

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Regular Meeting

October 15, 2025 | 5:30 p.m.
Chandler City Council Chambers
88 E. Chicago St., Chandler, AZ



Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Heumann at 5:45 p.m.

Roll Call

Commission Attendance

Chairman Rick Heumann
Vice Chairman Sherri Koshiol
Commissioner Michael Quinn
Commissioner Charlotte Golla
Commissioner Ryan Schwarzer
Commissioner Tom Bilsten

Staff Attendance

Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
David de la Torre, Planning Manager
Darsy Smith, City Planner
Taylor Manemann, City Planner
Thomas Allen, Assistant City Attorney
Danielle Smee, Clerk

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Golla.

Scheduled and Unscheduled Public Appearances

Members of the audience may address any item not on the agenda. State Statute prohibits the Board or Commission from discussing an item that is not on the agenda, but the Board or Commission does listen to your concerns and has staff follow up on any questions you raise.

Consent Agenda and Discussion

1. September 17, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

Move Planning and Zoning Commission approve Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes of the Study Session of September 17, 2025, and Regular Meeting of September 17, 2025.

2. **Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan, PLH25-0009 Cooper Road Medical and Retail Building, 0.64-acre site generally located south of the southwest corner of Cooper Road and Chandler Boulevard**
3. **Rezoning and Preliminary PLAT, PLH25-0034/PLT23-0023 Tumbleweed Estates, 5.02-acre site located at 1981 S Tumbleweed Lane, generally located 1/3-mile east and northeast corner of Germann and Alma School Road**
4. **Zoning Code Amendment, PLH25-0025 Objective Design Standards, amending Chapter 35 Land Use and Zoning pertaining to House Bill 2447**
5. **Zoning Code Amendment, PLH25-0024 Middle Housing Overlay District, amending Chapter 35 Land Use and Zoning pertaining to House Bill 2721**
6. **Notice of Cancellation of the November 5, 2025, Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing**

Move Planning and Zoning Commission to cancel the November 5, 2025, Planning and Zoning Commission

Consent Agenda Motion and Vote

Vice Chairman Koshiol moved to approve the Consent Agenda of the September 17, 2025, Regular Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting, Seconded by Commissioner Schwarzer.

Motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Action Agenda Item No. 7 Motion and Vote

7. **Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan, PLH24-0046 Price Road Innovation Campus, located 3380 S. Price Road (southwest corner of Price and Dobson roads)**

Move Planning and Zoning Commission recommend denial of PLH 24-0046 Price Road Innovation Campus, rezoning an approximately 40-acre site from Planned Area Development (PAD) to PAD for a data center (approximately 422,877 square feet and 85 square feet in height) in addition to knowledge-intensive uses, advanced business services and ancillary commercial with a Mid-Rise overlay up to 90 feet and Preliminary Development Plan approval for site layout and building architecture, as recommended by Planning staff.

DAVID DE LA TORRE, PLANNING MANAGER, presented PLH24-0046 Price Road Innovation Campus. Mr. DE LA TORRE provided background information on the property and information on the proposed request to rezone for a data center, advanced business services and ancillary buildings. History of the property was provided, as well as a review of the history of the South Price Road Corridor, a major employment focused area.

MR. DE LA TORRE reviewed the zoning code for data center ordinances, noting that data centers as a primary use are not allowed by right. Ancillary data centers are allowed as long as they occupy no more than 10% of the footprint.

With the proposed development, there would be three phases, including a data center being "Building A" and which would be a standalone building with that as its primary use. "Building B" would be on the north side of the data center for a research and development SPEC building as no current tenant has been identified. It is noted that on the west side of the property there is a noticeable stench due to the water treatment plan nearby, which could be addressed. "Building C" and "Building D" would also be considered for research and development buildings. At this time, the only active tenant would be the data center, with the goal of attracting a single user for the remaining acres. "Building A" and "Building B" would be constructed at the same time.

