brass asked if it may be possible for them to add a phase of the trees and plantings earlier.

Ms. Sieh stated that one thing to remember is that in the beginning the berm will be up and will be a grassed hill and they will not actually be screening anything initially.

Mr. Burnette stated that they are happy to take a look at possibly doing some of the landscaping work earlier in the process and take a look at what types of product they feel would be resilient enough to last through their construction efforts. He stated that he understands the intent but it also doesn't make sense for them to put things in that they know won't last.

Chair Brass stated that there is a similar situation with the Wagner farm where they had them put in the berm, but noted that about half the trees are dead. He stated that he agreed that there is a reason that the landscaping goes in last, but at the same time, this is a large berm. He suggested that perhaps there could be a one year delay where they plant the grasses and then the next year put in some of the plantings.

Commissioner Olson stated that right now the plan is for this to be CloudHQ, but there are no guarantees on anything. He asked, for example, if these were to fall through if the Kelzer family would then take over the responsibility for the berm. He reiterated that he feels as though they need to ask the questions about what would happen in the worst case scenario.

Chair Brass suggested that they keep some money within the escrow for the landscaping in the event of a worst case scenario and they back out of the project.

Commissioner Olson stated that he did not think they were necessarily looking for 'the' plan, but to make sure that there is a plan to take care of the plantings on the hill and not just the grasses.

Mr. Burnette asked if the Commission was suggesting that there be some additional surety so that if they were ever to not complete the berm, instead of just having it just be native seeds that there be some funds to add whatever the City deemed appropriate.

Chair Brass confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Burnette stated that the second idea raised was that somewhere between native seed and when they begin construction to do some additional phased landscaping on the residential side of the berm.

Chair Brass stated that he believed that was the general idea.

Mr. Burnette stated that he thinks that CloudHQ would be fine with all of that but would need to do a bit of research on what will last the best. He stated that he understood the Commission's need to look at through the lens of what would happen if this doesn't move forward, but he is hopeful that with the timing they are planning with the building, none of this will actually be relevant. He reiterated that he could support the addition of those two conditions.

Community Development Director Kabat stated that he believes they can work on some of those items but noted that they may be a bit tricky to put into conditions. He stated that he thinks all parties are on the same page so he was not sure it needed to be further defined.

Chair Brass encouraged them to work with the neighbors to address their concerns, especially on the portion mentioned by Mr. Gilbertson.

Community Development Director Kabat noted that both CloudHQ and Kimley-Horn have been good to work with thus far and been responsive to residents.

Commissioner Olson stated that he wanted to make sure that there was communication and that this approval was not just a one and done situation.

Chair Brass suggested that they add conditions for the additional escrow funds for the event where they walk away from the project for money to finish the landscaping and also a plan, if they don't walk away from the project, to phase in some of the landscaping earlier in the process.

Motion by Commissioner Olson, second by Commissioner Aasen to recommend to City Council approval of the Conditional Use Permit for the installation of a berm on Kelzer's Site/CloudHQ/PC #2023-23, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approvals shall be based on the following exhibits:
 - a. Conditional Use Permit for Berm Fill Narrative (pgs 1-2), submitted by Kimley Horn, dated September 27, 2023
 - b. CHQ – MSP (Chaska) – Test Fit plan, submitted by Corgan, dated June 1, 2022
 - c. Alta/NSPS Land Title Survey (pgs 1-2), submitted by EFN Land Surveyors
 - d. Existing Property Aerial Image, submitted by CloudHQ
 - e. Render #1 – View From East, submitted by CloudHQ
 - f. Site Section #1, submitted by CloudHQ
 - g. Render #2 – View From North, submitted by CloudHQ
 - h. Site Section #2, submitted by CloudHQ
 - i. Render #3 – View from Northwest, submitted by CloudHQ
 - j. Site Section #3, submitted by CloudHQ
 - k. Berm Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, submitted by Kimley Horn, dated September 27, 2023
 - l. Soil and Restoration Plan, submitted by Kimley Horn, dated September 27, 2023
 - m. Erosion and Sediment Control Details, submitted by Kimley Horn, dated September 27, 2023
2. Adherence with the City Engineers Memo dated October 11, 2023.
3. Hours of Operation for berm installation are limited to 7am-8pm Monday-

Friday and 8am-7pm Saturday and meet the general code of ordinances section 6.12.030.

4. The berm area will include an area maximum of 20.9 acres and 350,000 cubic yards and as shown on the Berm Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
5. All storage of equipment and materials used in the operation shall be kept in areas that are not visually impeding on neighboring residential.
6. The permittee shall comply with the noise pollution requirements/standards of the Minnesota State Rules Chapter 7030 and Section 6.12.010 of Chaska General Code of Ordinances.
7. Street cleaning and dust control shall be performed on a regular basis and as required by the City. Dust control and street cleaning shall be provided within the same day as it is requested. Failure to comply with a request within the time specified shall be a cause for the City Engineer to stop the work onsite until compliance is achieved. If the permit holder is unable to supply dust control or street cleaning within the time specified, the City will perform the work and bill the permit holder for actual costs incurred plus any penalties imposed by City ordinance.
8. Provision to further evaluate and implement a continuous loop haul route that minimizes the need for truck back-ups on site and to be shown on the plans prior to release of the CUP agreement.
9. The permit holder shall comply with any/all CCWMO rules and regulations, which includes obtaining any permits the CCWMO deems necessary.
10. The permit holder shall obtain, continuously maintain, and comply with the terms of drainage and erosion control permits issued by the CCWMO.
11. The permit holder shall obtain a grading permit from the City of Chaska ahead of any grading operations commencing.
12. Existing drainage patterns shall not be altered.
13. An erosion control plan that includes seeding and restoration information and which is consistent with the requirements of NPDES permit and CCWMO permit shall be submitted to the City of Chaska and adhered to by the permit holder.
14. The permit holder shall submit to the City of Chaska a formal report from a qualified geotechnical engineering firm annually by the end of each calendar year. The report should include testing and an analysis of the material that was placed at the site. All fill being used within the berm area will be required to be free of contamination and meet geotechnical engineering standards for compactable fill.
15. The permit holder shall provide a performance security in an amount defined by City staff that is sufficient in stabilizing the site that is also in a form acceptable to the City of Chaska, naming the City of Chaska as the obligee. This performance security shall be replenished by the permit holder to its full amount 5 business days after being utilized by the City of Chaska.
16. The performance security shall be re-submitted to the City of Chaska annually in an amount that is 2% greater than the previous year.
17. The City of Chaska may utilize the performance security for reimbursement for any and all expenses incurred in the event that the permittee fails to comply with any conditions or requirements of this CUP or for any reason ceases to operate the facility in accordance with the provisions of this CUP, if the City of Chaska incurs costs, liabilities, expends monies, labor, services, or

material to compel or restore compliance with the terms of the CUP, or perform on-site or off-site restoration resulting from permittee's actions or non-actions.

18. The CUP shall not be effective until such time that an agreement is approved, executed, and recorded with the Recorder's Office in Carver County, Minnesota.

19. Any and all claims that arise or may arise against the permit holder, its owners, agents, trustees, servants, or employees while engaged in the use of the property shall in no way be or become obligations of the City of Chaska. The permit holder, jointly and severally, shall indemnify, hold harmless, and defend the City of Chaska, its officials, officers, employees, and agents against any and all liabilities, losses, costs, damages, expenses, claims, actions, or judgments, which includes reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses, and court costs, including experts, that the City of Chaska, its officials, officers, employees, or agents may hereafter sustain, incur, be subjected to, or required to pay, in any way connected with the use of the property and the CUP. The obligations contained in this paragraph shall survive the expiration or earlier termination of the CUP.

20. City staff shall be allowed access to the site to inspect all elements of the CUP. The landowner will be notified more than 24-hours in advance of site access.

21. Provision that the watermain pipe coming from Schoolmaster Drive be planned with the CUP berm work and extended to service the Kelzer property in a way that does not impact the berm.

22. Provision that the permit holder notify City and County staff when significant trucking operations to the site start and stop.

23. Financially securing funds for completion of landscaping if they walk away from the project

24. Staging the landscaping to phase in some of the landscaping on the residential portion of the berm earlier in the process

Motion carried.

- b. PUBLIC HEARING: Recommend Approval of the Preliminary Site and Building Plan, Preliminary Plat and Rezoning for 3740 Chestnut Street/Audrius Asakenas/PC #2023-24

City Planner Hanson presented the item to the Commission.

Commissioner Olson noted that they had mentioned that they were doing underground storage.

City Planner Hanson stated that this was correct and explained that there are 4 different areas where they are capturing stormwater.

Commissioner Olson stated that it is nice to see this rather than just going straight into a pond. He asked about plans for the north side of the building.

City Planner Hanson explained that the goal with the north side was to keep it open so there is a drive aisle to accommodate adequate turn movements in front of those stalls.

Commissioner Olson asked if it was an island.

Tom Goodrum, Moore Engineering, explained that what they were seeing on the drawings was depicting the underground system and was not an island.

Chair Brass asked if the units would be for lease or for sale.

Mr. Goodrum stated that they will be for lease.

Chair Brass stated that he likes these kinds of projects because this is an underserved area which has a need in the community. He stated that these kinds of spaces encourage people to grow their businesses outside of their homes. He stated that he also likes the look of the building.

Commissioner Olson stated that his only hesitation and drawback was the parking with respect to the building.

Mr. Goodrum stated that they believe they have adequate parking on all side of the building. He explained that they expect that most of the tenants will have a single vehicle so very few people will actually be using the parking stalls. He explained that for the north side of the parcel, they are still in communication with TEL and are hopeful that they will be a future partner. He stated that the example he uses for the type of tenants they will likely have is someone like his brother who has a candy vending business. He explained that his brother has his van that he pulls in, loads up the candy, and then spends all day delivering, and comes back one more time to unload the boxes.

Chairperson Brass opened the public hearing at 8:38 p.m. There being no public comment, Chair Brass closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Urbanski stated that he has always liked this project.