There is a possible Development Agreement (DA) proposed for council approval to obtain permits for "Building E" and "Building F" within 12 months of receiving a certificate of occupancy of the data center. With the final phase, there is a commitment to obtain a building permit for "Building C" or "Building D." within 36 months of certificate of occupancy for the data center.

MR. DE LA TORRE reviewed the proposed architecture of the building, noting staff is pleased with the finished and "high tech" look applicants provided. Renderings of the buildings were provided.

With the 2016 General Plan, this site is located in the South Price Road Corridor, which is preserved for knowledge-based industries and has an intent to preserve "campus-like" environments. There are concerns that a data center provides lower numbers of jobs after construction is complete and may not fit in with what is envisioned for this area. Additionally, the campus-like setting does not appear to be achieved with the proposed later phases of this site.

MR. DE LA TORRE provided further explanation of a data center by definition, likening it to a storage center and stated that data centers may not be considered a knowledge-based industry.

In regard to the campus-like environment, staff reportedly struggles with then lack of a campus-like environment with the proposed layout, noting it lacks qualities of "campus design" including elements such as a boulevard like driveway that would connect and unify the buildings, enhanced pedestrian walkways and shared amenities or focal points that could bring a campus

together. It was noted there is a water feature on the northeast side of the property that could be utilized as a major focal point.

MR. DE LA TORRE noted that details within the policy for the General Plan, this specified area is planned to encourage more diversified knowledge-based industries in the area and preserve the campus-like environment, centered on a common design theme. Staff does not feel the proposal meets those policies.

Staff has concerns with the approval of a data center as a primary use is setting a precedent for the remaining undeveloped properties in the South Price Road Corridor. There are currently 10 data centers in the area, all of which were approved prior to the 2016 General Plan.

The applicant hosted three neighborhood meetings, one additional meeting to what was required by code. At each meeting, it was reported that there was discussion about a variety of topics about uses, heights, noise and other concerns. It was noted the applicant did address all comments. Staff has received three e-mails in support and seven emails in opposition. There were two couples that did each send their own e-mail, therefore totaling 5 households in opposition.

Staff recommended denial due to the inconsistency with the General Plan policy of the South Price Road Corridor. Should the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the item, there is an alternative motion with stipulations for the commission's consideration.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZER asked about hearing the alternative motion stipulations.

CHAIR HEUMANN stated they needed to continue through the process and then could go back and see more information about the alternative motion, if necessary.

COMMISSIONER GOLLA inquired about the term campus-like setting, stating that in looking at the current area, there were not many campus-like environments that she could identify. There was also a question on the smell and wanting a campus and how that would work or make sense.

MR. DE LA TORRE elaborated about large setbacks, fountains and other water features, boulevards and greenery on either side, that previous buildings had in order to establish a campus-like look. With the stench, there were possible ways to provide help, noting a large building could be built to assist with blocking the stench, but that it does not have to be a data center.

CHAIR HEUMANN looked to examples of the current Wells Fargo building in the area, noting that campus may sound like a funny word in this application, but that the idea was to "pull things together" and give the feel of one comprehensive unit.

COMMISSIONER GOLLA noted that the setback comment helps and that with looking at a site-like Intel, she does not necessarily see campus but understands the provided references.

COMMISSIONER BILSTEN commented that the “campus-like environment” concept was interesting to him, noting that he thinks of grassy lawns and picnic tables, but that there is a reported noticeable stench, so that may not be what is placed there. He noted there was nice areas in the existing area already. He wanted to dive in more as to what campus-like environment concepts mean, sharing that there is something interesting to rearranging the layout to make a grand boulevard or for the buildings look at each other.

COMMISSIONER BILSTEN stated that while another building could be proposed to be built and block the stench, the current proposal is what is what is being provided now, there is nothing else being proposed for the site currently.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL appreciated the proposals of the vision of the General Plan but stated that it seemed that the need was for more employment, but that there was a lot of focus on layout of the site.

MR. DE LA TORRE noted that one of the alternative motion stipulations was to redesign the layout with the applicants. It was noted that building higher may be a way to incorporate more space for more jobs while achieving the desired campus-like look.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked about possible employment footprint within each building that is proposed, as the data center would be limited to the specific space outlined.

MR. DE LA TORRE shared a “square feet per job” data slide he had prepared, emphasizing that data centers have quite a lower number of jobs per square feet compared to the targeted users for that area.

COMMISSIONER BILSTEN noticed staff comparing a data center to a storage facility. He noted that there are a lot of storage facilities being built and people may ask why they build so many, but that they would not be built if people were not using them, which could be applied to this instance with data centers. He commented that with these AI data centers, they could support high-tech industry and high-tech jobs.

CHAIR HEUMANN shared that with the provided footprint, the job creation with a data center is “nil.” He then thanked MR. DE LA TORRE and asked the applicant to step forward.

ADAM BAUGH, ATTORNEY presented on behalf of applicants. MR. BAUGH elaborated on data centers and AI data centers, providing additional definitions and information on AI data centers specifically.

MR. BAUGH shared that there are a variety of parcels and opportunities in the South Price Road Corridor and he appreciated the intent from the previous General Plan and complimented staff on their use and ideas for the area, but stated that with this plan proposal, the applicant has had to change their plans to fit the parcel to adapt to the circumstances around it. MR. BAUGH noted that in this instance there are city owned facilities, such as the water treatment plant that create some challenges that the applicant is willing to adapt to. He stated that a data center would have less complaints about a possible smell than a "campus" would. It was also noted that Northrup Grunman moved out of the area after one year, which says to him that this building had become "functionally obsolete" and that to provide a space for a single user is not an easy task.

MR. BAUGH stated that with the robust development areas of other cities in the valley, Chandler has had competition to continue to be the innovative city it strives to be. He acknowledged that there are upcoming layoffs occurring in the area and that staff is asking for a campus-style use while current employers there are "shedding jobs."

It was elaborated that this proposal is not "just a data center" but is an AI data center and that it will have a "tech park" included. Additionally, MR. BAUGH stated that the uses that come with an AI data center are the types of knowledge-based industries encouraged by the 2016 General Plan. He stated that if this were "only a data center, it would be a different conversation."

MR. BAUGH wanted to distinguish the differences between an AI data center and a regular data center, noting that the equipment is different, in that it is modernized and that the power and cooling systems are different as well. He notes it does not compare to the other data centers in the area in its processes and power.

According to MR. BAUGH, the significance of an AI data center is the backbone of technology now and going forward and an AI data center is a part of "America's Action Plan" to win the AI race on a global scale. With having the 9-acre data center on this property, this would reportedly "unlock" the remaining acreage to have the additional buildings constructed.

It was noted that jobs will be created with this project, and MR. BAUGH stated that staff and the chair were seemingly ignoring that the other buildings on the site would create jobs, however the other buildings will not come without the AI data center. Also, regarding the reported odor, the AI data center would be built on the western side near the water facility, which would solve the odor problem, limiting the people that would be closest to the odor.

MR. BAUGH reports there are two different development scenarios in this instance, both of which will involve the building of an AI data center. He stated the city has the opportunity to attract and market the site for a single user. If after marketing without a single user acquired, the applicant would build the speculative buildings, because "they owe it to the city to ensure something happens with the space and it does not stay dirt." Additionally, there is an excess of parking planned, meaning any of the buildings would have the possibility for a second story or mezzanine level, increasing the employment spaces available.

MR. BAUGH showed renderings of buildings in the area and the design style, stating that the buildings are attractive for the area and have high quality architectural design expected of the area.

MR. BAUGH wanted to make it clear that the city did not ban data centers and elaborated on the zoning and rules. He provided the rules on notification process and meetings, stating the applicant has gone above and beyond and done extra things, such as a third neighborhood meeting.