Commissioner Olson stated that he agreed but noted that he liked it even more with the underground stormwater storage plans. He asked about the plans for putting in landscaping in an area that is proposed for parking. He stated that if they are putting trees there he would not agree that would be proposed parking.

Chair Brass asked if the understanding was that they would have to pull out the trees if they needed proof of parking.

City Planner Hanson stated that if they have to use that area and there is landscaping over it, it would be removed. She explained that the City would ask them to replace it because it is part of the landscape plan. She stated that what it looks like now is that it is very unlikely that this area would be impacted, but agreed that the best practice would be not to put the landscaping there.

Commissioner Olson stated that he would recommend that they make adjustments there to ensure that they are not putting landscaping in any areas where they are saying could be parking.

Chair Brass asked if City Planner Hanson was saying that even if it is not the best practice, it may be acceptable, in this instance, because of the minimal parking needs. He stated that the thought is that the need to use this proposed parking in the future because of the size of the units is less than it would be if it needed so the thought was that it would be better to have trees there and risk that they may need to be ripped out later.

City Planner Hanson stated that was correct, for this specific plan.

Chair Brass noted that because of code they need 46 proofs of stall, but realistically with this plan they will probably only need about 15 stalls.

City Planner Hanson stated that they do have some room to work and agrees that they can push some of the trees so they are not in these potential impact zones. She stated that she thinks there may be ways to look at it and achieve both things.

Motion by Commissioner Aasen, second by Commissioner Gaare, to recommend approval to the City Council of the Preliminary Site & Building Plan and Preliminary Plat for 3740 Chestnut Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approvals shall be based on the following graphic exhibits:

- a. Project Narrative (pgs 1-5)
- b. Cover Sheet (pg G-001), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- c. Civil Notes (pg G-002), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- d. Civil Legend (pg G-003), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- e. Details (pgs C-201-C-203), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- f. Landscape Details (pg C-204), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- g. Stormwater Details (pgs C-205-C-216), submitted by Moore engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- h. Demolition Plan (pg C-301), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- i. Preliminary Plat (pg C-601), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- j. Site Overlay Plan (pg C-602), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- k. Site Plan (pg C-603), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- l. Utility Plan (pg C-604), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- m. Utility Plan – Sanitary (pg C-605), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- n. Grading Plan (pg C-606), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- o. Erosion Control Plan (pg C-607), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023

- p. Landscape Plan (pg C-608), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- q. Tree Preservation Plan (pg C-609), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc., dated September 5, 2023
- r. Passenger Car Access Exhibit, submitted by Moore Engineering, inc.
- s. Van Access Exhibit, submitted by Moore Engineering, inc.
- t. Truck Access Exhibit, submitted by Moore Engineering, inc.
- u. Fire Truck Access Exhibit (pgs 1-2), submitted by Moore Engineering, inc.
- v. Photometric Plan, submitted by Davis, dated August 31, 2023
- 2. Adherence with the Engineers Memo dated October 11, 2023.
- 3. Compliance with the MnDOT memo when made available.
- 4. Provision/modification of any drainage and utility easements as required by the City Engineer in the course of their review.
- 5. Provision of easements for the shared access (vehicular cross access easements) and utilities (utility easements) that service this lot, to be recorded with the plat.
- 6. Coordination with the City Engineer with regard to utilities, grading and drainage.
- 7. Installation of all site lighting at a 0 degree angle with the light source fully concealed.
- 8. Utilization of modular face brick or natural stone as a Class I material.
- 9. Uses that require auto maintenance or exterior storage will not be permitted.
- 10. Provision of a 50 foot building/parking setback and a 30 foot no grade/no mow setback from the edge of 18% wooded steep slopes.
- 11. Provision of hydrant placement needs to accommodate City standards for hydrant placement and fire code standards.
- 12. Provision to submit Utility and Site Plan As-Builts prior to issuing a building permit.
- 13. Any and all building signage shall be submitted separately, meet the sign ordinance, and shall obtain sign permits prior to installation.
- 14. Provision that signage for all tenants to use similar signing methods and design.
- 15. Provision of a storm water management plan meeting City and Carver County WMO standards.
- 16. Compliance with applicable zoning requirements, in particular Section 15.28 (Special Regulations).
- 17. Provision that all mechanical equipment will be fully screened from view.
- 18. Compliance with Section 15.28.120 Building Design/Materials and Site Design.
- 19. Coordination with Electric Department on service locations.
- 20. Provision of decorative front doors and overhead doors on the south, north and interior facades.
- 21. Provision that planting islands are provided in the parking lot areas that meet Section 15.28.070.E.4.
- 22. Provision of irrigation for the landscaped and sodded areas of the site.

Motion carried.

Motion by Commissioner Urbanski, second by Commissioner Gaare, to recommend approval of the rezoning from Open (O) to Planned Industrial Development (PID-11)

Motion carried.

8. Other Business

9. Receive Other Meeting Minutes

- a. Receive the August 21, 2023 City Council Meeting minutes
- b. Receive the July 31, 2023 EDA Meeting Minutes
- c. Receive the August 8, 2023 Park Board Meeting Minutes

10. Adjourn

Motion by Commissioner Urbanski, second by Commissioner Gaare, to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 pm.

Motion carried.