MR. BAUGH reviewed what the top concerns were for this project, including noise levels, water use and traffic. He offered solutions for each issue. Additionally, he spoke about environmental concerns that people may have, which he respected. Residents reportedly had concerns with the power being used, but it was stated that the applicant has worked with SRP and completed a cluster study that could assist in how much power they would be using and would be paying for. It was reported no new power lines would be installed.

There is also a "phasing commitment plan" that is to be worked out in a development agreement, still pending at this time. It was reported that the applicant will decommission the existing water chillers within 60 days of zoning approval, demolish the existing structures within 90 days of zoning approval, and give the city opportunity to attract a user but will also commence construction to construct the buildings in the front (near Dobson Road) within 36 months of obtaining the building permit for data centers. It was reiterated that there will be not only a data center but other buildings that will provide employment opportunities. There is also a commitment proposed in the development agreement (still pending) for two jobs for every 1,000 square feet of occupied space or there would be a \$2,000 penalty fee for each employee short. There is also a possible request for \$200,000 each year that the required buildings in the front area are not completed as well as an additional \$250,000 for every year the building proposed in the middle are not completed.

CHAIR HEUMANN asked how many years that money would be due, asking if there was a time limit or if it was in perpetuity. MR. BUAGH reports this money being owed annually would be active until the buildings have been completed.

Other important points that would be included in the development agreement were also addressed. There would be a building built prior to or concurrent with data center building establishing an opportunity for employment right away. If there was a fear that the power lines would affect the city's sewer and water lines, the applicant would absorb the cost to address.

This is reportedly a 2.5-billion-dollar project, which would also have construction jobs as well as continued jobs once built. The long-term impact would be "tremendous" for revenue for the city with things like permit and building fees.

MR. BAUGH stated that he had a difficult time with the staff's stipulation for a campus-like environment when he reports that there are things such as pedestrian walkways and gathering area and water features implemented in the original plan.

MR. BAUGH concluded his presentation differentiating between the definition of a data center and an AI data center, discussing building heights with option for second floors and increased employment, enhanced corridor aesthetic and that it is compliant with the 2016 General Plan.

CHAIR HEUMANN commented that there is no development agreement completed. THOMAS ALLEN, CITY ATTORNEY reports he is not the attorney working on this and that to his knowledge there is nothing formally in place or completed. CHAIR HEUMANN wanted to make that point about that not being an active and that this is "a lot of ifs and buts" right now. As far as layoffs, CHAIR HEUMANN stated that federal projects can come and go and that can vary employment for these types of businesses in the area.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked about the build time for the buildings, once permits are received for the data center.

JEFF ZYGLER, FOUNDER AND CEO OF ACTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE, responded that things will be done in a methodical way and may take about six months to complete.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked if there were any other AI data centers like this in the valley today.

MR. ZYGLER reports there are, but they are in construction and not operational yet.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked about the cluster study completed by SRP, asking if SRP reached out to the applicant about what the power needs were for the startup of the project and ongoing.

MR. ZYGLER reports they submitted their load ramp process to SRP and were then informed that SRP would be lumping everyone together and that would be in a cluster with other projects.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked the other projects that contributed information and if it included speculative developmental properties. She wanted to know if there was any sort of pre-planning or predictions made with his process.

MR. ZYGLER noted that he is not sure who the other projects belong to, but that to his knowledge the projects are real and include one in the immediate area.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked MR. ZYGLER to speak to the environmental concerns that have been brought to the Commissions attention by residents.

MR. ZYGLER noted that people had concerns about “forever chemicals” or PFAs and stated that they are everywhere in daily life, including commonly fire extinguisher foams and non-stick Teflon cookware. He reviewed the process of the closed loop water system that would prevent bacteria and that it would not need to be refilled unless there was required maintenance. Any water that would be drained would go to the wastewater treatment facility.

CHAIR HEUMANN asked if MR. ZYGLER has built one of these types of centers before anywhere. MR. ZYGLER reports he has a data center currently being built that is not completed or operational yet. He reported that this other data center is in Virigina.

COMMISSIONER BILSTEN complimented the commitments that the applicant made from the review of the slideshow. COMMISSIONER BILSTEN asked that if one singular tenant is not identified then building would then be built with more floors to accommodate more businesses. He also inquired about the calculations for how many employees would be required or what the city’s expectation or threshold would be.

MR. ZYGLER provided basic numbers of employees per building that were requested of them. With an addition of a mezzanine it would increase those numbers.

CHAIR HEUMANN reiterated that there is no formal development agreement in place.

COMMISSIONER QUINN asked about the timelines, noting it sounded as if there was an acceleration to the building but then per the presentation, it appeared that nothing was “speeding up.”

MR. ZYGLER clarified that the buildings would be built along Dobson Road after the Certificate of Occupancy was received for the data center. He reported that it can take a long time to obtain all the permits and certificates for a building this size.

COMMISSIONER QUINN further asked for clarification on when the provision for the employment “kicks in.”

MR. ZYLGER shared that as each building is built, then that provision for employees per square foot would kick in.

COMMISSIOR QUINN asked what would be happening in “Phase One” construction. It was reported by MR. ZYGLER it would be “Building B” as part of the tech-pack.

COMMISSIONER QUINN further asked about the employee ratios of 2 to every 1000 square feet being applicable only to buildings B through F.

MR. ZYGLER reported that is correct.

COMMISSIONER QUINN stated that there is no reason for those buildings not to have a ratio like that, but that the “ask” is that the largest building on the property, the data center, would have a ratio of .2 employees per 1000 square feet.

MR. ZYGLER agreed stating that data centers do have overall less employees, which is why they are wanting to tie in the ratio with the tech-park.

CHAIR HEUMANN inquired about the employees threshold being in place for a reported five years but that the buildings, if they are not built is in perpetuity in which fees would be owed. It was also asked how the applicant would pay for this and if bond money was something that would be introduced.

KEVIN MAYO, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR interjected, stating that most of what was being discussed was not a part of what was being presented tonight for the Planning and Zoning Commission, and that things they were discussing were things that would be negotiated later.

CHAIR HEUMANN agreed but stated that the applicants brought up things within their presentation that brought up questions.

COMMISSIONER QUINN asked about the desirability of this project, noting that the applicants have stated that they are “giving the city the opportunity to attract others” but that if their facility is so desirable, it should be attracting people on its own.

MR. ZYGLER stated he believed it would attract users and that they are confident they can fill the buildings, but that they are allowing the city to identify a single user for the campus.

COMMISSIONER BILSTEN asked about “Building A” and the deed restrictions but stated that there was something else discussed and wanted the applicants to elaborate on what was said earlier.

MR. ZYGLER stated that there were two ways that it cannot encroach outside the boundary, noting they have a legal defined area they cannot change without coming back through the process of Planning and Zoning, as well as the deed restriction, basically “double locking” this in.

CHAIR HEUMANN then began calling speaker cards.

VEAN SIMON III (2312 W SUNRISE PLACE, CHANDLER) shared he appreciated the thoroughness of the project. He shared that money they are putting into this project out of pocket is high and that the technology they could be bringing to us is phenomenal. MR. SIMON felt that this project

“wanted to please us all” and that this project is “awesome.” MR. SIMON felt that there was no issue with traffic and that they as the applicants do not have any responsibility for the smell in the area and that they are trying to offer a solution for it as well as occupying an otherwise empty building.

KYRSTEN SINEMA (NO ADDRESS PROVIDED) stated she was a part of the National Coalition that was formed to work with the Trump Administration as we as a nation prepare for “AI Dominance” and the AI revolution that is coming. MS. SINEMA reported that this would give Chandler the opportunity to determine how and when these data centers get built before federal pre-emption occurs. MS. SINEMA noted that AI was not mentioned in the 2016 General Plan but that the “spirit” of the General Plan to encourage and diversify knowledge-based industry, which is what the AI data center could provide. MS. SINEMA concluded that there was a lack of understanding of AI data centers from staff, noting that companies want to co-locate around these data centers, so they have the compute power near them to operate at the highest levels. MS. SINEMA was in support of this project to lead the “AI revolution” in America.

TERRI KIMBLE (491 W CHERRYWOOD DRIVE, CHANDLER) stated that she would let experts talk about AI but that she wanted to speak on the workforce in the area, stating that we need to advance our technology if Chandler wants to continue to be innovative and grow. MS. KIMBLE reported statistics of jobs in the Price Road area and how many are shifting to being hybrid or remote. MS. KIMBLE was in support of the project.

JEFF STICKELMAN (2477 W MARKET PLACE, CHANDLER) expressed his support for this project and lives adjacent to the proposed project site. He noted that he has seen the empty building for years and is happy to see them go forward with a project for that space.

LINDA LENOX (2511 W QUEEN CREEK DRIVE #207, CHANDLER) shared she was confused as to why Chandler needed another data center. MS. LENOX had concerns with the energy needs that any data center including an AI data center would utilize. She also had concerns of the size of the project, noting that it would take at least 10 years to get built and wondered if the buildings would remain empty if people want to work remote or hybrid. MS. LENOX concluded that she wanted the commission to think about if this what we really want to do with the space and that the buildings could remain empty.

ROBERT STY (3120 S DAKOTA PLACE, CHANDLER) reported he is a long-time Chandler resident and helps lead a local data center group within Arizona. MR. STY was in support of the project, stating that this project would help support a number of things from an AI standpoint as well as with research and development. He believed it would support the semi-conductor industry as well as many others and would bring jobs to the area.

CEPAND ALIZADEH (2800 N CENTRAL AVE, PHOENIX) shared that with reviewing e-mails about this project the words “eye sore” and “disappointment” stood out in reference to this current site. MR. ALIZADEH supported the project, stating that AI can provide jobs that would be good jobs with benefits. MR. ALIZADEH concluded on how AI has enhanced something like 911 emergency services and that it can save lives and shared his personal experience in an accident where AI assisted the first responders and were better able to help him.

CARLA HOEFER (2511 W QUEEN CREEK ROAD, CHANDLER) questioned the project, stating that she was in support for the concept of a tech park and having infrastructure for technology, but that she does have concerns with the proximity that she and many other neighbors would now be to an AI data center. She reported that there is little known about the short- and long-term impact of something like this and she was concerned with PFAs that were mentioned earlier in the evening. She concluded by stating she was concerned with the health risks to the exposure she and others may face.

DUANE LIDMAN (2301 W PALOMINO DRIVE, CHANDLER) reported he had questions about the water use and feels the applicant did answer this throughout the presentation. MR. LIDMAN spoke about the unknowns with water for the site.

CHAIR HEUMANN asked if there were any other speakers and seeing none, closed the floor for speakers. CHAIR HEUMMAN then asked DAVID DE LA TORRE to come back up to discuss his alternative motion option.

MR. DE LA TORRE presented the alternative motion option, which was to recommend approval with conditions. For the rezone, there were several stipulations. Stipulations 1 through 5 address the land use that would be permitted under the zoning and specifically discussed data center use. Stipulation 6 would discuss the mid-rise overlay, capping the height of buildings at 90 feet.

CHAIR HEUMMAN asked if every building on the site could be 90 feet if desired.

MR. DE LA TORRE reported that was correct.

MR. DE LA TORRE continued reviewing the stipulations. Stipulation 7 discussed the architectural design that the development would need to confirm with. Stipulations 8 through 11 were considered “boiler plate” about completion and construction of right-of-way improvements within the city. Stipulation 12 referred to water meters, and that a 1-inch water meter would be allowed to serve the data center and anything additional would have to go through the city for review. Stipulation 13 discussed the mechanical cooling system, requiring them to use the closed loop system as presented. Stipulation 14 required all generators be used as backup power only.

With the Preliminary Development Plan, Stipulation 1 required substantial conformance with the development booklet. Stipulation 2 required that building permit and plan review still need to

occur and that all buildings would need to meet city code. Stipulation 3 discussed the parking spaces and the percentage at which would need to be for electric vehicles. Stipulation 4 stated that the walkway that was previously utilized by previous occupants in the Orbital property would need to be removed. Stipulation 5 stated that the site plan layout for phases 2 and 3 would need to be redesigned to further create the campus-like feel, with a focal point on the water feature. Stipulation 6 stated that the phases of the building needed to be consistent with the development booklet unless a development agreement (DA) was in place, in that instance the DA would supersede.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZER asked if the building needed to go through a redesign for the campus-life feel, would it come back to Planning and Zoning, if item was approved tonight.

MR. DE LA TORRE stated that this item would not need to come back to Planning and Zoning Commission and that the redesign would be worked on between staff and applicant.

CHAIR HEUMANN inquired if this project would need to go through the Design Review Committee.

MR. DE LA TORRE reported that it could be brought to Design Review Committee if that was the commission's decision.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZER stated this was a significant enough project that it could make sense to go to Design Review Committee.

COMMISSIONER BILSTEN inquired if the 1st and 2nd stipulations were contradictory of each other.

CHAIR HEUMANN stated that it seemed clear of what buildings that could be a data center.

MR. DE LA TORRE elaborated that the stipulations talk about the entire site and the uses that are allowed.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked for clarification on where generators will be located.

MR. DE LA TORRE asked if the applicant wanted to provide that information.

MR. ZYGLER shared they would be behind the building, facing the wastewater treatment plant.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked about stipulation 5 under the Preliminary Development Plan, asking about re-evaluation of phases 2 and 3 and if previous iterations of design and plan fit more of what staff was wanting with the campus-life setting.

MR. DE LA TORRE stated there are elements in the previous versions of the site plan that do work with the campus-like setting than the current proposal

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked about Stipulation 6 about phasing outline, with the understand there may be a development agreement, asking about the development booklet about the developers phasing timeline and demolition.

In the development booklet it does identify the timelines of the data center and Building B, as well as for the rest of the phases, but it does not discuss demolition timelines.

CHAIR HEUMANN reminded everyone that with no formal development agreement in place currently, what is being approved tonight would be what is in front of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER BILSTEN asked if the goal of the city to have the campus-like setting, if the applicant would have to have that completed prior to going to council. MR. BILSTEN did not want to see the project slowed down further and asked how they could keep moving.

CHAIR HEUMANN stated they could take the project to Design Review Committee or leave it up to staff to work with the applicants.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL concluded the evening, commending staff for their presentation and the work staff does for the city. VICH CHAIR KOSHIOL had some concerns with the water use, but believed that the city could be on the cutting edge for water use and savings. VICE CHAIR KOSHIOLs motion included returning to Design Review Committee.

CHAIR HEUMANN agreed that this has been a long process and that AI is going to be important for the region, but that he would be voting no tonight based on his experience with the Price Road Corridor and 2016 General Plan.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL moved to approve Action Agenda Item No. 7 of the October 15, 2025, Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting; seconded by COMMISSIONER BILSTEN.

Motion carried by majority (5-1), CHAIR HEUMANN dissenting.

KEVIN MAYO, ZONING AMDINSTATOR, closed out the meeting with complimenting staff for their work on the Objective Design Standards and Middle Housing Overlay, noting that other jurisdictions may not have done things "in house."

CHAIR HEUMANN reminded everyone of the upcoming election on November 4, 2025.

Calendar

The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 19, 2025; in the Chandler City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.



David de la Torre, Secretary

Rick Heumann, Chairman